



REPORT OF THE WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM

To United States International University- Kenya

November 5, December 5, 2013

January 23, 2014, February 6, 2014

Team Roster

Linda Buckley, Associate Vice President Academic Planning and Development, San Francisco State University, Chair

Penelope Washbourn, Professor Emerita, Saint Mary's College of California, Assistant Chair

Marilee Bresciani, Professor of Post Secondary Educational Leadership, Co-Director of the EDD program San Diego State University

Richard Winn, WASC staff Associate

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page numbers
Section I. Overview and Context	3
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Special Visit Report. Quality of Report and Supporting Evidence	4
C. Description of the Team's Review Process	5
Section II. Evaluation of Issues under the Standards	6
A. Issue: Assessment planning and implementation with focus on General Education	6
B. Issue: Program Review	9
C. Issue: Strategic and Long Term Planning	11
D. Issue: Implementation of Doctoral level Programs	23
Section III. Findings and Recommendations	27
Appendices	29
I Follow up on Substantive Change recommendations DBA	29
II Follow up on Substantive Change recommendations Ph.D. IR	29
III Personnel consulted	30
IV Materials Reviewed	34

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

The United States International University, Kenya (USIUK) is a private, independent, non-profit university located 12 kilometers from the business center of Nairobi, Kenya and founded in 1969. In 2012, it had an enrollment of 5,198 students with three schools including the Chandaria School of Business (CSOB), the School of Science and Technology (SST), and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS). It received accreditation through the Kenyan charter in 1999 by the Commission for Higher Education (CHE). USIU has been accredited by WASC since 1981; first as a campus of USIU in San Diego, then as a separately accreditable unit, and finally as an independent institution in 2005.

In the March 15, 2009 Commission letter following the Educational Effectiveness report of November 2008, the Commission requested a Special Visit in fall 2013 to review efforts to sustain and improve educational effectiveness, program review, general education assessment, transition in Academic Affairs leadership and long range planning issues.

An Interim Report was submitted by USIUK on July 12, 2011. In the October 20, 2011 letter from the Interim Report Committee, the panel recommended that in anticipation of the Special Visit, the planning process be more explicitly linked to the capital budget and to anticipated new degree programs in terms of projected resource demands. Strategic objectives should be linked to timelines where possible, and data from assessments should be shown as being considered in the creation and updating of the strategic plan. (CFRs 4.1-4.3)

For the Development of Assessment, the panel recommended that the university be able to demonstrate the degree to which the assessment activities and program review process have impacted learning in the classroom. Evidence from direct measures rather than surveys and samples of student work that faculty are using to verify levels of learning should be provided at the time of the Special Visit fall 2013.

Other areas of specific focus for the Special visit included assessment of the goals and achievements of the student affairs department, training and orientation of adjunct faculty, and assessment of the specific outcomes of the general education program.

The October 20, 2011 Interim Report Action letter also recommended that the Special Visit report should address the New Accreditation 2008 Standards and their specific criteria.

B. The Institution's Special Visit Report: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence

USIUK submitted a narrative Special Report in August, 2013 with 31 Appendices and WASC required institutional data. The Report and supplemental documentation addressed each of the key areas for the Special Visit. From the report's description of its process, several committees, including faculty, were involved in generating information for the report.

While some documentation, such as evidence of the assessment of Student Affairs programs, provided support for USIUK in addressing the key issues identified by the Commission's letter and the Interim Report letter and the PhD action letter, in other areas such as strategic planning, program review and assessment of general education, the data

was incomplete. An example was the Educational Effectiveness Inventory (EEI) Table, which provided little program-specific information.

The university was forthright in recognizing areas where there had been a lack of progress, such as in the general education program review and assessment of their strategic planning process, but conclusions and action steps were lacking.

Due to the change from an in-person site visit to a series of virtual conference calls over three months, some of the documentation that would have been provided to the Team on site was sent electronically prior to each conference call. The institution was most responsive to further requests for information during this lengthy process. The team had hoped to review samples of student work. However, the fact that the review took place virtually precluded this plan.

C. Description of the Team's Review Process

The team reviewed the university's Special visit report and supporting documentation and conducted its conference call early September 2013. The team identified a number of areas where additional information was requested, specifically on the doctoral programs, and the Chair conducted a call with the USIUK ALO to answer a number of questions. The site visit was scheduled for Oct 8-10, 2013. However, due to the terrorist attack in Kenya September 21, 2013, the WASC team decided that an actual site visit was inadvisable due to security concerns and, in consultation with the university, scheduled three virtual site visits at future dates. The WASC team also reviewed some additional materials that had been requested for the actual site visit and conducted the first two hour

video conference call on November 5, 2013, focusing on program assessment, General Education assessment and program review. The quality of the calls was challenging due to breaks in communication service, but sufficient evidence was presented to address the majority of the team's concerns. The second two-hour video call was scheduled for December 5, 2013. The WASC team met via conference call for a pre-visit meeting and reviewed the materials that USIUK had sent at its request a few days prior to the call.

