

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

To California Institute of Integral Studies

November 7-10, 2016

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Katrina Rogers– Chair
President, Fielding Graduate University

Sharon B. Hamill – Assistant Chair
Professor of Psychology, California State University San Marcos

Jay M. Finkelman -- Team Member
Department Chair, Business Psychology, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Rebecca Hong -- Team Member
Dean, Curriculum and Assessment, Biola University

Jonathan L. Reed -- Team Member
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs, University of La Verne

Geoffrey Chase -- WSCUC Institution Liaison
Vice President, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC 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 the publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	PAGE
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	3
B. Description of Team’s Process	7
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	8
 SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL	
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	11
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards	18
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees	24
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	29
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	34
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	41
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment	49
H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement	53
 SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	 56
 APPENDICES	
A. Federal Compliance Checklists	
1. Credit Hour Review	
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	
3. Student Complaints Review	
4. Transfer Policy Review	

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Description of the Institution

The California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) has a venerable history. Originally established as the California Institute of Asian Studies (CAIS) in 1968, it was the educational center of the Cultural Integration Fellowship, a non-profit, non-sectarian, religious, cultural and educational organization. In 1974 it was incorporated separately as a private, non-profit, non-sectarian, graduate school. The name of the school was changed to the California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) in 1980 and was granted its initial WASC accreditation in 1981. In 1993, CIIS began a Bachelor’s degree completion program and in 2015 The American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine (ACTCM), a private, independent graduate school, was integrated within CIIS.

CIIS occupies a number of physical spaces throughout San Francisco. The main facility, owned by the University, is located on Mission Street in the Mid-Market area of SF and CIIS leases two sites in the Potrero Hill neighborhood nearby. There are five counseling centers located throughout SF including one in the housing authority complex in the Mission District (the “Clinic Without Walls). The newly acquired ACTCM campus houses a public clinic and interns practice at five affiliated clinical sites in SF and Berkeley.

CIIS provides clear statements about its mission and purpose; they further articulate their values in their Seven Commitments statements (*Institutional Report, page 1; Exhibit 1.1*). CIIS “is an accredited university that integrates and embodies spirit, intellect, and wisdom in service to individuals, communities, and the earth.” Its purpose is to “expand the boundaries of traditional degree programs with transdisciplinary, cross-cultural, and applied studies with face-

to-face, hybrid, and online pedagogical approaches.” They offer a “personal learning environment and supportive community” with the goal of providing a “multifaceted education for people committed to transforming themselves, others, and the world.” CIIS values can be seen in their Seven Commitments, written as aspirational statements designed to advance their mission. CIIS is committed to (1) practicing integral approaches to learning and research; (2) affirming spirituality; (3) committing to inclusion and diversity; (4) fostering multiple ways of learning and teaching; (5) advocating sustainability and social justice; (6) supporting community; and (7) striving for integral and innovative governance. Collectively, these statements illuminate CIIS’ identity and values [*CFR 1.1*].

The clinics provided by CIIS students and faculty, in addition to the Public Programs and Performances events and workshops, clearly illustrate CIIS’s contribution to the public good [*CFR 1.1*]. All of the CIIS counseling clinics see clients on a sliding scale except for the Clinic Without Walls; therapy services at The Clinic Without Walls are free. Information on the website states that they help over 2000 people per year – an admirable service. The Public Programs and Performances events provide opportunities for continuing education of SF residents and professionals in mental and physical health topics.

Structure: Schools and degrees offered. CIIS offers degree programs within its four schools: The School of Professional Psychology and Health; the School of Consciousness and Transformation; the American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine; and the School of Undergraduate Studies (*Exhibit 2.5*). CIIS has one baccalaureate-level degree completion program, and all the other programs are at the masters and doctoral levels. It was difficult to determine the exact number of degree programs offered at CIIS. Leadership acknowledges the need to improve presentation of the typology of academic programs, since definitions on campus

vary depending on the lens of degrees, majors, concentrations, foci, and format. The CIIS website (www.CIIS.edu) lists 29 programs, the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicator lists 33 degree programs (*Exhibit 2.3*), and the Institutional Report states that there are 25 programs (*page 9*). In an interview with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness during the Accreditation Visit (AV) the team was told that there are “30+ programs,” which can be considered the most up to date information. Moreover, although the school structure provides some general classification of degree programs, it is not clear how the programs relate to one another or why they are housed in a particular school. Most of the CIIS programs are delivered in a face-to-face format. Three programs are offered online but some of the programs are adopting a hybrid format. Several of the programs offered by CIIS use a cohort model to deliver the curriculum. Overall, the Institutional Report was incomplete in that it did not provide a coherent picture of the structure of the schools and programs, the number of programs offered, and which programs are taught in the cohort model, on-line, or hybrid.

Faculty, staff and students. According to the Institutional Report (*page 11*), CIIS has 232 faculty: 66 full-time core faculty, 18 part-time core faculty, and 148 adjunct faculty. There are 158 staff members. Thirty-five percent of faculty and staff come from underrepresented groups (*Exhibit 2.10*). Forty-eight percent of the faculty is women (2014 data from www.ciis.edu website).

As of fall 2015 there were 100 (95 FTE) undergraduate students and 1,412 (1282 FTE) graduate students attending CIIS (*Exhibits 1.2 and 1.3*). Across all schools, 37% percent of students identify as coming from an underrepresented group (*Exhibit 1.8.1*) and 68% are women (2014 data from www.ciis.edu website). CIIS reports an average class size of 13 with a maximum size of 33 students (*Institutional Report, page 11*).

Accreditation History

Since 1981, CIIS has been accredited by the Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The clinical psychology program was an American Psychological Association (APA) accredited program from fall 2003 through summer 2012. The program, however, lost its accreditation due to issues concerning its curriculum, assessment, and student success in the program. The program is currently working to reestablish its accreditation, with an APA site visit scheduled for November 21-22, 2016 (*response to Lines of Inquiry*). The integration of ACTCM into CIIS has brought additional accredited programs to the institution. The Master of Science of Traditional Chinese Medicine has been accredited by the Accreditation Commission for Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (ACAOM) since 1991; its Doctor of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine (DAOM) degree has been accredited since receiving Candidacy in 2010.

The last full reaffirmation review for CIIS occurred in 2006/2008. The Capacity and Preparatory Review took place in 2006; the Commission received the report 2006 and gave permission to proceed with the Educational Effectiveness review in 2008. This review occurred in 2008. The report was received and the Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation and schedule the next Capacity and Preparatory Review in spring 2016 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in fall 2017. The Institutional Proposal was to be due in spring 2014 with an Interim Report due in spring 2012.

The Interim Report was submitted and accepted by the Interim Report Committee in 2012. At that time, the previously scheduled CPR and EER visits were changed to an Offsite Review and an Accreditation Visit one year later (2016), and the proposal review process was dispensed with, in line with the new accreditation process.

There have been 5 substantive change requests/actions since the last review [*CFR 1.8*]:

1. 2013: Proposal for new PhD program in Human Sexuality was not accepted; interim and final approval was granted in June, 2013.
2. 2014: Substantive Change Committee granted Interim Approval of Doctorate of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine and Doctorate of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine (new degree programs), contingent on Commission's approval of the merger with American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine.
3. 2014: Substantive Change committee allowed CIIS to proceed with a site visit to evaluate the merger with American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine; the site visit took place and the Committee granted Final Approval of the merger with American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Doctorate of Acupuncture and Oriental Medicine and Doctorate of Acupuncture and Chinese Medicine.
4. 2014: The Substantive Change Committee denied the proposal for the Master in Fine Arts in Theatre Performance Making (New Degree Program). In 2015, the Substantive Change Committee granted Interim Approval of resubmission of joint MFA in Theatre Performance Making with the University of Chichester (UK). Final approval was granted 3/16/15.
5. 2015: The Substantive Change Committee granted Interim Approval of PhD in Transpersonal Psychology (online). The Final approval was granted 6/10/15.
6. WSCUC approved two substantive change applications in 2016. Both were MA degrees adding an online version from an existing residential version: the MA in Philosophy and Religion with a Concentration in Philosophy, Cosmology, and Consciousness, and the

MA in Counseling Psychology with a Concentration in Expressive Arts Therapy. Both degrees will require a face-to-face intensive, as do all of the CIIS online programs.

B. Description of Team's Process

The OSR/AV team was provided access to the CIIS report and supporting documentation in March, 2016. Each member examined the materials and completed an independent assessment of the documentation using the team worksheet provided by WSCUC. The feedback was compiled by the Assistant Chair for use during the team phone conference, held on April 7, 2016; items to be discussed during the OSR were identified during this conference call. The OSR was held in Oakland on May 4-5, 2016. The team discussed and further examined CIIS documentation, identified Lines of Inquiry, and communicated this information to the CIIS ALO and his team via a video conference on May 5, 2016. CIIS provided the requested information by September 9, 2016; each team member evaluated documentation relevant to the Lines of Inquiry and submitted these evaluations to the Assistant Chair by October 14th, who compiled the information for use during a conference call which took place on October 27, 2016. Team members worked on assigned sections of the team report and submitted them for final compilation on October 14th, 2016. The complete draft report was provided to the team prior to the AV on October 27th, 2016.

The AV took place November 7-10, 2016. At this time the team conducted interviews of individuals (e.g., the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, Development Director) and groups (e.g., key players of the ACTCM merger, the Faculty Council). The Team reviewed additional documentation (e.g., sample dissertations) and documents relevant to federal requirements on-site. A confidential email account was provided to CIIS during the visit.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

CIIS undertook an extensive process to conduct this review. The self-study took place while the campus was engaged in University-wide strategic planning. During the 2014 and 2015 academic years, the Academic Vice President led the Program Chairs in discussions to identify student learning outcomes for the various degree programs. This exercise to examine their curriculum goals began with a faculty retreat and eventually expanded to a University-wide discussion on the mission statement and seven commitments, led by the President, and inclusive of all faculty and staff. In preparation for this review, CIIS established a WASC Steering Committee comprised of 24 faculty and staff members in 2015. During the campus visit, the Steering Committee told the Team that only program and department chairs were surveyed regarding the Review Under the Standards. Committee members wrote preliminary drafts of each chapter for the report; the drafts were circulated to the wider campus community and finalized in early spring 2016 [**CFR 2.4**].

