

# REPORT OF THE WASC PATHWAY B VISIT TEAM

To the NewSchool of Architecture and Design

March 14 to 16, 2012

## Team Roster

Stephen Beal, Chair  
President, California College of the Arts

Kelly Wahl, Assistant Chair  
Principal Institutional Research Analyst, UCLA

Jennifer Asselstine  
Acting Co-Director, School of Architecture, Academy of Art University

Laurel McCabe  
Professor, Psychology, Sonoma State University

Christopher Oberg  
Adjunct Professor, Higher Education  
Claremont Graduate University

Barbara Gross Davis  
Vice President, WASC

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

### **SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

A. Description of the Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution's Self-Study Report: Quality of the Report and Evidence	6
C. Description of the Team's Review Process	9

### **SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS**

<b>Standard 1: Institutional Purposes and Objectives</b>	10
<b>Standard 2: Achieving Educational Outcomes</b>	13
<b>Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources</b>	22
<b>Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning</b>	26

### **SECTION III. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **APPENDICES**

Distance Education	
Compliance Audit Checklist	
Credit Hour Policies and Procedures	

## **SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **A. Description of the Institution and Visit**

The NewSchool of Architecture and Design (NSAD) was founded as the NewSchool of Architecture in 1980 to serve students in the San Diego region, as no local institutions offered a four-year undergraduate degree program in architecture at that time. The school moved to its current urban San Diego campus from its original site in Chula Vista in 1988.

A series of for-profit enterprises acquired the institution in succession since the late 1980's, beginning with the Bislin Education Corporation, a subsidiary of Futures in Education, Inc. In 2001, ForeFront Education, Inc., acquired the NewSchool of Architecture and changed its name to the NewSchool of Architecture and Design (NSAD), "to reflect an expanding interest in the larger context of architecture and related fields of study." (p. 1, NSAD WASC Self-Study Report) Ultimately, Laureate Education, Inc., acquired the institution in 2008 and remains its parent company today, with NSAD maintained as a separate legal entity. The Laureate International Universities network, of which NSAD is a member, consists of 58 higher education institutions worldwide and includes two "Art, Architecture, and Design" institutions in the United States (including NSAD), two in Italy, and one such institution each in India, New Zealand, and Spain.

The Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS) granted initial accreditation to NSAD in 1994, and the National Architecture Accrediting Board (NAAB)

has accredited the Master of Architecture and Bachelor of Architecture programs since 1998. NSAD's current architecture degree program offerings consist of two undergraduate degrees established in 1980 (Bachelor of Architecture and Bachelor of Arts in Architecture), three graduate degrees established in 1991 (Master of Architecture I, Master of Architecture II, and Master of Science in Architecture), and an Executive Master of Architecture established in 1999. The following degrees are offered in allied disciplines: a Bachelor of Science in Digital Media Arts (established in 2009), Bachelor of Science and Master of Construction Management degrees (established in 2010 and 2011, respectively), and a Master of Landscape Architecture degree (established in 2010).

Fall 2011 saw the enrollment of 613 students at NSAD, with approximately two-thirds of the population studying at the undergraduate level (400 students). The two largest degree programs during that term were the Bachelor of Architecture with 374 students and the Master of Architecture (4+3 program) with 139 students. The commuter campus served a student body whose average age was 25 and consisted of 65% male students and 35% female students. The institution educated racially and ethnically diverse students, who were 3% non-resident alien, 2% black/African American, <1% Native American, 10% Asian American, 20% Hispanic, 34% white/non-Hispanic, 2% two or more races, and 28% of unknown ethnic/racial identification. While online instruction had been introduced for selected courses that fulfilled General Education (GE) requirements, only four undergraduate course sections had been deployed fully online through Winter 2012, and these online sections enrolled students who were concurrently enrolled in unrelated on-the-ground

sections at NSAD. The Master of Construction Management is offered solely online. The WASC Distance Education report is attached in the Appendices.