This second conference call focused on strategic planning, academic planning, and succession planning. The final video conference to address the doctoral programs was scheduled for January 23, 2014. The team met with doctoral students representing each of the three doctoral programs from both the first- and second-year cohorts. The team then met separately with a representative group of faculty who teach in the doctoral programs.

A separate conference was then conducted with the two Deans and two Associate Deans from the School of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Chandaria School of Business. An exit interview with the Vice Chancellor and the USIUK senior administration was conducted on February 6, 2014 with the Team Chair and Assistant Chair.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Issue: Assessment planning and implementation with focus on General Education

The review team noted that USIUK has completed a great deal of General Education assessment – as demonstrated by the General Education Review Report sent to the review team on November 9, 2013.

USIUK had documented several improvements in the GE program including a reduction in the number of courses required, refined program learning outcomes, re-examination of course content, delivery, and structure, and refinement of essential learning.

The assessment of general education has provided USIUK with an opportunity to distinguish itself from other public and private universities in East Africa. USIUK has aligned its GE program learning outcomes with the USIUK mission outcomes. The team notes especially that local accrediting bodies are communicating appreciation for the value added that GE provides and is seeking to follow the USIUK example. USIUK graduates appear to have a breadth of focus demonstrated by the evaluation of the first-year experience and senior experience as well as by alumni surveys. (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.7)

The GE report notes that there has been some “warming up” toward GE from other divisions of the university, and many faculty are pleased to see a reduction in total required GE credits to make more room for study in the majors. As a part of the expanded engagement of faculty, the university requires attendance at GE workshops for all new faculty before they can teach a GE course. Senior faculty with a wealth of experience are creating a certain amount of excitement about teaching in the GE curriculum and suggest that they present their materials from a more

advanced level of knowledge. This appears to be matched with the teaching of lower-level “life skills” in the earlier courses. Student assessment has been a strength in this process with formative feedback from the students informing faculty whether their content is “too high” or “too low” at the pre-designed place in the curriculum. (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

The review of GE has generated some useful conversations among the faculty and helped to consolidate more support. The team understands that this is why the process has taken longer than originally planned. The team notes that USIUK is making significant changes to the General Education program and proposing a new administrative structure for General Education. The proposed curricular changes are to be presented to the administration in the near future. In addition, the new administrative structure will require the funding of new positions which have yet to be approved. (3.5)

The Implementation Team for the new GE is in place and the first step will be to determine what curricular changes are required. There is a strong plan for the implementation team, which will also determine who will teach when there are multiple sections. (CFR 2.7) September 2014 is when issues of faculty selection and needed training will be addressed, all of which will be accomplished prior to enrolling the first students in the new GE. By January 2014, there is a plan to determine which courses will be provided by each school, along with a full schedule to handle incoming freshmen. This will be presented concurrent with teaching out the students in the prior curriculum.

Because USIUK is undergoing so many significant changes in the curriculum, the team recommends an updated report in fall 2016. At that time, the team recommends that the university step back from all of the detailed work of the General Education assessment program and answer the question: "Based on the evidence generated from the GE program review, how will USIUK know that its General Education program distinguishes its graduates from those of other universities?"

B. Issue: Program review

In reviewing four annual program assessment reports and four program review reports, along with the student affairs co-curricular assessment report and sample assessment plans and curriculum alignment matrices, the team commends USIUK's considerable effort in preparing the report. The team notes the exceptional efforts related to the assessment of student work. (CFR 2.6, 2.)

The team acknowledges that USIUK has implemented several models for program review. In 2007, USIUK implemented a program review process that involved a centralized approach. At present, in order to create faculty buy-in (both adjunct and full-time), representatives from each school have been selected for the Educational Effectiveness/ Quality Assurance Committee. (CFR 2.4)

This process has taken longer, yet it has helped identify training needs among the various departments. The team applauds the professional development being

provided to the faculty and expects it will help in the upcoming review cycle. (CFR 3.4)

Nonetheless, the team recognizes the decision-making cycle in that the university first determined the objectives for the decision-making framework, then created a planning council to address the review process and its requirements. Out of the program review process, certain key changes have come about. Refining the sequence of courses, for example, is the product of a line of decisions that have come out of the review. The findings of the review help identify which of the learning objectives have been met. (CFR 2.10, 4.4)

The team acknowledges that many recommendations born out of the program review process are addressed at the school level, which has been productive. The Academic Management Team considers possible resources that may be at issue with regard to each recommendation and coordinates surveys (employers, alumni, etc.) to obtain needed data that may inform any additional resource allocations. Focus groups and listening sessions are also convened as needed and the findings are aggregated. (4.2, 4.3)

With regard to how well a department will follow-up on the recommendations that have resulted from program review, the team understands that each review team will present a plan to the Dean, including a timeline for implementation. Some decisions will not require a budget or much more than filing a Curriculum Action Form, while other changes will require more extensive planning. The team looks forward to discovering how the university will ensure that some actions, previously not followed up on, will be implemented or rendered no longer necessary.