Although CIIS took a candid approach to the self-study and review, we must comment on the sheer volume of documents they submitted. They amassed and submitted over 1600 documents, presumably as evidence to support statements made in the report. However, the number of supporting documents served to overwhelm the Team, and made it extremely difficult to evaluate the evidence presented. A primary concern emerged: who on the campus has read and digested the information in all of these documents? It suggests that some members of the community were engaged in amassing large quantities of data without program specific and/or campus wide consideration of the data. This interpretation was supported during the AV as faculty and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness described the collection of data and establishment of a large data warehouse. In the judgment of Visiting Team members, generating large amounts of data but failing to digest data for the purposes of evidence-based decision making overwhelms

faculty and staff and leads to frustration because the data may not clearly address key questions; moreover, it is likely that much of it will not be used. Rather, an approach that is intentional with regard to key questions and sources of evidence is fundamental to a self-study that is both reflective and informative. Without this kind of analysis, the institution's conclusions regarding their performance and the educational effectiveness of their programs are premature.

During the Off-Site Review, the Team found the Institutional Report to be an honest attempt to provide as much information as possible on all aspects on the educational efforts and operational management of the institution [CFR 1.8]. The report had a number of strengths including the clear and distinct mission and values statements (Seven Commitments), description of the progress made on establishing student learning outcomes and developing rubrics, and the provision of robust student services.

The OSR Team identified several areas of inquiry that were then pursued during the AV. These issues focused on (a) institutional strategy, especially with regard to the ACTCM merger, long-term viability, and shared governance; (b) reflection and closing the loop including data amassment versus assessment, student retention, completion rates, and debt, and the differential degree cultures (Masters and Doctoral levels); and (c) faculty/staff climate including workload and morale as well as information about the research culture at CIIS. The team requested the following additional materials be submitted before the AV: an organization chart that provides descriptions for the governance structure; faculty job descriptions for doctoral, masters, and bachelor programs; IPEDs data feedback report with comparison group information; a description of why the program lost its accreditation for the Clinical Psychology PsyD program and the APA decision letter; and a more detailed development plan. The OSR Team received all

of the documents it requested in response to the lines of inquiry ahead of the AV. These issues are addressed in more detail in the essays presented in subsequent sections of this report.

Update. Four days prior to the AV, the team received news from WASC. CIIS had informed WASC and the Team that the President of the University had been granted an immediate sabbatical and was retiring at the end of the academic year. The Academic Vice President (who had been planning to retire at the end of the year, as well), was promoted to Interim President, in addition to retaining her AVP role, to provide some stability during this transition. Additionally, CIIS notified WASC that it had uncovered an unanticipated budget shortfall and was currently taking steps to deal with this financial crisis. Additionally, CIIS is undergoing a senior leadership change. Subsequent to the budget announcement, the President announced he was going to retire at the end of the academic year, and asked the Academic Vice President if she would remain at CIIS for another year to support the transition to a new President. Further discussions between the Board and the President led to an agreement for his departure in the form of a sabbatical effective on October 31, 2016. The Board appointed the Academic Vice President as Interim President. Consequently, the Team visit occurred while the Institution was reeling from troubling financial news and the abrupt departure of their key leader. CIIS should be commended for their immediate notification to WSCUC of these issues as they became apparent to leadership [**CFR 1.8**].

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission Actions

CIIS did a good job of outlining the issues raised in previous Commission actions and reviews in the Institutional report [**CFR 1.2**]; their responses were provided as a separate

document (*Exhibit 1.8*). These issues fall into the following seven categories; comments regarding their progress since the previous review are provided.

(1) **Educational effectiveness** (including assessment and program review). The Educational Effectiveness review (2008) noted that CIIS needed to focus on developing and more fully implementing finely-tuned assessment in all programs and courses. In particular, they needed aggregate level data to inform decision making and to include adjunct faculty in the assessment process. The Interim Report of 2012 said that although progress had been made, they still needed to provide institutional level learning outcomes, demonstrate constant use of aggregate data, and establish consistency of assessment practices across programs. The Interim Report stated that “It is expected that at the time of the next review, all programs will have measureable learning outcomes at the course and program levels, demonstrable evidence that the learning outcomes have been assessed, and there will be examples of how the evidence obtained through assessment has been used to improve programs.” In their response to the previous Commission Action Letter, CIIS stated that they believe they now have well-developed learning outcomes and curriculum maps.

However, this 2016 Team has found that CIIS is still in the early stages of developing a culture of assessment. The learning outcomes are not consistently stated, often not clearly described in measureable terms, and are not routinely used across programs. Moreover, the curriculum maps provided do not include adequate information about how students master learning outcomes as they move through the curriculum. During the AV, the Curriculum and Academic Review Committee (CARC) stated that CIIS does not have a consistent method for conducting program review of student learning outcomes across programs and that most programs do not address all program learning outcomes in their self-studies. It is unclear what

role adjunct faculty play in assessment and program review. Thus, it is not clear how CIIS uses incomplete assessment data to close the loop and make evidence-based decisions. Although they have a Director of Institutional Effectiveness on staff, the Director, Assessment Leads, and CARC do not share a common, coherent strategy and understanding of assessment. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity in terms of who owns assessment. The Team provides greater detail about educational effectiveness in discussions of components 3, 4 and 6.

(2) **Diversity** (including curriculum and climate). The EER from 2008 identified diversity as a continuing problem for CIIS and encouraged them to move beyond traditional, categorical thinking about diversity. The Interim Report of 2012 underscored that the goal for increased student diversity still had not been met and they did not see how CIIS' plan to include guest speakers and forums for new voices would result in the kinds of diversity they expected. The panel requested that efforts to increase diversity in faculty, staff and students include data to show that this occurred; they were also concerned about the lack of diversity in the Board of Trustees and wanted CIIS to make this a goal and their progress in this area. CIIS' response to the panel was vague as it focused on hiring more women and people of color and making note of the diversity of their student body, but it did not provide information on how they addressed diversity in the curriculum. The Team concluded that CIIS has made some progress in this area but needs to do more. This will be challenging given that low faculty turnover makes it difficult to add diversity to their faculty; the recent financial challenges requiring a moratorium on filling vacant positions, described during the AV, also suggests that this is unlikely to change any time soon.

The Team is pleased to see that CIIS hired a Dean of Diversity and Inclusion. This position builds on previous work. CIIS has multiple bodies that are working on diversity and

inclusion goals; these bodies predate the position. There is an active Faculty Diversity Committee that is an official part of the faculty governance structure. There is also a Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice (DISJ) Committee that includes faculty, staff, and students and addresses issues that cut across the University. Many academic programs also have their own diversity committees that include both faculty and students. In addition, CISS has an MHSA grant that provides staffing for the recruitment and support of students from diverse communities. As the new position evolves institutionally, it will be important for the university as a whole to listen and heed the advice of the Dean and the Office of Student Affairs, in collaboration with the Student Alliance, to support efforts to make CIIS more inclusive. For example, the conversational dynamics we observed during our visit seemed to preference the dominant culture. Moreover, it appears that the burden currently falls on the Dean of Diversity and Inclusion and the student affairs leadership team to live up to aspirations for diversity and inclusion, rather than being disseminated and assimilated more widely throughout the institution. The commitment to diversity and inclusion must become more systemic and deeply rooted at CIIS if they are to meet their diversity goals.

(3) **Financial** (including growth, sustainability, and budgets). The EER of 2008 reported that CIIS had made substantial progress in this area but needed to increase student financial support and develop appropriate reserve and contingency funds. The goal was to increase their ability to use data to make financial decisions. At the time of the Interim Report in 2012, CIIS had made substantial progress in this area and provided evidence to support this assessment. They sold a building, renovated a new building, and built up reserves. They entered a merger with ACTCM and they increased tuition revenue. However, the report raised concerns regarding the low federal financial composite ratio which was projected to be 1.6 in 2013.

Shortly before the 2016 visit, the Team was informed of CIIS's immediate budget concerns, which were detailed during the visit. CIIS faces approximately a \$2 million deficit which is the result of miscalculations in financial aid for ACTCM, higher than anticipated renovation costs, and a shortfall in credit units taken by students. The necessary cuts to balance the budget—a not unprecedented activity in CIIS's recent history—include the temporary elimination of retirement benefits and not filling open positions, both of which continue to impact morale, especially as expressed to the team by staff members. The current financial crisis is of concern to the Team as a long-term indicator of CIIS's fiscal sustainability; the DOE Federal Composite Score was 1.6 last year, perilously close to the 1.5 threshold. It appears that the financial crisis played a key role in the leadership transition.

(4) **Faculty and staff** (including workload, development, and support). Workload concerns have been a recurring theme in evaluations of the CIIS climate for faculty and staff. The 2008 EER highlighted that faculty and staff workload issues were an issue during both the capacity review and the EER. At that time, CIIS had just begun assessment of student learning and was advised to be aware of potential workload issues as they became more involved in assessment. They were also told that they needed to identify the sources of staff dissatisfaction. In 2012 the Interim Review Panel noted that the faculty/staff workload issues were not well-addressed in the Interim report and they encouraged CIIS to try and meet the goal of faculty and staff salaries at the 60th percentile. CIIS responded that they had constituted a committee to develop a faculty workload policy and conducted a staff survey to get information on issues. At the time they wrote the response letter, they were looking at available data. They also planned a faculty/staff retreat. In spring 2016, they conducted a compensation study, which revealed that some of their positions were close or met the 60th percentile. In light of recent financial

difficulties, however, there was a recognition that the institution would not be able to make progress on improving salaries overall in the near term. Although they reported conducting surveys to get information on staff satisfaction, there was no clear picture regarding the issues they were facing or possible courses of action provided. Further inquiry found that employee satisfaction surveys had not been conducted recently. Rather a staff survey was conducted in 2016 that focused on uncovering issues that created work dissatisfaction.

The most recent Institutional Report does not shed additional light on faculty workload issues. Whereas CIIS did write a faculty workload policy, the Team did not find the document informative as many questions were left unanswered. CIIS provided a 2008 Faculty Handbook (*Exhibit 2.11*) and a faculty workload policy from 2011-2012 (*Exhibit 1.8.7*), both of which predate the merger with ACTCM and neither of which were found to have clear answers to questions regarding workload. When asked directly about this during the AV, CIIS administrators and faculty stated that it was “complicated” and were they unable to articulate precisely how it was calculated in individual scenarios. CISS has two faculty tracks: ranked faculty (Assistant, Associate, and Full Professor) and lecturer faculty (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer). Ranked faculty members are expected to teach 18 units/year, engage in service, and publish scholarly works. Lecturer faculty members are expected to teach 24 units/year and engage in service. ACTCM has a larger number of Lecturer Faculty than of Ranked Faculty and so more of them have a 24 unit workload. Although service is required, there is no consistent message about how much service is appropriate, perhaps leading some faculty to take on too much. There was also disagreement on workload issues. Administrators thought that the service requirements and supervision of theses/dissertations was uncompensated (as described during the meeting during the AV), but faculty reported that it was compensated (although they couldn’t agree on

the amount of compensation); the 2011-2012 workload policy seems to support this. Still, comments made by faculty during the AV indicate that the workload issue has not been adequately addressed and is still a concern. The team believes that there needs to be better communication regarding workload and how faculty is compensated for work in involving theses and dissertations. The current practice is that dissertations are included in faculty workload as follows: faculty is given .33 workload units for every dissertation they chair and half that for serving on a dissertation committee but not chairing it. As a result, faculty members in PhD programs typically teach two classes/semester, with the rest of their workload made up of dissertation work. Faculty is expected to serve on departmental committees and one university-wide committee per year. In conversations with faculty, the team concluded that faculty were themselves not entirely clear about these workload norms. CIIS leadership needs to disseminate the information to faculty on both campuses as there seemed to be a lack of clarity regarding both the dissertation norms and compensation practices.