The institution's application for Eligibility was approved in a letter from the WASC Eligibility Review Committee dated January 14, 2011, which cited the panel's finding that NSAD met 22 of the 23 Eligibility Criteria, with activity underway that was subsequently completed to meet the 23<sup>rd</sup> Criterion (i.e., expansion of the Board of Directors membership, as explained below). Suggestions and recommendations were offered by the panel in support of the institution's application, including:

- that the composition of the Board of Directors include a majority of members not employed by the institution; that the selection of its Chair be from among the public members rather than from employees of the parent company who serve as Board members; and that the Board evaluate the performance of the President and set the position's terms of employment;
- that highly qualified academic and administrative leadership in key roles be recruited and retained, including expansion of student services staff in light of planned future enrollment growth; that transfer credits continue to be duly qualified by staff with training and experience in such matters; and that the faculty's critical role in the admissions process be retained;
- that a distinction be made between program objectives and student learning outcomes, and that defined student learning outcomes for the General Education program with

- assessments specific to these outcomes embody a quality assurance process that is “owned” by a core of faculty devoted to this curriculum;
- that part-time faculty be involved, afforded opportunities for professional development, and receive training in direct assessments of student learning;
  - that library staff be engaged with faculty: 1) in the design of learning activities to develop student information literacy skills and 2) in the determination of whether the institution’s resources support intended learning, particularly at the graduate level;
  - that program review be more explicitly included as a key input in the planning process, and that efforts continue toward systematic student learning assessment 1) supporting program review and 2) being used to improve student learning.

NSAD was invited to pursue the Pathway B accreditation process, which is designed for institutions that currently hold accreditation with an institutional accreditor recognized by the U.S. Department of Education. Subsequent to the institution’s comprehensive review self-study, the team conducted this visit with the purpose of considering data and evidence to support the claims made by NSAD regarding its performance in light of the WASC Standards and to formulate an assessment of the institution’s readiness for initial accreditation.

#### B. The Institution’s Self-Study Report: Quality of the Report and Evidence

The team notes alignment of the institution’s self-study report for this Pathway B Initial Accreditation visit with the specifications for such a report that have been outlined by the

Commission, including the necessary exhibits and materials for the Compliance Audit. The institution's faculty, administration, students, and external institutional constituents participated in the preparation of the self-study report, with key faculty serving as not only stakeholders but also leaders in the formation and articulation of learning outcomes and program objectives. NSAD's report demonstrated continuity of the institution's engagement with key issues among the Criteria cited in the Eligibility Review Committee's Pathway B approval letter of January 14, 2011, as follows:

- The Board of Directors grew by three members who have no employment relationship with the institution's parent company. The Board acknowledged the panel's recommendation for an external member to assume the role of Chair; however, the Board chose to remain with its current leadership of a Laureate Global Products and Services employee "to integrate the new Board members, but it will give appropriate consideration to the panel's recommendation as the Board develops and the bond between the school and the communities it serves grows." (p. 5, NSAD WASC Self-Study Report). The Board adopted policy to define the President's terms of employment, and the Board established a process for evaluating the President's performance.
- Learning outcomes were developed at the institutional, program, and course levels, which "reinvigorated faculty and advanced the understanding of outcome-based assessment theories and techniques." (p. 7, NSAD WASC Self-Study Report) The institution began to articulate disaggregated student learning outcomes that can be assessed using existing student work products that otherwise form the basis for the

evaluation of student performance in courses. The team's meetings with faculty and staff during the visit confirmed that this most granular statement of outcomes was in its initial stage of development across the institution.

- Personnel in the new Admissions Department were reorganized to ensure the appropriate evaluation of transfer credit; faculty developed and approved policies and procedures in the review and approval of applicants (although a direct assessment of student applications by faculty was not depicted in the self-study report); and the new Student Success Center, which was initiated in 2012 just prior to the WASC visit, and additional student support positions expanded the institution's capacity for addressing the needs of a growing student population.
- A new General Education core curriculum was approved, with an initial Annual Program Assessment of General Education making the first steps toward systematic student learning outcomes assessment specific to this area of the curriculum.
- Part-time faculty were integrated into the assessment activities required for program review. They reported that, when available, they attended faculty meetings and participated as committee members. They reported being assessed in light of Faculty Development Plans that outlined their professional goals, and the institution acknowledged the need to buttress this assessment process.
- Information literacy workshops via tutorial were available from the library staff in response to faculty requests, and the Library Director solicited feedback from faculty and Chairs regarding the collection's adequacy for the programs' needs.
- The timing of both the Annual Program Assessment and the five-year comprehensive program review was, by design, the institution's assurance that program review data

could inform the institution's planning process. By way of example, a recent curricular enhancement in the Architecture program was cited as being undertaken subsequent to the annual component of program review, which underscored the need for change. Faculty were developing learning outcomes and articulating them in a TaskStream system used in the institution's program assessment process.

NSAD presented materials as evidence of its capacity and educational effectiveness in fulfilling all four Standards and every Criteria for Review, and such an exercise of self-examination is designed to demonstrate a commitment to continuous improvement through an analysis of data describing both institutional and student performance. Fulfilling such an ambition presents a challenge to any institution, regardless of size or depth of history. NSAD collected and presented its evidence thoroughly, and the team valued the institution's candor and spirit of self-disclosure. During the visit's interviews and meetings – and throughout its review of documents, reports, and data presentations – the team looked for analytical underpinnings of an institution with a culture of evidence based in the assessment of performance.