The team, however, remains unclear on how the budgeting process aligns with the recommendations that result from program review. Thus, the team recommends that the institutional leadership provide the resources for implementing the recommendations from the action plans from program reviews and provide timelines and connection to the institutional budget planning process. (4.2)

C. Issue: Strategic and long-term planning

The 2008 EER Action Letter to USIUK noted that the university had put into place key building blocks for a new strategic plan and a new academic plan. The action letter encouraged the institution to take a long-term view of planning, including not only academic program development, but also development of support services and activities for both faculty and staff. The letter also cautioned that the continued and rapid growth, while positive in many respects, would also unduly tax the administrative and support staff of the university. (CFR 4.1 to 4.3)

At the time of the EER, USIUK had not implemented any doctoral programs. In fact, those plans had been deferred, and the EER letter further cautioned that moving to the higher degree level and even adding more master's level programs would require significant upgrading of the university's research infrastructure and support systems as well as a review of faculty evaluation and promotion criteria. (CFR 3.1, 3.2.)

In addition, the letter noted that the build-out of the plan for academic programs would require the integration of long-term financial planning to ensure that adequate financial resources would be available for the needs arising from implementing future

development plans. (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2) The WASC Commission requested an interim report to include progress on strategic planning in July of 2011.

In the letter following the 2011 interim report, the Commission noted the hiring of a Director of IR and the investment of additional dedicated resources to the planning process and commended the institution for these efforts. (CFR 4.3, 4.5) The letter further recommended that the institution more explicitly link the planning process to the capital budget and to anticipated new degree programs in terms of projected resource demands. It also suggested linking strategic objectives to timelines and including assessment data in the creation and updating of the plan. (CFR 4.3, 4.4)

One of the challenges in reporting on the progress on strategic planning is the disparate nature of the documentation provided to the WASC team. The 2013 Special Visit Report included a copy of the Five Year Strategic Plan (AY 2009/10 – 2013/14). The plan begins with an introduction to the institution, including historical background, critical assumptions, strategic challenges, and institutional philosophy. It goes on to present in detail the operational framework and main services of the campus. The core of the plan presents four goals:

Goal 1 – Reputation as a Premier Global University

Goal 2 – Organizational Excellence

Goal 3 – Fiscal Health

Goal 4 – Excellent Facilities and Communication Technology Infrastructure

Each of the goals is explicated in a subsequent chapter, which proposes specific, actionable strategic objectives for the goals. The plan also includes suggested monitoring

processes for the strategic plan and a methodology for assessing the effectiveness and relevance of the plan at mid-point. In addition to the strategic plan itself, the Special Visit Report (2013) included summaries of achievements for 2010/2011 and 2011/2012. These reports indicate that progress has been made on Goals 1, 2, and 3, with attention to some, but not all strategic objectives within each of the goals (See Appendix 25 of the Special Report (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

The WASC team requested an update on the strategic planning before the second video conference. Subsequent to that request, a grid was sent with strategic planning activities between 2009 and 2013. The grid was organized by unit and included annual management performance reports. The reports varied in format from one unit to another and offered virtually no narrative for interpreting the relative success in accomplishing the strategic goals. The university also sent a Consolidated Strategic Plan Review that was presented to the Board. In the conference call, university personnel stated that the activities grid had proven too detailed for use by the Board, so it was replaced by a more general summary review. However, the linkage of the activity reports and the work of the strategic planning group to the Consolidated Report for the Board were unclear. (CFR 4.1,4.2) The university also forwarded to the WASC team the separate Academic Plan document, which was dated 2009. According to USIUK, the Academic Plan was integrated into the Strategic Plan in 2011 and reviewed annually after that point. Although the Special Visit Report focuses almost exclusively on the Academic Plan, it does dedicate one paragraph to the strategic plan. It appears from the Strategic Planning

activities grid that many of the goals have been addressed. The following paragraphs outline those activities.

Goal 1 – Reputation as a Premier Global University

A number of the objectives of this goal have been achieved. Customer service training and follow-up review have taken place with staff, and an evaluation tool for a staff/faculty recognition/reward system for outstanding performance has been developed. The University began to implement an awareness program in May 2013 to familiarize faculty and staff with the university's vision and mission statement. As a result of aggressive advertising, some international faculty from China, U.S., Russia, Nigeria and the UK have been hired. It was clear from the report and conversations with administration, however, that the greatest challenge for this goal for the foreseeable future will be faculty hiring. USIUK has wisely revised its goal of 90% faculty with terminal degrees to 70% for the graduate programs. Given the complicated pressures described by the Vice Chancellor in the teleconference, the institution may need to revise this goal further. In order to give some definition to this effort, Academic Affairs should analyze specifically where Ph.D. faculty are needed most and focus on strategies to augment those areas. (3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 4.3) The expansion of academic programs and the continued implementation of educational effectiveness efforts are a part of Goal 1, but were not addressed in the 2010/2011 and 2011/2012 activities reports. The accomplishments in these areas are addressed later in this section.

Goal 2 – Organizational Excellence

The activities detailed in Goal 2 focus on succession planning and improvements to Human Resources.