An additional issue raised in previous reviews was faculty training. CIIS had been encouraged to increase the number of faculty with doctoral degrees on their staff; Exhibit 1.8 shows that 89% of their core faculty members have doctoral degrees as do 30% of their adjuncts. The faculty at ACTCM is largely comprised of adjunct faculty with Master's level training. CIIS will need to address the appropriate level of training for faculty in each of the schools, especially in light of the recent merger. ACTCM faculty members have expressed challenges with using Canvas and other technology and will continue to need development in this important area.

The Institutional Report did not clarify lingering questions regarding the reasons for low staff morale found in previous reviews. They did not include information on staff satisfaction

and salaries. They did report that they now have a staff council; however the Team was surprised to learn from the WASC Steering Committee that the staff was not included in the survey they used to conduct the Review Under the Standards. The Team noted a high level of frustration and discomfort by staff with a perception of preferential treatment of faculty. Despite the fact that CIIS has established a Staff Council, they did not feel empowered to advocate in any significant way on behalf of their constituents. They described a workload shift moving many tasks from faculty to staff, exacerbating an already untenable situation. In the context of the low pay and high cost of living in SF, the workload described puts tremendous strain on staff.

(5) **Integration of ACTCM and CIIS** (including faculty, academic policies, and culture). In documents provided to CIIS during the approval of the merger, CIIS was instructed to build a post-merger strategic plan and to integrate ACTCM faculty into the culture of CIIS, including integration of ACTCM into the LMS system, communications systems such as email and other current technologies/pedagogies. However, this kind of integration remains a work in progress. For example, ACTCM faculty expressed frustration that Faculty Council meetings are held at times that make it difficult to attend given their teaching and clinic schedules. Additionally, ACTCM faculty shared that the move to the semester system has been difficult. This move was recommended by the Department of Education to synchronize the quarter and semester calendars, but has had lingering impacts related to integration, workload, and overall faculty morale.

Moreover, CIIS was encouraged to promote and support the acquisition of terminal degrees by ACTCM faculty. During the AV, the Team met with the two sets of faculty separately. Our assessment is that there is no common culture, there are few opportunities to assimilate ACTCM faculty, and the morale of the ACTCM faculty is quite low. Although the

seven core faculty of ACTCM may benefit from some efforts by CIIS to integrate, the adjunct faculty largely feels left behind. They raised significant issues during the visit including their concern that CIIS administration does not clearly understand the critical functions and issues inherent in running physical health clinics as the needs vary from clinics focused solely on mental health.

(6) Clinical sites and professional placement outcomes. The merger documentation from the Commission encouraged CIIS to refine MOUs with clinical sites so that they are strengthened, providing detailed expectations for both CIIS and clinic faculty. They were also encouraged to strengthen measures of student success such as professional placement. Due to critical issues that arose during the visit with regard to the budget crisis and change in leadership, the Team did not address these issues and focused on more immediate, critical concerns.

(7) Doctoral culture and research. Although the Team met with students and discussed their experiences regarding their doctoral work, the immediate concerns regarding leadership and finances prohibited the Team from directing its focus on doctoral culture and research.

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards

Review Under the Standards

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional purpose. The self-review that CIIS conducted appears adequate in scope for the size of their institution, though it was discovered during the AV that the Steering Committee did not use representative sampling of respondents to include staff and students in the Review Under the Standards. Although their mission appears to be well understood and agreed upon by faculty and staff, it is problematic that half the respondents reported that educational objectives and indicators of student success need more attention [**CFR 1.8**]. Since student success is such a critical outcome variable, it is important that this measure be made consistent with the mission of the university. Perhaps the mission statement can be enhanced by providing clear documentation of operational measures that will be used to assess its successful implementation. Although the Team was not persuaded that a representative sample of the CIIS community (faculty, staff and students) participated in the self-review, the Team felt that CIIS met Standard 1.

Integrity and transparency. This section of the Institutional Report on diversity (pages 8-9) seems more aspirational rather than substantive. It is problematic that half the respondents felt that diversity needed attention and 70% rated the issue as a high priority (*Review Under the Standards*). Given that diversity is a significant element in the culture and ethos of CIIS yet so many respondents indicated that it needed attention requires some further investigation to understand the discrepancy. It is commendable that the Board of Trustees adopted the “President’s Initiative on Diversity, Inclusivity, and Intercultural Sensitivity” in fall of 2014, but there is a need to review outcome data and progress on this initiative [**CFR 1.4**].

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and learning. There is insufficient information with which to judge the appropriateness of content, standards, and degree level [CFRs 2.1 and 2.2]. Having one qualified full-time faculty member per program may not be sufficient. The University may be overextended with respect to the number of programs it is supporting. There is a need for evidence to justify and support the admission requirements and levels of achievement necessary for graduation of the various degrees [CFRs 2.2a and 2.2b]. Student learning outcomes appear limited to the result of licensing exams, where applicable, and are characterized as excellent. This needs to be expanded beyond licensure and tied back to the actual data addressing whether the student learning outcomes of the programs are being met (i.e., direct assessment of student learning).

Scholarship and creative activity. There are ostensible expectations for both faculty and student scholarship, but only reference to documentation of faculty scholarly output. It is important to understand the depth of faculty participation in scholarly and creative activities and how such activities are valued and rewarded within the CIIS culture. The linkage to faculty evaluation, compensation, and promotion was not explicit. It may not be clear to faculty either, which could be problematic [CFR 2.8].

Student learning and success. Student success data is provided and there appears to be a systematic effort to collect such data through the recent creation of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) – an obvious good step. But consistent with the observations made for “Institutional Purpose” it still appears to be a work in progress, with more than half the respondents seeing it as an area needing improvement, which is a concern that will hopefully be addressed through the OIE [CFRs 2.6, 2.10]. Student support services are recognized as an issue

by CIIS – as reported by half the reviewers as a relatively high priority. Enhancement to these services is apparently being addressed as part of the CIIS Strategic Plan 2020. This improvement may need to be addressed more rapidly with various interim updates and progress reports.

Student support is too vital a priority to be allowed to languish. The handling of transfer students, especially into the undergraduate degree completion program, is characterized as a strength in the self-review [**CFR 2.12**]. Greater documentation and clarification of the process would be appropriate.

Overall, the Team thought that CIIS met Standard 2. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness has informally trained selective faculty on assessment processes and measures, and has worked with all academic programs to obtain appropriate data. However there were concerns raised regarding CFRs 2.4 (faculty’s collective responsibility for assessment) and 2.6 (graduates meet stated standards of achievement). The confusion over who owns assessment and full faculty participation in the process was not evident to the Team. Additionally, the failure to link data collection clearly to PLOs and making meaning of the data to close the loop suggests that they are not meeting these CFRs. The Team also had concerns about CFR 2.10 regarding support for student achievement. Students may not be making timely progress in their degrees, incurring heavy debt and a particular concern regarding projected salaries in their chosen profession.

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

Faculty and staff. The Team believed CIIS had difficulty meeting the CFRs in this category (**3.1** through **3.3**). There was insufficient evidence that CIIS has been able to develop a sufficient and diverse faculty and staff to support operations and programs with little progress made since their interim report of 2012 [**CFR 3.1**]. CIIS has put some policies and practices in

place but the lack of clarity with regard to workload issues and consistent processes for assessment [**CFR 3.2**] were problematic and are explained in subsequent sections of this document. Our assessment is that faculty and staff development has been irregular and lacks the benefit of a structured plan [**CFR 3.3**].

Fiscal, physical and information resources. Evidence provided through the Institutional Report and information about the CIIS' fiscal resources shared during the AV raised significant concerns regarding **CFRs 3.4** (financial stability) and **3.5** (alignment of facilities, services, and technology with objectives). CIIS has been mired in managing the short term budget shortfalls rather than establishing solid long term plans. These issues are described in more detail in component 7.

Organizational structure and decision-making processes. CIIS may have met **CFR 3.7** regarding clear, consistent decision-making structures and processes; it is also apparent that their priority is to sustain institutional capacity and educational effectiveness. They have also met **CFR 3.8** regarding a full-time CEO and full-time CFO that are sufficiently qualified. However, whereas the leadership operates with integrity, responsibility, and accountability, the current interim President has 15 direct reports, which raises the question of optimal performance and increased concern of the entrenchment of silos [**CFR 3.6**]. There is evidence to support that they have demonstrated effective academic leadership by faculty through adequate governance structures [**CFR 3.10**].

The Team believes that, given the financial concerns about CIIS, the Board has acted appropriately with action regarding the President [**CFR 3.9**]. However, it is incumbent upon the Board of Trustees to provide strategic oversight; not management for CIIS. The Team believes that CIIS needs to reevaluate its institutional planning efforts.

Collectively, the Team has grave concerns about CIIS performance in the area of sustainability and does not believe that they have met Standard 3.

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

Quality assurance processes. According to the Institutional Report (*page 14*), "CIIS has a full array of policies to assure quality, to utilize data for decision making and planning, and to evaluate and improve. These include program review, annual assessment reports, new program approval, and, more recently, assessment of student services and co-curricular activities [CFR 4.1]. CIIS argues that it has invested in building a more robust institutional research function by creating an Office of Institutional Effectiveness and staffing it with high-level experts" (*Institutional Report, page 14*). However, information gleaned from the AV indicates that the Director is focusing on developing infrastructure and data warehouses with only minimal participation in training faculty in assessment or working with programs to obtain appropriate data.

As in other sections of their self-study, it seemed somewhat aspirational and descriptive of intent, rather than accomplishments and true corrective action. But Chapter 6 of the Institutional Report did have some concrete examples of the operation of their quality assurance processes and approach to institutional learning and improvement. Exhibit 6.2, in particular, provided some credible descriptions of issues that were identified and ostensibly addressed. We might have preferred a more direct linkage description of the identification of the issue through the quality assurance processes and the learning and improvement that resulted. While there was logic in the description, a more detailed decision and approval process would have been helpful. It is also not clear that the examples cited are actually representative of their quality assurance processes, learning, and responses (corrective action).