### C. Description of the Team's Review Process

Prior to the visit, the team reviewed the institution's self-study report and discussed the document as well as strategies for the visit during a pre-visit conference call. Upon the team's request for additional materials prior to the visit, NSAD supplied an array of documents in advance of the team's arrival. The team completed its Compliance Audit, and

all elements provided by NSAD were found to be present and were assessed as having fulfilled the requisite specifications (see the Appendices).

## **SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS**

### **Standard 1: Institutional Purposes and Objectives**

#### **Institutional Purposes**

NSAD articulated a clear and thorough mission statement that both expressed its purpose and informed its educational activities and participation in the community. (CFR 1.1) The team verified that NSAD’s educational objectives were created through a participatory process, were “embedded across curricula,” and “emerge[d] directly from NSAD’s mission and values.” (p. 16, NSAD WASC Self-Study Report) Faculty, with the Advisory Boards, created student outcomes mapped to the institutional, program, and course levels of the academic structure, and these outcomes were published and presented to the public in a variety of venues and documents. (CFR 1.2) The Annual Program Assessment process was beginning to incorporate data from student learning, and student completion rates and placement rates were reported systematically and publicly on the Student Performance Fact Sheets for compliance reporting and for students navigating the admissions and enrollment process. Such reports were disaggregated to the degree program level. (CFR 1.2)

As noted above, NSAD was responsive to the WASC Eligibility Review Committee's guidance regarding the expansion of the institution's Board of Directors to include independent members. While the appointment of a Chair from among the parent company's employees may suggest a greater influence of Laureate Global Products and Services over the Board's activities, the institution remained open to a reconsideration of this arrangement as the current Board members mature in their governance role. (CFR 1.3) In the testimonials of faculty and staff, the team found evidence on campus that the academic operations of the institution were undertaken with appropriate autonomy, with NSAD's curricula, faculty hires, and academic programs determined locally and without undue influence or interference from its parent company. (CFR 1.6) The roles and responsibilities of senior academic management were reviewed and reconsidered as recently as the fall of 2011 to create the Provost position, filled at the time of the visit in an acting capacity, which included and expanded upon responsibilities of what was formerly a dean position. The relationship of the Board to the President, in terms of the President's performance review and position description, was articulated in the Board's policy to include the oversight recommended by the WASC Eligibility Review Committee. The Performance Review System that evaluated staff throughout the institution ensured that appropriate responsibility and accountability were implemented in the operation of the institution's administration. (CFR 1.3)

## Integrity

NSAD tracked the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students with reports authored and monitored by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment as well as the Human

Resources area. Using the IPEDS comparison group tool, NSAD identified a cohort of similar institutions and benchmarked its student diversity against these institutions. A Diversity Policy was in the process of being adopted at NSAD, and an institutional learning outcome expressly stated the priority of learning about diverse cultures and environments. This institutional outcome prompted the addition of a specific General Education course that studied class, gender, and race. Further, the administration adhered to appropriate training and implementation of policy and procedures to promote a harassment-free environment for members of diverse cultures. (CFR 1.5)

Academic goals, programs, services, and refund policies were published in detail for both students and the community on the institution's website as well as in the Academic Catalog. Degree completion information was published on the School Performance Fact Sheets, which were presented to students and discussed during the enrollment process as well as published in a similar format on the NSAD website. Policies and procedures regarding student conduct and student grievances were published in the Student Handbook and Academic Catalog, and historical records regarding such issues were maintained properly. Student credit hour designations, grading and student evaluation policy, and procedures for appeal were published and observed. (CFR 1.7) The team found ample evidence to suggest the institution demonstrated integrity in its business practices, policies, operations, response to complaints and grievances, and self-reflection and analyses regarding these issues -- from the regular audit of the institution's financials to the publication and implementation of the faculty and staff grievance policies and procedures. (CFR 1.8) Academic freedom policy, as well as due

process procedures, were published in the Faculty Handbook and were embraced by the institution's administration. (CFR 1.4)

NSAD engaged in the accreditation review process firmly committed to honesty and openness, responsive to the Commission's requirements of prompt communication when material issues arose, and respectful of the relevant WASC policies and procedures that embodied a best practice of seeking initial accreditation. (CFR 1.9) The team appreciated NSAD's follow-through with the Commission during its time of academic leadership transition and position restructuring in the fall of 2011.