Based on the documentation available to the WASC team, it appears that in the recent strategic planning process, the university was challenged by a diminished capacity for the appropriate leadership that would be responsible and accountable for delivering on the strategic priorities. Recently, however, the University wisely implemented a revised leadership structure. Going forward, these leaders will likely be charged with implementing the activities that will lead to the successful completion of strategic priorities and goals that lie within their area of responsibility and authority. (CFR 1.3, 1.8) With this new structure, upper administration will be situated to ensure that these new leaders have the appropriate training to manage these efforts. In addition, in order to accomplish these tasks, it will be necessary for the strategic planning task force to develop strategic objectives that have measureable outcomes with timelines attached and a reporting structure that will result in clear summary reports. It will be the responsibility of central administration to provide both carrots and sticks in accomplishing those objectives and goals.

The Board of Trustees also has an important role to play in the planning effort. In overseeing and helping achieve the goals of the new strategic plan, the Board must set criteria for reviewing the reports and timelines for accomplishing them. This apparently has not always been the case in the past. It is greatly regrettable that the fall Baraza had to be cancelled due to the fact that the Management Council had not reviewed the 2013/2014 agenda with the Board (December 5th video conference call). Such an action

weakens the confidence the university community has with its leadership, and may lead to a lack of morale. (CFR 1.3, 3.9)

Finally, it is critically important that the strategic planning process become a more integrated effort. The concern in the current economic climate ought not to be whether planning is occurring, but how effective that planning is. Planning that is compartmentalized into categories without focus on the quality or the interconnections and integration of planning will lead to ineffective resource allocation. The WASC team urges USIUK, as it moves into the next cycle of planning, to develop a more comprehensive and integrated approach. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

With regard to the activities around Human Resources, in the teleconference university administration indicated that the changes in this area would be a focus in the next strategic planning effort. To date a new electronic system for tracking leave, payroll and staff evaluations. has been added. In addition, salary reviews are occurring every three years along with the external review of salaries and job descriptions. (CFR 3.7)

Goal 3 – Fiscal Health

Goal 3 of the 2009-2014 Strategic Plan has achieved a number of accomplishments during this period. Strategic objectives under this goal included the expansion and strengthening of strategic partnerships, the expansion of non-tuition revenue and the continued quest for fiscal improvement, the expansion and diversification of revenue streams, the development of the fundraising program, establishment of an endowment fund and strengthening partnerships with the alumni, corporate and donor community. (CFR 3.5)

At the time of the approval of the Strategic Plan in 2009, a plan was put in place for the financial monitoring for the implementation of the plan in years 1, 2 and 4 at the divisional level, and in years 3 and 5 for a comprehensive review by all stakeholders (Appendix 24 Table XII). While it is not clear from evidence presented how the five-year Financial Projections in the Strategic Plan (Appendix 24, Appendix1) compared with actual results during the period and whether the comprehensive review in year 3 was conducted, other evidence indicates progress in building fiscal health for USIUK. Enrollment growth has been steady at 5% per year, and importantly, most of the new graduate level programs are meeting or exceeding their enrollment targets.

Although not a part of the current strategic planning effort, progress has been made in plans for developing non-tuition revenue streams through the Capital Campaign Plan for 2014-2018. In its self- assessment SWOT analysis, the plan lists the fiscal health of the institution as a strength. There is no debt and while currently 90% of revenue comes from tuition and fees, 25% of gross assets are liquid. A contribution to the endowment fund from the Chandaria Foundation of \$1-million (US) was established in 2011, and during this period, total grants of \$2.7 million (US) were received from USAID, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Goldman Sachs Foundation. These were used for capital development, including the Library and ICT infrastructure and equipment and ongoing training programs. During this same period faculty research grants have also increased exponentially with funding from a wide range of academic, nonprofit and governmental

organizations including The British Council, Michigan State University and Open Society Institute in East Africa. (CFR 3.5)

On the video conference call, the team heard that USIUK has established a US based non-profit to allow tax-free donations from USIUK friends and alumni as part of the capital campaign. The team was also given descriptions of plans for the revision of the alumni association and steps being made to build a culture of philanthropy using methodologies from best practices in US university alumni associations. Alumni fundraising has increased for scholarships, but the alumni will need to be a major target for raising an expected 20% of the strategic fund raising target, which represents 50% of student financial aid over the next five years.

While internally the university increased its attention to infrastructure in 2011 by establishing the Office of External Relations, the Capital Campaign Plan SWOT analysis noted some internal weaknesses both in the management capabilities for conducting a campaign and in communication with the variety of stakeholders. The university understands that an internal commitment within USIUK stakeholders to a capital campaign is essential for the success of the campaign. Ironically, there may be a perception of affluence about the university, which, due to recent high interest rates, has allowed it to self-finance the construction of new buildings, including the School of Science Building which will be ready by May 2014. Funds are also currently in place to begin construction of the student center in May 2014.

In spite of these positive outcomes and plans for diversifying revenue streams as demonstrated in the Capital Campaign document, the political and economic environment in East Africa is somewhat unstable, as evidenced by the 2013 terrorist attack in Nairobi.