The Team asserts that, even though CIIS collects large quantities of data to address quality of programs, they are nascent in their attempts to track results over time and have yet to consistently make improvements based on evidence collected [CFR 4.1]. The Team understands that the Director of Educational Effectiveness is a relatively new position and there is a great deal of “building” still taking place. However, it will be important to think clearly about data needed immediately to address the current financial crisis, perhaps delaying the full development of a data warehouse until the institution reaches some state of equilibrium [CFR 4.2].

Institutional learning and improvement. The evidence provided by CIIS does not clearly indicate that they are meeting the CFRs in this category [4.3 to 4.6]. Specific concerns are addressed in Components 3, 4 and 6, discussed in separate sections of this document. In sum, with the exception of the Undergraduate program, current methods of assessing student learning and actions to close the loop are not adequate to inform CIIS about students’ learning and program improvement.

In conclusion, the team agreed that CIIS meets standards 1 and 2, but is not meeting standard 3. Additionally, CIIS may be at risk of being out of compliance on Standard 4. They have made some progress on their assessment efforts however there is some disarray which requires some regrouping in order to make a compelling case that they are meeting the standard.

Federal Requirements

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

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

During the visit, the team reviewed and affirmed the four forms noted above. They are added as an appendix to the Team Report.

C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees Key Learning Outcomes and Curricular Integrity

Undergraduate Program

The School of Undergraduate Studies at CIIS consists of a single undergraduate program: a BA degree in Interdisciplinary Studies, with an option for a minor in Critical Psychology. This is a four-semester, cohort-based, upper-division degree completion program that is taught in a hybrid, on-line and weekend curriculum format. Students must complete at least 60 units prior to entering the program and have completed a majority of their general education requirements in these 60 units. CIIS does supplement the major degree program with general education required courses (e.g., humanities, social sciences, math, natural sciences), and elective courses that they did not complete prior to transferring to CIIS [CFR 2.14]. The program learning outcomes (PLOs) were informed by a variety of documents including the WASC Core Competencies, LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, Lumina Degree Proficiency Qualifications, CIIS Seven Commitments, and the School of Undergraduate Studies Mission Statement.

Though the Institutional Report provides large quantities of documentation in support of its BA program, there are some basic discrepancies evident in said documents which serve to obscure clear communication regarding the key learning outcomes at the undergraduate level [CFR 2.2]. CIIS defines each of the components of assessment (e.g., degree proficiencies, program learning outcomes). They define degree proficiencies as “those skills and attributes that students will now and be able to do once completing a degree program” (*CIIS Website Assessment Introduction* document). In the same document they further define program learning outcomes as “outcomes that students will achieve or manifest if successfully completing a degree

program.” Some further explanation of the distinction between these lists is warranted, given that they only have one program that leads to the BA degree. Moreover, the 9 PLOs found in the Institutional Report are not those that are listed in the PLO document (*document PLO_BIS_BA under the PLO folder for the BA program*). That document shows that there are four program level outcomes: Intellectual and practical skills; interdisciplinary knowledge; situated knowledge; social justice and social change. These four program-level learning objectives are not stated as learning outcomes but as general goals; the goals are further defined by 29 specific objectives, some of which are stated in measureable terms, but many are not (e.g., PLO 3.1: Demonstrate a conscious awareness of the learning process and co-create the learning environment). Examination of course syllabi serve to further obscure clear communication of learning outcomes. Some syllabi contain all of the learning outcomes and degree proficiencies, others select a few to highlight, and others provide course-level outcomes. Consequently, there is no consistent format across courses to clearly inform students about how a particular course contributes to the program and/or degree and what students can expect to gain from the course.

CIIS has provided various curriculum maps for the BA program and they are generally better than those provided for the graduate programs. But they do not clearly illustrate how (1) the core curriculum aligns with PLOs, (2) how student mastery occurs over the years of study, or (3) how the PLOs align with degree proficiencies, core competencies or the Seven Commitments. For example, the curriculum map attempts to align core courses with seven PLOs, none of which appear on the more extensive list of program learning outcomes [*Undergraduate Studies Curriculum Map, CM_BIS.BA*]. The curriculum map shows that students are introduced to, reinforced for, and required to exhibit demonstrated competence with certain PLOs within single courses and in the first semester of the program; there is no clear progression of mastery of PLOs

over the semesters. The alignment between the BA core curriculum and the BA proficiencies, and the alignment between the core curriculum and the PLOs (the list of 7 PLOs, not the full 29) are depicted in Exhibits 4.4 and 4.5, respectively. Exhibit 4.6 illustrates the alignment between the core curriculum and the Interdisciplinary Studies PLOs (i.e., the core competencies). These charts clearly show that quantitative reasoning is not addressed in the core curriculum. It is also unclear as to how the BA degree proficiencies or PLOs from the BA program support the seven commitments (*Exhibit 3.2*). If the courses were visibly aligned with program level outcomes, and the program level outcomes were distinctly aligned, in turn, with the degree proficiencies and Seven Commitments, this would provide support for a coherent, clearly defined curriculum and help to ensure that fundamental learning outcomes are met. However, this is not currently the case.

Despite these issues with specific aspects of the learning outcomes and maps, it was clear to the Team that some undergraduate program faculty understand the principals of assessment. Consequently, we believe that with some attention to details provided above and some revision, the PLOs and curriculum maps will be brought into alignment, thereby illuminating the relationships between learning goals and student performance.

Graduate Programs

Virtually all of the programs at CIIS are graduate level programs. A review of the degree proficiencies, program learning outcomes, and curriculum maps reveals the same problems in the graduate programs that were identified in the undergraduate program, but they were more pervasive. Each individual program identifies its own degree proficiencies, rather than proficiencies than the proficiencies that would be expected for a graduate program of a particular level (e.g., MA vs PhD; *Exhibit 1.7*). There is no clear connection between the proficiencies and

the Seven Commitments, and CIIS leaders have acknowledged that some commitments are not reflected in the proficiencies (*Institutional Report page 22*). The quality of the PLOs varies considerably across programs. Many of the programs have large numbers of outcomes that are not stated in measureable terms (e.g., the Clinical Psychology PsyD program), some consist of vague lists (e.g., Community Mental Health program, Certificate in East-West Spiritual Counseling) whereas others do generally use appropriate terminology to clearly state what a graduate will know, be able to do, or value upon completion of the program (e.g., Philosophy and Religion programs).

Some of the curriculum maps for the programs exhibit greater coherence than others. Many of the maps provided contained Xs or check marks (e.g., PsyD Clinical Psychology, BBSE) which convey no information about level of mastery for a course, or how skills and knowledge are built across the curriculum. In some cases, numbers are used but not defined on the map (e.g., *MCP - Community Mental Health, CM_MCP_CMH.pdf*). There are a few cases in which maps provide information about how courses contribute to mastery of learning outcomes throughout the program (e.g., PhD Philosophy and Religion – concentration in Philosophy, Cosmology and Consciousness). However, there are a number of instances where blank rows or columns exist in curriculum maps, suggesting that course doesn't contribute to mastery of the PLOs or that a PLO is not addressed in the curriculum [e.g., DACM]. The faculty needs to review the data and reflect on whether the courses or learning outcomes need to be revised or removed.

Summary

Whereas CIIS has what is characterized as a “distinctive and clear mission” to “expand the boundaries of traditional degree programs with transdisciplinary, cross-cultural, and applied

studies with face-to-face hybrid, and online pedagogical approaches,” more than half of the respondents felt that it needed attention in that, presumably, the actual educational objectives that it might suggest are neither obvious nor clear. Evaluation of the PLOs and curriculum maps suggest that faculty need to discuss and clarify their educational goals and where in the curriculum they will address those goals. Overall, indicators of student achievement at the institutional, program and course levels need to be articulated in a transparent and public manner. **[CFR 1.2]**.

The absence of an articulation of structured and distinctive student experiences and learning outcomes makes it difficult to unambiguously assess the meaning of a degree from CIIS, beyond the title and overview description of the degree program **[CFR 2.2]**. Although the programs have learning outcomes, assessment plans “embedded in rubrics and grading criteria,” they are not evaluated or integrated in the Institutional Report **[CFR 2.3]**. Instead there is a plethora of raw data but a dearth of information as to how it influences decision making and continuous improvement – and how it might be expected to flow from the mission – and be used for program review **[CFR 2.7]**.

Without a more explicit reporting and discussion of the implications of the data, it is difficult to understand how faculty might use that information to ensure the quality and rigor of the degrees offered, maintain institutional standards of quality and consistency, and protect the integrity of the degrees that are granted by the various programs. If faculty is engaging in deep reflection regarding the rigor and academic integrity of the degrees, and considering possibly restructuring, it is not apparent in the Institutional Report **[CFRs 2.4, 2.5, 2.6]**.

Essentially, faculty and reviewers are left to connect the dots on their own and extrapolate conclusions -- and possible corrective actions that may be necessary -- with respect to the meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees that are offered by CIIS.

There appears to be a CIIS commitment to improvement based on data and evidence, but the Institutional Report is more aspirational and descriptive of the review process, rather than providing an explicit demonstration as to how the process is being executed and the results implemented in a constructive and meaningful fashion. Hopefully this is being done but more extensive documentation that transcends raw data is required [CFRs 4.3, 2.7].

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation Student Learning

CIIS chose to focus on their sole undergraduate BA program in this section and to address graduate programs in chapter 6 on Quality Assurance and Improvement. It is unclear why the institution chose to delineate it this way, as student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation are relevant at all levels of education. Consequently, comments here will largely reflect performance in the undergraduate program, with additional remarks about graduate programs where the Team was able to address them.

Methods used to Assess Student Learning: Undergraduate.

The Institutional Report describes an on-going assessment effort for the BA program rather than just focusing on data collection just prior to program review, a best practice in assessment. “Core” faculty members serve as leaders in assessment and this position is rotated. The extent to which adjunct or part-time faculty are engaged in the process is not articulated. CIIS provides a draft of their assessment plan (*Exhibit 4.1*) which, according to the Institutional Report, represents an improved alignment with their 7 year program review cycle. Examination

of the plan shows that they are reviewing all seven PSLOs at all times which may be too onerous to maintain.