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Outcomes**

The academic programs offered at NSAD were well developed. They represented appropriate academic standards and were offered at suitable degree levels, with clearly stated program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes, which were communicated for each program and published in department materials, syllabi, the Academic Catalog, and the NSAD website. In all instances when such alignment was possible, the program learning outcomes were consistent with the learning criteria required by the relevant accrediting board (i.e., National Architectural Accrediting Board, Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board, and American Council for Construction Education).

The team judged the assessment process at NSAD as not yet fully mature. The Annual Program Assessment system spoke to the ground that has been gained as well as to the

necessary effort ahead; however, the team discovered in its interviews that the identification of which student learning outcomes stemmed from the program learning outcomes was happening intuitively but not yet formally. The tools, the mechanisms and procedures, and the commitment all existed to make the process of assessment more broadly institutionalized, and the team recommends continued progress. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3)

Faculty engagement in the Annual Program Assessment was high, based on discussions with students, faculty, Department Chairs, and the NewSchool Curriculum and Academic Policy Council (NCAP). Recent minutes from the Undergraduate Level Coordinator meetings described continuing review of student learning outcomes, establishment of appropriate course learning outcomes, and on-going development and review of curricular maps. Course rubric development – to track and to assess specific student learning outcomes – was beginning to take place. Rubrics for oral, visual, and written communication skills were cited by faculty and the administration, while assessment tools for other course learning outcomes varied in their level of development. (CFR 2.4)

As described by the faculty and documented in supporting materials provided to the team, evaluations and reviews of student work provided high levels of individualized attention to students throughout their academic careers. Feedback was delivered within the courses and also as the students approached the last year of their undergraduate work in Architecture, when they received specific reminders of academic goals as well as faculty response to overall portfolio skills and capstone project work. External reviewers were invited to participate in the critical response to student work. NSAD had active and committed

Advisory Boards that drew from the professional community and contributed generously to this evaluation process. (CFR 2.5)

NAAB Accreditation of the Architecture Department (renewed in March 2011 for a six-year term) provided strong evidence of the achievement of program learning outcomes as stated. Construction Management and Landscape Architecture followed this example by aligning their program learning outcomes with their disciplines' external accreditation standards. Departments that did not have specific professional accreditation standards (i.e., Digital Media Arts) or programs that serve the institution more broadly (i.e., General Education) developed and documented their program learning outcomes appropriately. (CFR 2.6)

NSAD faculty and staff were offered the opportunity to take courses and to pursue degrees within the Laureate network of schools at a substantially discounted tuition rate. This benefit was particularly lauded by NSAD staff who could further their education during their employment. The institution had a published Faculty Development Grant Policy that addressed opportunities for both full-time faculty, as well as more limited avenues for adjuncts, to embark on special projects. Some faculty attested to taking advantage of this opportunity or an offer to "trade" teaching hours with research hours for a quarter. The budget and the scope of NSAD's commitment to this initiative was less than fully apparent to the team, and faculty expressed some disappointment with its implementation, which required the instructor to produce the research prior to remuneration. The team suggests further development of the above-mentioned policy, and the team recommends that NSAD

seek ways to advance the faculty's expertise in assessment of student learning and to promote the value of such expertise in the promotion and tenure processes. (CFRs 2.8 and 2.9)

NSAD had several new and established co-curricular programs that supported student work, benefited student learning, and promoted student success. Students spoke favorably to the team regarding the Career Services program that reached out to local industry to place students after graduation. Similar praise was given to the new Student Success Center and Information Literacy Program, both put in place prior to the visit to support student learning and achievement in areas identified as needing attention. Career Services provided a rubric to the team for student portfolio and resume documentation as evidence of its methods for encouraging the refinement of job search skills. Co-curricular programs had not yet been reviewed and formally evaluated at NSAD, although reviews of the library, student services area, Career Services, new student orientation, disability services, and student leadership were scheduled to begin in 2012. The team suggests that once these co-curricular programs are evaluated, analysis from these program reviews be integrated into the budgeting and institutional planning process. (CFRs 2.11 and 2.13)

The Academic Catalog described the admissions process that the Admission Committee conducted in collaboration with Department Chairs. In response to recent student satisfaction surveys, NSAD -- with the support of Laureate -- revised the policies and procedures for admissions review, portfolio review, and transfer of credit. This was supported by the implementation of the new student record keeping information system

(ONYX). Documentation of this initiative stated that work was on-going to better define procedures for portfolio review and studio placement for transfer students. (CFR 2.14)

## Program Review

Program review consisted of two components: the Annual Program Assessment process and a five-year intensive examination of a particular department, curriculum, or degree program.