Thankfully, it appears that this event has had little impact on USIUK's enrollment and operations to date; nevertheless, as a highly tuition -dependent university, USIUK is subject to potential risks in its economic environment. Moreover, the Kenyan new National Social Security Act (NSSF) may increase costs for pensions and construction. Increased competition in Kenya for qualified staff and faculty (the number of universities in Kenya has risen from 28 in 2008 to 66 in 2013) may increase pressure on salaries and recruitment costs for students as well as staff and faculty.

Looking forward, the November 13, 2013, Consolidated Strategic Plan Review 2009-13 presented to the Board of Trustees noted the need to oversee the implementation of a university strategic plan that is integrated into long-range financial projections and reviewed on an annual basis. This corresponds to the recommendation in the 2009 WASC Action letter for an integrated long-term financial plan with strategic and academic plans. This continues to be an area for attention in the next planning cycle.

Goal 4 – Excellent Facilities and Communication Technology Infrastructure

In the documentation provided for the Special Visit, the WASC team noted a number of instances in which communication appeared to be problematic in moving the strategic plan forward. In the video conference, the administration acknowledged this challenge, noting a number of different attempts to reach the university community. In addition, they have expanded marketing and communications efforts and have designated an internal communications position. In 2011, an external IT audit was conducted, and there is now a centralized portal that provides updated policy notifications. (CFR 3.7)

With regard to facilities planning, a number of initiatives are underway. There are currently plans for a new student center, which is the focus of the nascent Capital Campaign. This center is expected to bring not only new spaces for student activities, but also a kitchen that will be used by the Hospitality Management program. All of these activities will actually be part of the next strategic planning effort.

Academic Planning

Academic Planning and educational effectiveness are part of Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan. Without a doubt, the focus of their strategic planning efforts has been with the development of the Academic Plan.

It is clear from the Special Visit Report and conversations with USIU personnel that the most successful aspect of their strategic plan has been the development and expansion of the academic programs. Seven of the eleven planned programs have been approved through WASC Sub Change and implemented. Two others are planned for implementation in 2014. The Global Executive Master of Business Administration (GEMBA) has twice the expected enrollment and the Master of Clinical Psychology has an enrollment of 23. USIUK is to be commended for its extraordinary effort in developing broader and deeper curricular offerings, including doctoral level programs since its EER action letter.

At the same time, there have been challenges with initiating some programs and with sustaining enrollment in others. For example, the implementation of the Pharmacy degree, which was scheduled to be offered with Shenyang Pharmaceutical University in

China, had to be delayed due to governmental restrictions in Kenya. In addition, the online eMBA program has been deferred until the next planning period, and the Hospitality Management program has not yielded the expected numbers because job opportunities in this field appear to be strongest below the level of management, and thus not requiring a baccalaureate degree. Going forward, it may serve the institution well to revise and enrich the marketing analysis of new programs in order to ensure their success. (CFR 3.5, 3.6) Moreover, it may be useful for those involved with academic planning to take advantage of resources available from sources such as the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), which offers both extensive publications and training workshop in the development, budgeting and management of academic degree programs. (CFR 4.1)

The USIUK Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Academic Affairs commented during the teleconference that it was important for the university to develop a niche market among its academic offerings. With that goal in mind, it may serve the university well to think in terms of its mission as well as market forces in future program development. Slowing the addition of new programs, ensuring the quality of the existing programs, and clarifying the alignment of the academic programs with the mission will move the university toward a clear development of its niche in Kenyan higher education. (CFR 1.1, 4.1)

A great deal has also been accomplished in the area of educational effectiveness. A solid infrastructure for assessment and program review with supporting policies is firmly embedded and accompanying faculty development for assessment has made great progress over the past five years under the capable guidance of the university's ALO.

Moreover, the University is commended for its development of an assessment process for the co-curricular areas. (CFR 2.3,2.4, 2.7 4.4 4.6, 4.7) It will be important going forward to continue this work and to ensure that departments are accountable for the timely submission of assessment reports and program review self-studies. The quality of USIUK academic programs will be an important factor in establishing its niche and reputation throughout Kenya and more broadly in East Africa. That reputation, in turn, will help ensure the financial success and stability of the university. Hopefully, this message will help create buy-in from faculty and staff in the educational effectiveness efforts. (CFR 2.4, 4.6)

Lessons Learned for Future Planning

As the University turns its attention to revising its strategic plan for the next cycle, the WASC team urges the institution to reconsider its approach to strategic planning. While consultants are useful in guiding institutions in their planning processes, they are not a substitute for institutional leadership. In the previous planning process, institutional documents indicate that consultants held focus groups with a variety of constituency groups and created a plan that was validated by the University Management Council and endorsed by the Board of Trustees. For the planning process that lies ahead, the WASC team recommends that the strategic planning process be led by a designated university administrator who, with input and assistance from the Vice Chancellor, appoints an internal strategic planning task force to create a draft strategic plan after extensive reflection and conversation across the university. (CFR 4.6) The evidence provided for the 2013 Special Visit indicated that managing the implementation of the strategic plan

proved challenging for USIUK. In particular, the infrastructure for responsibility and accountability for specific goals and objectives was unclear. In the 2014-2018 planning effort, the university will be able to take advantage of the newly appointed leadership structure to make the implementation phase more clearly organized and communicated.