The BA program uses a variety of assessment data. Direct assessment focuses on transcript reviews, admissions essays, and senior projects. Indirect assessment centers on student and alumni surveys, in addition to review of PLOs and curriculum maps. The assessment plan provides a very useful chart that highlights what they learned from their assessment and actions they are taking to close the loop (*Exhibit 4.7*). However, it is unclear as to what methods they are using to collect data from the direct and indirect sources and we believe they are trying to assess too many PLOs at one time. For example, they developed a rubric for the senior project and are in the process of creating a signature assignment to assess. This is a good approach to making assessment systematic and relatively simple to complete via embedded assessment. However, will they sample from student assignments or assess all of them? Moreover, the faculty may want to consider distributing evaluation of the PLOs over the course of the 7 year period (e.g., 1-2 PLOs a year) so as to allow for more in-depth exploration of the PLO while not over-burdening faculty. In fact, the MOU generated from this assessment (*Exhibit 4.2*) states that the workload is untenable and they are seeking to hire additional staff. However, they may be able to create a more manageable system by reducing the assessment load to focus attention on fewer activities that yield higher quality information about the specific PLOs.

Methods used to Assess Student Learning: Graduate.

Assessment in the graduate programs utilizes a dissertation proposal rubric that has been refined over 5 years (*Exhibit 6.7*). This rubric contains multiple dimensions with which proposal are evaluated (e.g., Inquiry/Topic, Research Questions, Methodology, Organization and Form) and is an excellent tool for not only determining whether students are meeting agreed upon

standards for the dimension but also allows for identification of areas faculty might want to focus on to improve student performance. Data from the assessment of 420 dissertations is provided with commentary on areas that should be targeted for additional attention (e.g., Review of the Literature received the greatest percentage of “poor” rankings and could be a target for additional instruction). This document provides a thoughtful analysis of the data and should be used as an exemplar for the campus.

Assessment plans are highly variable by program and do not utilize a common approach to systematically gathering data to address PLOs. This serves to create a situation in which great quantities of data may be collected that cannot be used or, in many cases, lead to faculty rejection of assessment because the system is so complex and cumbersome. The faculty would benefit from working more closely with faculty assessment experts and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness to develop meaningful and sustainable assessment processes.

Core Competencies: Standards for Performance.

Undergraduate. The report outlines extensive efforts to align the BA program learning outcomes with the core competencies. Through this review they recognized that the senior project and its rubric provided an appropriate means by which to assess four of the five core competencies (omitting QR). These senior projects are evaluated in the fall and summer semesters each year.

Written Communication. Admissions essays are evaluated by faculty though it isn't clear if a rubric is used for this evaluation; staff, however, review the pass rates for writing courses taken at other universities. If students are found deficient they are conditionally accepted and must enroll in a writing workshop. CIIS evaluates student writing based on the senior project and pays particular attention to students who were deficient when they were admitted. Results of

analyses conducted over 3 semesters shows that, as a group, most students meet the standard for the criteria on the rubric and more recent semesters are revealing higher mean scores across categories. The rubric itself was not included so the dimensions used for evaluation are unknown. However, the process of identifying students early, requiring some remediation, and evaluating student performance through the senior project yields some promising data. Based on their analysis, only 4% of seniors failed to meet the writing standard. More information about the rubric and performance standards in particular writing skills would be informative.

Oral communication. In fall 2014 CIIS established an oral communication component to the senior project. Initial assessment showed that 55% did not meet the standard. Consequently, an instructional component on oral communication was added to the senior project courses. Pass rates increased to 82.5% after implementing this change; as of fall 2015, 97% met the standard. No information was provided on the dimensions on which students' oral communication skills were evaluated. However, this is a good example of using evidence to close the loop and make a change to improve student performance.

Information Literacy. The requirement that students produce either a literature review or field reader that will lead to a senior project during the second semester provides the evidence for an assessment of information literacy. Most recent data shows that 96% of students meet or exceed the standard for this competency. The rubric upon which this data was not included (only a table summarizing percent meeting threshold was provided).

Quantitative Reasoning. QR has not been assessed at CIIS. The faculty is currently investigating the possibility of using a signature assignment to evaluate students' QR skills. CIIS notes that students take math elsewhere and they only have 3 courses that focus specifically on QR skills (e.g., Research Methods). Given the empirical nature of the behavioral and social

sciences, it is important that the faculty consider how they may already be integrating QR into the curriculum or consider adding this component to the undergraduate curriculum.

Critical Thinking. The Institutional Report indicates that critical thinking is infused throughout the curriculum (*page 37*) and mentions the writing rubric as the means by which it is assessed. However, neither the rubric nor data generated for the dimensions of the rubric are presented. Summary statistics provided in Exhibit 4.7 show student means that meet threshold for this core competency, but no further information on the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard is provided.

Graduate. CIIS has different degree proficiencies for the professional- and research-oriented Master's and doctoral degrees. The Institutional Report does not address core competencies for the graduate programs. Data reflective of these competencies could be gleaned from the dissertation proposal or other direct assessments of student performance on the PLOs.

Learning-centeredness Embedded Across the Institution.

Although the documents provided indicate that a great deal of time was spent generating learning outcomes, the current state of the PLOs and curriculum maps, and the nature of the evidence of on-going assessment provided suggests that a culture of reflection on teaching is still in its infancy at CIIS. Perhaps the most advanced program in terms of articulation of the PLOs and consideration of student mastery of PLOs through assessment data resides in the BA program. In fact, that program displays some instances of best practices in teaching and learning such as true reflection on student performance on written and oral communication. However, the large number of PLOs across programs (many of which are not measureable), the development of degree proficiencies for every graduate program (rather than focusing on the level of degree), the haphazard manner in which some programs completed curriculum maps, the copy/pasting of

responses to the Educational Effectiveness Inventory, and the inclusion of over 1600 documents in their reports suggests that the self-study was meant for reaffirmation of accreditation, rather than an embedded process to reflect on, and improve, student learning [CFRs 4.3, 4.4].

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
Definition of Student Success

CIIS defines student success through academic persistence and timely attainment of educational goals as evidenced through overall graduation and retention rates, career readiness as indicated through license examination pass rates, and job placement rates. In alignment with the institution's commitment to a "whole-person" learning environment, student success is also defined by faculty and students as a "culture that succeeds in supplanting the traditional student/professor divide with more collaborative and interactive student and faculty roles" (*Institutional Report, page. 38*) and evidenced through high student satisfaction.

Retention Rates

The institution's one-year retention rates in the Bachelor's Completion Program average 94% for entering cohorts and remain, overall, above 90% (CFRs 1.2, 2.10). CIIS attributes their high retention rates to their student support services and the choice students intentionally make to transfer and complete their degree at the institution because of the institution's mission and distinct academic program.

Thirty-six unit Master's programs have an average one-year retention/persistence rate of 87% for 2009-2011 cohorts and have seen a gradual increase of 6% in their one year retention rate over the last three years. The MFA has had a 90% retention rate over the past three cohorts, the highest among this group of Master's programs. The 60 unit Psychology Master's Program has held steady over the last three years with an average one-year retention/persistence rate of 94% for the 2008-2009 through 2010-2011 cohort periods.

The PhD programs have experienced a 7% increase in their one-year retention rate over the last three years and the institution cites it as a “very positive trend” (*Exhibit 5.4*). While the majority of the PhD programs hold a one-year retention rate close to or above 90% and efforts toward decreasing time-to-degree are mentioned in the report, the Women’s Spirituality and Transformative Learning and Change are the only two programs among the group of seven 36-unit PhD programs that reflect lower retention rates [**CFR 1.2**]. No specific efforts are mentioned in how the Women’s Spirituality program will be addressing the issue of retention. The Transformative Learning and Change program, an online PhD program, is being phased out and replaced by the Transformative Studies Program.

The Institutional Report (*page 43*) notes that the retention and persistence rates for graduate programs are attributed to students’ resolve toward achieving their personal or professional goals, while attributing attrition in graduate programs to “unforeseen financial or health circumstances, which is typical for working adults students” or because students have “met their personal goals prior to completing the degree” [**CFR 2.10**].

Ongoing efforts to improve retention and completion rates were listed in Exhibit 5.7 and range from bolstering assessment efforts of student readiness for programs, enhancing financial literacy, increasing student support for writing and research, and conducting earlier interventions by program faculty with students who show signs of emotional or academic stress. However, no specific programs or timelines were linked to the list of ongoing efforts, or to the individuals who will be accountable for these retention and completion initiatives. Further, a deeper investigation to examine retention rates as it relates to program completion is a worthwhile exploration to gain a more robust picture of how students can be better supported in their academic pursuits.

Graduation Rates

CIIS provides One Year, Two Year, and Four Year graduation rates that are disaggregated by gender, race, ethnicity, and Pell Recipient, across a three-year average for upper-division transfer students into their Bachelor's Completion Program (*Exhibit 5.4* and **CFR 1.2**). Across a three-year average, 69% of upper-division transfer students graduate in one year, 87% in two years, and 84% in four years. CIIS highlights the successful matriculation to completion progress of their transfer students as particularly noteworthy and an indicator of academic success for their diverse racial, ethnic, and socio-economic student population.

The ten 36-unit Master's programs collectively reflect a 63% three year graduation rate across a three year average that increases to a 71% average when a four year graduation rates is examined (*Exhibit 5.4* and **CFR 1.2**). The institutional report acknowledges the broad variance among the ten Master's programs citing the Creative Inquiry program that holds an 80% completion rate in three years and the Women's Spirituality program significantly lower with a 48% completion after three years [**CFR 2.10**]. The widespread variance continues into the 4-year graduation rates with the Creative Inquiry program increasing to a 91% graduation rate but with the Women's Spirituality program remaining at 48% (*Exhibit 5.4* and **CFR 1.2**).

The six 60-unit Master's programs collectively reflect a 66% graduation rate across a three-year total, increases to 81% in four years, and 87% in six years. The variance in graduation rates across these six programs is not as significant as that which is seen in the 36-unit Master's programs.

CIIS acknowledges significant variance in graduation rates across their eight 36-unit PhD programs (**CFR 2.10** and *Institutional Report, page 46*). While the grouping of PhD programs' percentage increases from 29% for the 6-year graduation rate to 44% in the 10-year graduation

rate across a three year average, two particular programs remain significantly lower with graduation rates of 27% (Women’s Spirituality) and 29% (Social and Cultural Anthropology). Regarding the Social and Cultural Anthropology programs that had a low graduation rate, these programs have been revised with new curricula, faculty, program learning outcome, and student learning outcomes. The program was also renamed to Anthropology and Social Change. Subsequently, the graduation rate is on track for continuous improvement, with a three-year graduation rate of 82.54% in 2013—significant progress and an indication that the new curriculum is working for students.

The institutional report indicates an initiative toward “major programmatic realignment” of its curriculum, faculty, and student culture that will positively impact future program completion rates of the Social and Cultural Anthropology program. In addition, there is a plan to extend online delivery to increase access to students enrolled in the Women’s Spirituality program who have expressed challenges in program completion due to “health, family stressors, and financial exigencies” (*Institutional Report, page 46*).

The Team found the graduation rate in the MA and PhD Women’s Spirituality program as well as the Social Cultural Anthropology programs problematic and is critical of whether the institution has a developed process in place to determine when programs need to be sunset. The report does not provide sufficient evidence for the proposed long-term strategies being implemented to sustain these underperforming programs.

Student Support Services

CIIS provides a comprehensive discussion of their curricular and co-curricular student services with an eye towards measuring their effectiveness on retention and graduation [CFRs 2.11, 2.13]. The launch of the Digital Commons last fall provides an opportunity for students to

publish and publicly display their work and accomplishments during their time as a student at CIIS and after graduation. This initiative provides a medium for students to be agents of their own learning and a medium toward career preparation.

The institution appears to take a pro-active approach to expand and bolster their technological support to meet the needs of their traditional, hybrid, and online students. The LMS transition to the Canvas platform to provide opportunity for more face-to-face discussions, conferencing, video capabilities, and faculty-student interaction supports the institution's definition of student success to bridge the traditional faculty-student divide. For non-residential students, the extension of weekend services from the library, café, bookstore, Registrar's office, Financial Aid, Bursar's, and the Student Affairs office points to the efforts toward improving access of institutional resources for non-traditional students and supporting their success [**CFRs 2.13, 3.5**].

CIIS's commitment to "whole person" learning is being further actualized through the creation of Student Wellness Services this past academic year, with initial counseling services beginning in 2016-2017 [**CFR 2.13**]. The intention toward expanding mental and physical health services has potential for positive impact for their students as well as the neighboring community, with an eye toward demonstrating the value of CIIS toward the public good. The Student Wellness Center, for example, works with students at a distance via telephone and internet access. The post-election healing circle, which took place during the site visit, run by the Wellness Center is a good example; members of the community not present at CIIS participated via the conferencing capabilities of Canvas, our online learning platform. Questions remained for the team about how well off-site students are connected to the institution and the overall capacity to serve and provide equitable access to their post-traditional student population.

The quality of student services at CIIS is evidenced through student satisfaction results in both the Student Satisfaction Survey administered in 2014 and Graduation Survey administered every year (*Exhibit 5.2*). The effort to gather data and keep abreast of student satisfaction is commendable.

Overall, current students and soon-to-be graduates of the institution rated their satisfaction of their academic and co-curricular experience as above average. Acknowledged in the institutional report, the Student Satisfaction Survey does not disaggregate by program or student demographics, leaving a gap for deeper understanding of the experiences of sub-population groups. The Director of Institutional Effectiveness is working with faculty and administrators to refine the survey and initiate a way to utilize data for programmatic improvements [**CFR 2.10**]. Components of the survey that provide some understanding of the experiences of students of color indicate a lower satisfaction in their educational experience compared to their white counterparts (*Exhibit 5.3*). These results have initiated multiple efforts and widespread attention to diversity training, hiring practices, and limitations in financial aid [**CFRs 2.10, 2.13**] as the institution commits to diversity and inclusion in their Strategic Plan (*Exhibit 1.4*).

Recent Alumni Survey results (*Exhibit 5.11*) gather data from graduates as far back as 1977, with 50% of respondents representing alumni from the past five years (2010-2015). While the overall mean of the alumni satisfaction of their CIIS educational experience is around 84%, when disaggregated, the satisfaction gradually declines with most recent alumni (*Exhibit 5.16*). The declining satisfaction is mirrored by the same decline of recent alumni when asked if they would recommend CIIS to a family or friend. A majority of those who responded when asked about their dissatisfaction attributed their experience to “poor administrative support”.

The institutional report does not specifically address this concern that was widely shared by alumni, but does briefly mention a cyclical review of administrative units as an objective in their strategic plan (*Exhibit 1.4*). It would be helpful to connect specific proposed changes with the data from the alumni survey.

The Alumni survey also revealed that CIIS graduates believe that their education has reflected the values that attracted them to the University. Commendable is the result that the overwhelming majority agreed or strongly agreed that they had experienced the dimensions of an integral education. Somewhat troubling, however, is that the data also showed that 74% of respondents felt their degree did not prepare them for their chosen field (*Exhibit 5.16, Institutional Report, page 49*). While there are macro-economic forces that may be in play here, it is also unclear what the institutional strategy is to develop programs that enhance career preparation and further career development. This is further complicated by increasing debt burdens nationwide, particular for students of color and first generation learners. The team finds the alumni response troubling considering the myriad of financial challenges facing many CIIS students. The team would like to see CIIS make progress with their students towards specific career preparation and attainment, while keeping aligned with their values regarding integral education.

While the institutional report notes that employment and income levels of graduates are above the national average (*page 51*), about 58% of alumni report carrying a student loan and 30% of alumni report earning less than \$25,000 a year (*Exhibit 5.11*). Despite these burdens, approximately 20% of the survey respondents reported gift giving. 96% of those who gave gifts also reported high satisfaction with the quality of their education. This implies strongly that those who are highly satisfied are willing to support CIIS after they graduate. Simultaneously, though,

the institution reported a decline in the percentage of alumni donating over the past seven years (*Exhibit 5.22*). Being aware of the decline in the percentage of alumni giving back, institutional leaders are taking steps to engage alumni through online and social media outlets.

Improvements and Goals

It is clear that CIIS is committed to student success through curricular and co-curricular student support services and continual efforts to support the “whole” student during their time at the institution. High retention and completion rates in the Bachelor Completion Program are commendable, particularly during a time where student swirl has become a norm. The use of student and graduation satisfaction survey data keeps administrators and faculty aware of the needs of students, particularly as the needs of diverse student populations come to the forefront of conversations surrounding student success. A deeper exploration of retention and program completion rates in several graduate programs will benefit from institutional research data, the effectiveness and impact of student support services, and a deeper meaning-making process through the assessment of student learning.

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

Program Review

CIIS has an established Program Review process in place that was “revitalized” in 2002 under the Curriculum and Academic Review Committee (CARC) and led to a review of the process in 2005 (*Institutional Report, page 54*). The *Academic Program Review Manual* was then updated and expanded in 2015 that details the six-step process, purpose, timeline, and expectations of Program Review, held together by a memorandum of understanding (MOU) and in conjunction with program administrators, CARC, and Academic Vice President (AVP) (*Exhibit 6.1 and CFRs 2.7, 4.1*).

Following the revitalization of Program Review and an updated manual, the report states that a shift toward “outcomes-based, rigorous, collaborative, and empirical approach program assessment” required an increase number of external reviewers and an expectation of program administrators toward “meaningful inquiry” with multiple stakeholders (*page 54*). CARC’s desire to advance continued improvement in the assessment process was furthered through a recently conducted focus group comprised of three faculty members who recently led program reviews. The Team found that efforts are being made to gather feedback on the Program Review process and its effectiveness. The focus group findings revealed faculty found the handbook and communications from CARC to be helpful but had difficulty with the review timelines, finding qualified external reviewers, and challenges with the rotation of CARC liaisons. The report did not specify what was challenging about the four semester program review timeline or details about the rotation of CARC liaisons. The Team found no plans of how these issues will be addressed, though the report mentioned that they intend on addressing these issues.

According to the manual, program review is generally scheduled on a 7 year cycle, unless otherwise dictated by a program's specialized accreditation cycle [CFR 2.7]. In meeting with CARC, the anticipated expectation was for programs to undergo their self-study every four years, though programs might delay their review for "practical issues", such as faculty being on sabbatical. There was no mention of which programs had specialized accreditors and which programs may fall out of the 7 year cycle. For example, the Inventory for Educational Effectiveness (*Exhibit 2.1*) indicated that the MA and PhD in Anthropology and Social Change programs were on an 11-year cycle whereas the MA and PhD in Philosophy and Religion and the MA in Integrative Health Studies are on 5 –year cycles. Further inquiry elicited the response that the Anthropology and Social Change program is new, having been developed in 2011. Overall, the team could not find a clear explanation for the rationale of the program review cycles between the year listed under most recent program review on the Inventory for Educational Effectiveness (*Exhibit 2.3*) and Appendix E: Cycle of Program Review in the Program Review manual (*Exhibit 6.1*). In addition, the manual and MOU state that programs are expected to have a third year review and interim summary reports submitted to CARC and the AVP (*Exhibit 6.1*), though the review team could not locate what the third year interim summary reports required and no evidence of programs undergoing a third year review could be located in the documents provided.

In the *Academic Program Review Manual Appendices*, four WASC rubrics are included for chairs and their faculty: 1) Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews, 2) Assessing Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes, 3) Assessing the Use of Capstone Experiences for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes, and 4) Assessing the Use of Portfolios for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes. The manual states that the "goal for

CIIS is to reach for the ‘developed’ and ‘highly developed’ levels on these rubrics” and encourages faculty to utilize these rubrics to evaluate their own program’s effectiveness (*Exhibit 6.1*). While providing rubrics inform faculty on criteria and standards for best practices, the Team was unable to find how CARC holds programs to these standards and whether CARC and the AVP use these rubrics as a method of evaluation in providing feedback to programs prior to approving the MOU. Other than the rubrics provided in the manual, the Team was unable to locate more information on the process of how programs are evaluated and whether training and support are provided for faculty to reach a level of “developed” or “highly developed” in assessing their program effectiveness. The committee mentioned that the MOU works in theory, but they have yet to figure out a way to follow-up on programs after their self-study.

In meeting with CARC, the team found the committee to be dedicated to providing feedback to their colleagues during program review and a commitment to improve the process while elevating the importance of program review. The committee is demonstrating a commitment to educational effectiveness at the institution in two ways. First, committee members have voted to include the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, though they are unsure of the relationship between the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and CARC [CFR 4.5]. The committee also includes the Registrar. Second, the committee acknowledged a need to consider developing a program closure policy based on findings from program review [CFR 4.4]. Concurrently, the committee members expressed needing additional support from the institution in training the faculty on best practices surrounding assessment and the pivotal role that program review could have on a smaller campus.