D. Issue: Implementation of doctoral level programs

The implementation of three new doctoral level programs in 2013, the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (DCP), the Doctorate in Business Administration (DBA) and the PhD in International Relations (PhD IR) represents a major achievement of one of the University's strategic goals. (Appendix 25 Special Report)

The August 3, 2012, action letter from the Structural Change Committee recommended approval of the DBA to the full Commission and that a Special fifth year visit for Fall 2017 be done according to WASC protocol for new doctoral programs in conjunction with the scheduled accreditation visit. However, since that date, the WASC protocol for required fifth year visits for new doctoral programs has been eliminated.

The January 11, 2013, action letter from the Structural Change Committee recommending approval of the PhD in International Relations asked also that the University include in its Special Visit report due Fall 2013, an update on the status of the program with particular attention to the recommendations of the site visit report. These included continuing financial and scholarly commitment to the Ph.D. program, a review of program learning outcomes to incorporate the generation of new knowledge and research, and to develop a dissertation proposal presentation rubric to include an oral presentation component.

The action letter further encouraged USIUK to consider interdisciplinary collaboration across programs and faculty to help advance the doctoral research culture at the university. Also noted was the need to align program review and student learning assessment to inform institutional strategic planning.

Recommendations from the action letter for the DBA program August 3, 2012, also encouraged USIUK to review faculty workload as the DBA is implemented to ensure sufficient time for research and scholarly activities. The university was urged to be diligent in recruiting highly qualified faculty with competencies in each of the program tracks.

The Special Visit report had minimal information on the doctoral programs. The DCP and DBA programs began in January 2013, the PhD in International Relations enrolled its first students fall 2013. However, a subsequent request for more information yielded extra materials for the DBA and PhD programs, which provided enrollment figures by course, a list of faculty and their qualifications and teaching areas in each of the programs, including publications and conference attendance over the last three years.

Sample syllabi were also included as well as evidence of recent library acquisitions to support the doctoral programs. In addition, prior to the video conference on January 23, 2014, additional materials were submitted: Lists of faculty teaching in all three doctoral programs with their academic qualifications, years of teaching, publication records, graduate course taught and number of PhDs supervised. Enrollment figures by semester and by course were also provided. In addition, a profile of the twelve new PhD students in International Relations, with their educational backgrounds was provided. A list of

library resources acquired for each doctoral level course was also provided. After the conference call additional evidence of faculty scholarship in the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology program was submitted. Faculty scholarship and conference presentations are evident among the more senior faculty in both the DBA and Ph.D.IR programs and even among the more junior faculty in the DCP program, there is evidence of scholarly productivity. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.8)

For 2013, doctoral program enrollments are meeting projections with large applicant pools for each of the programs. We encourage faculty to consider monitoring enrollment numbers closely as their students move into dissertation writing phase to ensure quality of the doctoral experience and advancement of doctoral culture. (2.5, 2.6)

At the time of the fall 2013 review, the university website did not list the Ph.D. in International Relations. The University needs to ensure that its communications media are up to date to ensure transparency. (CFR 2.2, 2.3)

Based on the evidence submitted and the virtual meetings with doctoral level students, faculty and administrators, it was clear to the team that there is a developing research culture in each of the programs. Students are encouraged to develop research directions early in the programs and to work directly with faculty to present findings at conferences and produce publishable articles. Several students in the DBA and PhD IR programs have reported to have already published professional papers. Library resources for research in each of the program areas were rated highly by the students and faculty have support to order materials for their program areas. Trained Librarians are available to assist student research for each of the program areas. (CFR 2.5, 2.9)

In the area of faculty recruitment to support the doctoral level programs, the institution has had success in building a qualified faculty pool for each program and is ready to hire more this year. The DCP faculty has doubled in size and is seeking to recruit more faculty with PhDs to support research endeavors, rather than to hire faculty solely with a clinical emphasis. This will be an important step in developing the research aspect of their DCP program. However, faculty report that meeting the goal of hiring more qualified faculty will remain a challenge for the university given that these programs are among the first of their kind in East Africa. (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

Funding for faculty research is available with university funds; about 10 faculty have received \$4,000 per year. In addition, some faculty may be able to apply for teaching release for a specific academic research project. Support for student research from internal funds was not clear, though external funds as listed in their grants from a number of private, governmental and non-governmental agencies may be accessed with faculty research to support research in specific fields. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

The university is committed to continuing to move the culture of the university from a teaching institution to a teaching and research culture. There is a mentoring program for faculty who do not have a strong research record. The institutional goal for faculty tenure and promotion decisions is 40% teaching, 40% research and 20% service. The workload of doctoral level faculty has been adjusted with many of the courses being team taught and a limit of three doctoral dissertation students per faculty member has been established. (CFR 3.3)

It is clear to the team that USIUK is very committed to creating a doctoral culture. However, since these programs are still in their first or second year, as yet there are no

students who have begun their dissertation process. Thus, there is no evidence of the quality of doctoral work being produced or evidence of the success of the students graduating from these programs. (CFR 2.6, 2.7)