Assessment of Student Learning

The development of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the appointment of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness in 2014 have played key roles in encouraging program faculty and administrators in developing and refining program learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and assessment tools (*Institutional Report, page 56*). The report highlights “examples of refinement of assessment processes” that have been made such as the faculty and dean in the School of Undergraduate Studies revising learning outcomes and aligning them with core curriculum, the faculty in Women’s Spirituality developing a new writing course, the ACTCM committees revising their graduate exams, and all PhD programs developing new comprehensive exam and dissertation rubrics. While the reports highlight these examples, there lacks sufficient evidence across the numerous documents that all programs have engaged in the first steps in an assessment cycle with measurable PLOs and well-aligned Curriculum Maps (CFR 2.4). There is no doubt that a substantial amount of work was invested in the development of program learning outcomes (PLO), curriculum maps, and rubrics over the past few years. Yet, a lack of evidence exists that a systematic assessment process exists to sustain assessment efforts (CFRs 4.1, 4.4). Without an institutional annual assessment of student learning in place, refining PLOs, curriculum maps, assignments, and rubrics become optional and sporadic, rather than embodied as an institutional commitment toward organizational learning and assessment that utilizes direct evidence to improve teaching and learning (CFR 4.3). The need to give more attention and focus on refining PLOs and curriculum maps as the first two steps in the assessment cycle is critical in supporting the accuracy and effectiveness of their assessment of student learning.

The Bachelor’s Completion Program in the School of Undergraduate Studies stands out among CIIS programs as having a robust on-going assessment culture in place. An outline of their schedule of assessment activities links assessment measures to outcomes and timelines

demonstrate that their assessment practices are not episodic. Further, their continuous cycle of Senior Project Assessment was not driven by program review. Their major findings stemming from their robust assessment practices can be directly linked to curricular and programmatic changes being implemented, and illustrate closing the loop (*Exhibit 4.1*, **CFRs 4.3, 4.4**). Lastly, the assessment of direct and indirect evidence of student learning and the involvement of all core faculty and SUS staff on all parts of their self-study, and adjunct faculty in specific projects, can serve as a model for the institution.

Closing the Loop

The Institutional Report indicated specific improvements made in six programs (*Exhibit 6.2*) after undergoing program review. The Team found the changes to be general and lacked a connection between how specific program review data (graduation and retention rates, assessment of direct evidence of student learning, indirect assessments) were used and triangulated to initiate curricular and programmatic changes [**CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3**]. Direct evidence from student learning outcomes assessment was missing. Instead, curricular changes were made based on indirect evidence, such as student feedback on a capstone assignment. The majority of self-study reports from graduate programs surfaced gaps in how data were used to improve instruction and student learning. For example, the Women's Spirituality (WSE) programs had the lowest completion rates among the graduate programs (MA at 48% and PhD at 27%), but made no mention in their self-study report of how completions rates will be examined and further improved as a result of gaps in student learning assessment, learning opportunities, and instruction. Rather, new concentrations were proposed, career planning templates rolled out, and hybrid courses were initiated without a deeper reflection on how data were carefully and collectively reflected upon to drive changes.

While data were collected during program review, graduate programs have not adopted best practices in utilizing data as evidence for curricular and programmatic decision-making, planning, and improvement. The Institutional report mentions annual reporting of student learning needs to be instituted following program review (*page. 61*), but does not clarify whether these reports are updates to the MOU or a newly instituted commitment to ongoing data collection and assessment of student learning. There is also no indication of who will oversee these processes and hold programs accountable for the annual assessment of student learning and this was verified during the visit. The Team found the institution to be in the beginning stages of shifting program review toward “outcomes-based, rigorous, collaborative, and empirical approach program assessment” and still lacks a method of reporting annual assessment of student learning to improve curriculum and pedagogy [*Institutional Report, page 54; CFRs 4.3, 4.4*].

While some positive strides in the assessment of student learning have been made recently, the Team was unable to locate evidence that a posture of inquiry was occurring on a regular basis among graduate programs, lending to the conclusion that the surge of assessment efforts were undertaken as a result of accreditation and compliance, rather than a commitment toward teaching, learning, and assessment at this time.

From the report, the Team found the relationship between CARC and OIE murky at best. The lack of an ongoing systematic assessment process also surfaces a concern of whether shared governance exists and who is responsible for ongoing improvements to teaching and learning at the institution. According to the report, CARC holds responsibility for facilitating and evaluating program review and OIE as the driver for programs to establish outcomes and curriculum maps. It is also unknown as to who is responsible for training department chairs and faculty in

assessment, and whether faculty members are taking ownership of the assessment process to sustain a culture of inquiry [CFR 4.5].

At the visit, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness mentioned that there is no formal training for faculty on assessment and the ownership of assessment resides with the Academic Vice President. While some faculty came to CIIS with previous training in assessment, program faculty assessment leaders expressed the insufficient training and resources at the institution to support them in developing the knowledge and skills in order to effectively assess student learning. In meeting with CARC, it was evident that a disparity exists in who is responsible for supporting faculty and training faculty. The visit confirmed a deep disconnect between the role of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and CARC. Clarity in the function and responsibilities of CARC and OIE, particularly in the areas of faculty training and ownership of assessment, will be critical in building a sustainable culture of teaching, learning, assessment at the institution. [CFR 4.4, 4.5].

Clinical Psychology PsyD Program: Response to Loss of Accreditation

During the AV four members of the Team met with the Clinical Psychology Faculty to discuss the loss of APA accreditation for the PsyD program in 2012 after three years of being on probation. Primary reasons for this action were summarized by the Program Chair based upon the November 21, 2011 Accreditation Revocation letter by the APA Commission on Accreditation (*Summary of Reasons for APA Accreditation Loss* provided in response to the Lines of Inquiry). The issues largely focused on curricular quality and alignment, regular assessment of program learning and effectiveness, student success and support for learning, and graduation and retention data. The faculty described the work they did to address each issue, including digging into the raw data they had on students in the program and reconfiguring the

way that they evaluated dissertations. At the time of the writing of this report, the faculty was planning for the site visit by APA which will occur before the end of the semester. As the Team recognizes how difficult it is to get to the point of earning a site visit, the faculty should be commended for addressing the concerns and working to improve the program.

Institutional Research

Since the development of OIE and the appointment of the Director of Institutional Effectiveness in 2014, the institutional research (IR) function at CIIS has expanded to serve the growing assessment infrastructure needs of the institution. The Team commends OIE on their initiative in building strong data structures to improve how institutional and assessment data is organized, aggregated, and tracked [**CFR 4.2**]. Building a strong data structure for institution-wide and program-specific assessment data will serve CIIS administrators and faculty well in accessing and data for decision-making, planning, and improvement.

According to the Institutional Report, IR functions include federal and state compliance reporting and generating comprehensive data through their annual Fact Book (*Exhibit 6.3*) on enrollment trends and graduation and retention rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity, course enrollment, and faculty and staff workload. These data compiled by IR have valuable contributions to conversations surrounding student learning, student success, and institutional effectiveness. In particular, academic programs need these data to assist in understanding a bigger picture of student success and to crystalize findings from their own assessment efforts.

However, the Team was unable to find how these data are being shared across the institution, what groups are making meaning from these data, and how these data are integrated into critical conversations leading to decision-making and improvement. According to the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness is trying to clean

up historical data and plans to have a data system and infrastructure in place that will provide institutional data to support programs by the summer of 2017. There was insufficient evidence that the institution is collecting the right data, systematically disseminating data, and employing data-driven decision-making [**CFR 4.1, 4.3**].

As CIIS continues to build their assessment processes, it will be important for the institution to reevaluate whether the current OIE staff of one Director of Institutional Effectiveness and one part-time research analyst will be sufficient for the administrative offices it serves and the expectations of analyzing and utilizing institutional data [**CFR 4.2**].

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability; Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Current Financial Position

CIIS is among many small institutions of higher education that face challenges in fiscal sustainability. In the context of enrollment volatility, it is particularly vulnerable given its almost exclusive reliance on tuition revenues. Without a significant endowment, CIIS's portfolio of many—mostly small—graduate programs clustered around a unique mission and values is exposed to the vicissitudes of the changing higher education landscape, high cost of living in San Francisco, stagnant median incomes, and potential changes to federal financial aid. Indeed, doctoral enrollments nationwide are changing, as evidenced in the most recent CGS data report (2014-2015), in face of a populace that is bringing undergraduate debt burden into their graduate programs. The low starting salaries of graduates from most programs magnifies the concern. All of these factors mean that CIIS faces a great challenge of being nimble and aggressive while also being chronically under-resourced.

The current financial position has not changed significantly from the last WASC EER in 2008 (noted also in the 2012 interim Report), with DOE Federal Composite Scores increasing

slightly over the last six years, from 0.8 in 2008 to 1.8 in 2015, but back to 1.6 2016 (though 2.2. was projected in the self-study). Annual audits with perennial unqualified statements clearly indicate sound financial oversight [**CFR 3.4**], but this has come at a cost to faculty and staff salaries and other cost cutting measures.

CIIS's annual budget is perilously reliant on annual enrollment projections, which seems to make multi-year budgeting and planning difficult; on an annual basis little by way of contingency or reserve is budgeted, with a heavily restricted \$2.5 million endowment and modest cash on hand coupled with moderate debt service. The possible consequence in any given year, then, is to make adjustments on relatively short notice, or to dip into reserves to balance the budget. This was the case when real estate was sold off to fund major renovation in 2007, when salaries and benefits were temporarily cut (2013), and during the site visit, when CIIS was struggling to cope with a \$2 million shortfall. This budgetary gap was the result of unanticipated renovation costs, miscalculations involving the internal allocation of scholarships for ACTCM students, and a shortfall in the number of units generated by new entries in the fall 2016 enrollment cycle.

A significant change in CIIS's financial position has been the merger with ACTCM, which represents a significant complement of programs to help diversify program offerings. At the same time, ACTCM's leases and the ever escalating real estate costs pose a long-term risk to fiscal sustainability. The potential of donors being cultivated for leases, especially for an acupuncture clinic, could help resolve this conundrum while also increasing non-tuition revenue.

A general set of strategic goals for fiscal sustainability has been articulated: Keep tuition increases under control to ensure affordability, grow net asset reserves, diversify non-tuition revenue, and increase alumni giving/philanthropy. These are clearly appropriate overarching

goals, but little by way of realistic tactical objectives has been articulated to ensure progress over time. Indeed, the 2020 Strategic Plan identifies an increase in annual giving of some 3 million, which does not seem realistic given the staffing and infrastructure in development, and which is unlikely in the wake of a presidential transition. The issue of the Bay Area's affordability is likely to continue to be vexing, given that the kind of education that CIIS delivers is predicated on a model that is more expensive than most: mentor based, individualized, and flexible.

Alignment of Resource Allocation in Support of Educational Effectiveness.

The financial realities of CIIS clearly create considerable tensions as short-term crisis management engulfs long-term priorities and planning. Alignment of how to fund facilities/technology/equipment (the lack of a CRM for Admission, connectivity with ACTCM, and data architecture were noted), while simultaneously addressing compensation and benefits issues and cultivating stronger full-time faculty coverage (especially at ACTCM), is clearly a challenge. While the per student instructional expense has risen by some \$2000 over the last four years according to IPEDs data, this budgetary commitment to student success and academic quality has come at a cost. The limited investment in compensation as a whole and especially of staff salaries, faculty development, and research/scholarship poses a serious concern; without significant COLA increases and a low target of 70% of competitor salaries, faculty engagement, staff morale, and high staff turnover undermine long term student success. Similarly, the episodic short-term crises translate into limited funding for advancement efforts, which might over time increase philanthropy and alumni giving, especially given what appears to be high alumni loyalty and appreciation. Acting on the initiatives outlined in the September 17, 2016 Development Report could help CIIS achieve greater philanthropic success. That development analysis indicated a decent amount of support from alumni, especially given that alumni tend not to

support their graduate alma maters; focusing their philanthropy on their undergraduate institutions. Furthermore, limited resources are devoted to federal grant writing and working with private foundations. Until the presidential transition is resolved, there is little hope of any increase in giving to CIIS unless the Trustees themselves are able to step forward into this gap.

Multi-year planning is clearly problematic given the pressing short term needs after the budget shortfall. Even so, it was unclear how CIIS does multi-year planning, or how the academic plans of individual units are prioritized and connected to financial planning. A comprehensive long-term plan could communicate enrollment targets to program chairs in coordination with Admissions, and inform the process as resources are distributed between the various schools and programs. It does not seem that there have ever been clear targets, nor frank discussions about terminating programs that are no longer viable. The current culture of shared governance, with participation from faculty in the IPBC, has apparently not held serious and difficult conversations on fiscal sustainability that include possible program termination, increase in class size, reduction of sabbaticals, or consolidation of program support staff. Instead, faculty often voiced aspirations for decreased workloads even in the midst of a fiscal crisis [CFRs 4.6, 4.7].

Sustainability

For the most part, each of CIIS's programs aims at a rather narrow target audience. Increasing enrollments to 2000 will remain a stretch if the goal is to evenly distribute the new students across the current portfolio of offerings. How CIIS positions its complement of programs against competitors over time is critical; the process for strategically developing new programs is unclear, and adding more niche or boutique graduate programs might in the end result in an additional financial strain. The merger with ACTCM, although difficult

administratively and culturally in the short term, promises to position the institution for a more viable financial future.

It appears that CIIS is ahead of most institutions and its competitors with regard to delivery modes, moving to online and hybrid across many programs. Balancing delivery modes and their assessment, and creating flexibility of options across platforms is a significant step that bodes well for the CIIS's future. Although the relationship between online and hybrid offerings with current facility master plan and leases is unclear; it is possible that further planning in this area could mitigate CIIS's position in an area known for high and escalating real estate prices [CFR 4.7]. Other recently developed or proposed programs seem to be poised for success given the lack of immediate job prospects or as career enhancements. Considering programs that have more market salience is critical for institutions as small as CIIS. It may behoove the leadership team to consider additional support to assist with the substantive change process currently required by WASC.

H. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Commitment to Quality and Improvement

CIIS has taken introductory steps in building a sustainable assessment process, starting with an infrastructure for assessment data and CARC's initiative in revitalizing and improving Program Review. The collaboration and delineation of responsibilities between OIE and CARC in moving forward will be instrumental to building a sustainable culture of learning and improvement that brings faculty to the center of learning and assessment at the institution. The implementation of a regular process of assessing student learning on an annual basis that provides an opportunity to make corrective actions prior to engaging in Program Review is needed. This will require a cultural shift from sporadic compliance to shared governance. Faculty will need to be instrumental in that shift. Further, Faculty will need access to institutional data,

collect direct evidence of student learning, and collaboratively make meaning of data in order for educational quality and effectiveness to be a hallmark at CIIS. In addition, the onboarding and training of ACTCM faculty and demonstrated commitment toward a culture of inquiry that extends from evaluation to assessment will require the careful attention of faculty and administration.

Our collective experience in meeting with institutional academic and institutional leaders, faculty, students, trustees, and alumni was that the institution has learned across several dimensions since the last site visit. It was also clear, however, that evidence to support action from what they have learned is uneven and in some cases, scant.

In the 2008 team report and the subsequent 2012 interim report, the process had identified four key areas for continuous improvement: educational effectiveness, diversity, financial growth and stability, and faculty/staff issues. During the site visit in 2016, it was clear that the hiring of a Director of Institutional Effectiveness had substantially improved the process of data assessment. Program leaders, for example, cited that the student learning outcomes and program level learning outcomes were in good working order. Rubrics had been developed. What was less clear to the site team, however, was whether assessment of these outcomes was conducted on a regular basis and with a goal to make improvements at the curricular level. It was noted that data sheets were shared among program leaders at the chair meetings, and that conversations were conducted there. What was hard to discern were specific examples of how these conversations resulted in direct action that led to improvements, or to a changed strategy.

During our site visit, we learned that an office of diversity and inclusion had been established and a new leader selected for this work. In none of our conversations, however, did

diversity or inclusion emerge as either a goal or strategy. This lack of integrating intent to diversify with concrete strategies for growth, financial stability, educational effectiveness, and faculty and staff, seemed like an disconnect given the criticality of attracting new student populations for the future that are likely to be diverse, and in need of education that enables them to navigate across difference in an increasingly complex world.

The site visit revealed a number of issues with regard to financial growth and stability. In the 2012 report, it was noted that CIIS had made substantial progress in this area and had evidence to support this. In the fall of 2016, however, CIIS missed their enrolled target on a per unit basis although they did achieve their headcount goal. Just prior to our visit, the site team learned that this shortfall resulted in a \$1.1 million deficit. Combined with a couple of other “misses” in the budget, such as a miscalculation of internal scholarship funds and depreciation, CIIS experienced a \$2.2 million shortfall for the FY2017 budget. The shortfall is intended to be addressed through suspension of employer contributions for the 401(K) plan from January-June 2016 (the plan remains in place for employees’ personal pre-tax contributions); the elimination of one insurance provider (Aetna), and other measures in various quarters, such as cancelling low enrollment adjunct courses, and not filling empty staff positions. Alternative individual arrangements were made for employees who had been on the Aetna plan. At the time of writing this report (November 2016), CIIS leaders expressed that they expected to be able to cover the remaining \$400,000 gap by the end of their fiscal year to come back to a balanced budget. It was not entirely clear how they were going to do that as of yet, but they had an Institutional Planning and Budget Committee (IPBC) task force undertaking this work. The IPBC is a multi-stakeholder committee, consisting of director-level and senior staff and faculty leaders. What this situation has shown is that CIIS remains extremely vulnerable to the vicissitudes in

enrollment. This vulnerability underlies much of their difficulty in crafting and implementing a long term institutional strategy.

The panel noted that faculty/staff issues were not well addressed in the interim report. The report encouraged CIIS to try and meet the goal of faculty and staff salaries at the 60th percentile. Given the current financial situation, this goal has not yet been met nor is it likely to be so in the upcoming fiscal year. A long-term financial plan with benchmarks that could track incremental progress could give faculty and staff a sense of progress and certainty, even if it were slow.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Findings

Our conclusion is that CIIS has made limited and uneven progress with the issues raised in their 2012 Interim Report. Their financial picture makes it difficult to build capacity and sustain long-term initiatives that would strengthen their institution.

For CIIS to thrive, we think the Institute needs to make progress in three areas, which are noted below in the recommendations. To do this, they need to play to one of their key strengths, which is their common sense of mission and values. It is clear that they want to and are pulling together well to support the students and the goals of the institution.

Commendations

- **Diversity:** CIIS has made progress on creating space for diversity and inclusion. The evidence includes the hiring of a Dean of Diversity and Inclusion as a direct report to the Interim President; public signage involving diversity and inclusion issues, a public program dedicated to highlighting diversity and inclusion; and dialogue with staff that noted this area as an area of importance.

- **Staff:** CIIS made a good first step to create a Staff Council as suggested in the previous WASC report. The Team commends the staff for referencing the commitments specifically in conversation with us as a site team. This is evidence that the staff is living the CIIS mission and vision.
- **Faculty:** The faculty is to be commended on their openness to new delivery formats and online learning modalities (blended) while staying aligned with their learning values around an integral education with a commitment to whole person learning.
- **APA site visit:** Being granted a site visit is worthy of commendation, as it is an indicator of academic quality.
- **Undergraduate Bachelor's program:** For their assessment efforts, including their excellent work on their core competencies. Many aspects of their assessment efforts are examples of best practices.

Recommendations

These recommendations fall into three categories that we think when addressed will have multiple benefits across CIIS and position them to be a sustainable organization.

- **Financial stability.** This recommendation informs all the others.
 - **CEO leadership and Trustee role.** It is critical that CIIS hire a President as soon as possible. The Interim President will be hampered to make progress on these recommendations without executive leadership. It is incumbent upon the trustees to provide strategic oversight of this situation without involving themselves in daily management. Key to short term sustainability is to stabilize donor and alumni relations, which is an area where the trustees should and should be involved.

- **Enrollment planning.** Secondly, they need to focus on enrollment planning so that they can forecast more accurately for FY18 and FY19. This planning can provide more certainty for faculty and staff while also establishing parameters for achieving small goals.
- **Strategic institutional planning.** Within this category, we want to emphasize the following areas where progress needs to be made:
 - **Coordination.** It is critical that there is more coherent integration between strategic and financial planning. As noted several times in the report, a lack of integration has resulted in several unanticipated financial crises.
 - **Diversity.** Climate of inclusion is critical for the future health of the institution and needs to be explicit throughout. We want to encourage CIIS to continue to expand these efforts as it is a strategic issue to be a truly inclusive and diversity community.
 - **ACTCM merger.** CIIS needs to make progress on the integration of the merger with respect to technology and faculty culture. Regarding technology, faculty training is needed for CANVAS and other tools that are more routinely used within CIIS than ACTCM. Adjunct faculty, in particular, need more attention paid to their specific and different needs than the core faculty.
 - **Assessment.** The institution needs to move from data amassment to the use of data at the program and curricular levels and at key decision points. That requires faculty ownership and collective responsibility. Among these items, a consistent workload rubric for all faculty needs to be established and disseminated. We would also like to see the other programs consult with the undergraduate bachelor's program regarding best practices in

assessment, perhaps enlist the expertise of an outside consultant, and/or send a team of faculty to assessment trainings (e.g., the WSCUC Assessment 101 and 201). These actions would result in a strong resident group of faculty assessment experts on campus. CIIS can make progress in each of these categories, and we recommended that they utilize their strengths and capacities to focus attention in these areas. In closing, the team would like to compliment administrators, faculty, and staff for their dedication to the mission and vision of CIIS. We think that attention to the issues noted above will position the institution for a strong and secure future.

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Checklists

1. Credit Hour Review
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
3. Student Complaint Review
4. Transfer Policy Review