Further, funding for doctoral students, perhaps in the form of teaching assistantships, scholarships and support for student and faculty research will be needed as the programs grows, and as such, these resources need to be included in the Strategic Plan. At the time of the conference call it was evident that the doctoral students did not have a clear picture of funding opportunities and collaborative options with faculty researchers. Similarly, a clearer program of internal funds for faculty research and a communications strategy need to be developed. (CFR 3.5, 3.6, 4.2)

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

1. USIUK is commended for the progress it has made in developing the new General Education program and administrative structure for General Education.
2. The University is commended for the considerable work that has been done in the area of program assessment, including both academic programs and co-curricular programs. The team noted the exceptional efforts related to the direct assessment of student work.
3. The University is commended for the approval and implementation of seven of the planned programs.

Recommendations:

1. The WASC team recommends that the University continue with the implementation of the proposed new General Education program and submit to WASC in November of 2016 an updated report on the implementation. (CFR 2.2a)
2. While great progress has been made in the area of program review, it remains unclear how the budgeting process aligns with the recommendations that result from program review. The WASC team recommends that the institutional leadership provide the resources for implementing the recommendations from the action plans from program review and provide timelines and connections to the institutional budget planning process. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1-4.7)
3. The WASC team recommends that for the next cycle of strategic planning the institution designate a university administrator who, with input from the Vice Chancellor, appoints an internal strategic planning task force that creates a draft strategic plan after extensive reflection and conversation across the University. Once that plan has been approved, the task force (or an implementation group) should create a reporting structure to oversee and monitor the progress on strategic priorities. (CFR 4.6)
4. The WASC team urges the University to develop a strategic plan and a planning process that integrates planning and assessment processes with resource allocation. The plan should include a strategy for overcoming the challenges of hiring of Ph.D. faculty, an issue that holds particular significance for the development of quality graduate programs at the University. (CFR 4.1-4.3)

5. The team recommends that at the time of the next accreditation visit in 2017, the institution submit a full report on each of the three doctoral programs including samples of dissertations, student and faculty research and publications, and evidence of sustainable funding for doctoral programs. (CFR 3.1-3.2)

APPENDICES

Appendix I

1. Report on Substantive Change recommendations DBA program

A. Issue: Faculty workload

There is evidence that recent faculty hiring in the program has allowed many courses to be team taught thus reducing the teaching load on faculty , leaving more time for research and mentoring of doctoral students. An institutional policy limiting faculty to having three doctoral advisees has been put in place.

B. Issue: Hiring of Faculty with qualifications in each of three concentrations.

There is evidence of continued faculty hiring in the program since 2012 with another position to be filled in 2014.

Appendix II

2. Report on Substantive Change recommendations Ph.D. IR program

A. Issue: Financial and scholarly support of program

Adequate library resources have been provided to implement the program and a faculty hiring process is underway. An initial pool of faculty applicants did not have adequate qualifications, so the position has been re-posted. The challenge of finding faculty with doctoral level skills may represent an ongoing issue.

Funding support for students appears very limited and further development of scholarship assistance, internal research funds and an expansion of faculty research funds as the program grows, will be needed.

B. Issue: Incorporation of generation of new knowledge in Program learning Outcomes.

The Program learning outcomes have been revised to include generation of new knowledge and research.

C. Issue: Development of rubric for doctoral oral presentations.

This has been done.

D. Issue: Development of an interdisciplinary doctoral culture at USIUK.

There is a Faculty colloquium that meets bi- weekly for presentation of research and students are encouraged to attend. In each of the Schools opportunities exist for students to present research findings at colloquia.

As the doctoral programs grow the Schools should ensure more university wide doctoral presentations and activities to continue to build a doctoral culture at the institution.

Appendix III Personnel consulted

Doctorate Faculty & Deans and Students January 23, 2014

	Faculty	Title
Psy.D		
1	Dr. Deedre Werner	Associate Professor
2	Dr. Dana Basnight	Associate Professor
3	Dr. Carol Watson	Assistant Professor
4	Dr. Oscar Githua	Assistant Professor
5	Dr. Michelle W. Karume	Assistant Professor
6	Dr. Kihara Michael	Associate Professor (Research)
DBA		
7	Dr. Paul Katuse	Assistant Professor of Strategic Management
8	Dr. George Kaol	Associate Professor of Management and Entrepreneurship
9	Dr. Damary Sikalieh	Associate Professor of Management, and Entrepreneurship
10	Prof. Peter Lewa	Professor of Strategic Management
11	Dr. Caren Ouma	Assistant Professor of Management
PhD in IRL		
12	Dr. Fatma Ali	Assistant Professor
13	Prof. Kennedy M. Agade	Associate Professor (joined via phone)
14	Prof. Macharia Munene	Professor
15	Prof. Korwa G. Adar	Professor
DEANS		
16	Dr. George Achoki	Dean, Chandaria School of Business
17	Dr. Amos G. Njuguna	Associate Dean, Chandaria School of Business
18	Prof. Mulinge Munyaee	Dean, School of Humanities & Social Sciences
19	Dr. Tom Onditi	Associate Dean, School of Humanities & Social Sciences

Doctoral Students

	PSY.D.
1	Rosely Webbo
2	Elizabeth Gichimu
3	Azmaira Mawji
4	Faith Gichovi
5	Theodore Berhan
	PhD in IRL
6	Behr, Wanjiru Agnes
7	Githigaro, Mwangi John
	DBA
8	Nancy Onyango
9	Faith Kanjumba
10	Jacob Ogolla
11	Rita Ruparellia
12	Salome Gitoho
13	Patrick Mulindi

Exit interview Feb 6, 2013

1. Prof. Freida A. Brown Ph.D.:	Vice Chancellor
2. Prof. Mathew Buyu, Ph.D.:	Deputy Vice Chancellor, AAA
3. Mrs. Ritah Asunda: Affairs	Deputy Vice Chancellor, Student
4. Dr. Willie Lawrence Butler:	Deputy Vice Chancellor - IPA
5. ENG. Paul W. Warui:	Director, Operations
6. Ms. Regina Mutoko:	Director, ICT
7. Ms. Isabel Juma:	Director, Finance and Administration
8. Ms. Hellen P. Ambasa:	University Legal Counsel
9. Dr. Sylvia Ogola:	University Librarian
10. Prof. Angelina Kioko: Assurance	Associate DVC- Quality
11. Prof. Francis Wambalaba:	Associate DVC- Research
12. Dr. George Achoki:	Dean, Chandaria School of Business
13. Prof. Munya Mulinge: and Social Sciences	Dean, School of Humanities
14. Prof. Jimmy Macharia: Technology	Dean, School of Science &
15. Dr. Kepha Njenga:	Chair, Faculty Council

Video Conference December 5, 2013

Prof. Freida A. Brown Ph.D. - Vice Chancellor (President)
Prof. Mathew Buyu, Ph.D. - Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Mrs. Ritah Asunda - Deputy Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs
Dr. Willie Lawrence Butler - Deputy Vice Chancellor - IPA
ENG. Paul W. Warui - Director, Operations
Ms. Regina Mutoko - Director, ICT
Ms. Isabel Juma- Director, Finance and Administration
Ms. Hellen P. Ambasa - University Legal Counsel
Prof. Francis Wambalaba - Associate DVC- Research
Prof. Angelina N. Kioko - Associate DVC- Quality Assurance & ALO
Dr. George Achoki - Dean, Chandaria School of Business
Prof. Munya Mulinge - Dean, School of Humanities and Social S.
Dr. Jimmy Macharia - Dean, School of Science and Technology
Dr. Kepha Njenga- Chair Faculty Council
Ms. Damiana Kiilu – Ag. University Librarian

Appendix IV Materials reviewed

1. USIUK Narrative Special Visit Fall 2013
2. USIUK Report Appendices Special Visit Fall 2013
3. USIUK Required Data Exhibits Special Visit Report 2013
4. USIUK Extra materials for DBA and Ph.D IRL
5. USIUK List of Faculty by department listing teaching and research
6. USIUK Program Review Report Sample 1 EMOD 2013
7. USIUK Program Review Report Sample 3 IST 2008
8. USIUK GE program report
9. USIUK 1st Annual Program Assessment Report Sample 4 IST
10. USIUK Program Review Report Sample 4 Journalism 2011
11. USIUK Impact of Westgate Attack
12. USIUK Academic Plan 2009-2013
13. USIU IBA Annual Program Assessment Report Sample 3IBA 2013
14. USIUK Non tuition Revenue Capital Fundraising plan 2014-2018
15. USIUK Consolidated Strategic Plan Review2009-13 Presented to BOT Nov 2013
16. USIUK Annual Program Assessment Report Sample 1 Criminal Justice 2013
17. USIUK Gazette Star student publication
18. USIUK Strategic Plan grid for 5 year Strategic plan 2009-2014
19. USIUK Doctorate Faculty Psych. D revised January 2014
20. USIU Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators 2.
21. USIUK Program Review report sample 2 IRL 2009

22. USIUK Annual Program Assessment Report Sample 2 Hotel and Restaurant Management 2010-2011
23. USIUK Student profile first cohort Ph.D. IR
24. USIUK Curriculum for Doctoral programs
25. USUIK Doctorate Faculty list
26. USIUK Doctorate programs enrollment each semester 2013-2014
27. USIUK Library Resources for Doctorate programs
28. USIUK Follow up on recommendations of site visit reports DBA, Ph.D.
29. WASC USIUK EER Commission action letter and report 2008
30. WASC USIUK Subchange Site visit Report for DBA May 2012
31. WASC USIUK Subchange Site visit report for Ph.D. IR Oct. 2012
32. WASC USIUK Commission Action Letter for DBA August 2012
33. WASC USIUK Commission Action letter for Ph.D. IR January 2013
34. WASC USIUK Commission Action letter for Interim Report Oct. 2011
35. WASC USIUK Accreditation History August 2013
36. WASC USIUK Institution Summary Report July 2013
37. WASC USIUK Commission Action letter EER report March 2009