The Annual Program Assessment process was designed to promote a foundation for the cycle of assessment, analysis and interpretation, and subsequent implementation of learning improvement. This yearly review format included statements of the program's mission and rationale, a program description, student information including enrollment trends (including reporting by age of students), retention and disaggregated on-time completion rate trends (by gender and race/ethnicity), program learning outcomes mapped to institutional learning outcomes, curricular maps, and a multi-year assessment plan. A yearly assessment of program learning outcomes was described as well as assessment findings and subsequent recommendations. While other data regarding student success and satisfaction were not specifically incorporated into the Annual Program Assessment, such evidence was examined by the team, including student satisfaction and success surveys, surveys of employers, pass rates on state licensing exams, and employment data. (CFR 2.10) None of this evidence gave the team cause for concern.

At the time of the visit, the program review process at NSAD was limited to one cycle of the Annual Program Assessment, which the team notes had an impact on curriculum by more effectively aligning it in some instances with the programs' learning outcomes. This annual process in future cycles was slated to consider the articulation of five-year assessment plans with two to five specific program learning outcomes identified as areas of targeted improvement. In the assessments the team reviewed, the measurement of student performance was typically via final grades in classes for which the program learning outcome was a significant component of the course learning outcomes -- for example, research skills were demonstrated in the production of the research document from the initial studio/research course for the thesis in Architecture, and consequently a letter grade in that course served (in the NSAD assessment system) as evidence of students attaining the research program learning outcome. The team recommends that assessments be improved by pulling out specific learning outcomes from larger constructs and measuring them with focused rubrics to gauge improvement of all parts of the skill set. To extend the example above, the team suggests the articulation of more than one student learning outcome that would together compose the program learning outcome of "research skills." Consequently, the program can measure each student learning outcome with a separate rubric applied to student work products captured throughout each student's studies. The initial effort of learning outcomes assessment in Construction Management and General Education, for example, drew on rubric-driven assessments of particular papers that were assigned in courses, and as a consequence demonstrated movement towards this artifact-driven, as opposed to course-grade driven, approach. (CFR 2.7)

The Academic Program Assessment at NSAD suggested that the institution had the capacity to self-evaluate and to implement improvement in learning. The process of self-assessment led to the initiation of the Information Literacy Program to support student driven research and to improve analytical and critical thinking skills. The team recommends that the assessment process be strengthened by linking its findings to the budget process and to institutional planning. As departmental assessment matures and program learning outcomes are assessed by way of specific, disaggregated student learning outcomes, the process could become integral to creating department priorities and to fueling the process of learning improvement. (CFR 4.3)

A formal five-year program review process was also designed at NSAD; however, its initial implementation was planned several years into the future, and as a consequence it would have the potential to provide only a limited depiction of quality improvement cycles until more than a decade after the team's visit. External reviewers were to be invited to participate in this program review component, and the five-year format was proposed to include elements similar to the Annual Program Assessment (e.g., program description, program rationale, student information, retention/graduation data), descriptions of faculty qualifications and the preparedness of the students, and a five-year accumulation of annual learning outcome assessments. Recommendations, action plans, resource requests, and follow-up would complete the process.

## General Education

The new General Education core at NSAD was recently approved, and included courses at both the lower and upper division levels as well as a sufficient number of units studied in the core for graduation requirements to be met. NSAD had effectively linked institutional learning outcomes to the program outcomes of GE in ways that provided coherence to the undergraduate curriculum. Conducted in the fall of 2011, the institution's initial Annual Program Assessment included both direct and indirect methods of assessment of the two General Education learning outcomes chosen for review. As mentioned elsewhere, there had been four General Education course sections offered online at the time of the visit, in which on-the-ground students were enrolled. NSAD had no complete analyses considering the relative effectiveness of online courses to on-the-ground courses.

Students interviewed by the team noted that General Education courses were no longer offered during time blocks that enabled their schedules to accommodate employment commitments. Administrators informed the team that the recent change was to enable the major program departments to schedule their courses concurrently, without overlap with General Education courses that all students were required to complete for graduation. NSAD may want to explore the impact of this change on students and the institution.

The team reviewed the learning outcomes of General Education. All seven of the program learning outcomes covered the most important knowledge, skills, and values of the General Education program, and some rubrics were developed, in particular one for the assessment of

student writing. A complete set of rubrics and consistent linkage of outcomes to student work had yet to be realized across all parts of the General Education program. The team considered the General Education curriculum to be aligned with the outcomes, given the detailed curricular map that indicated the levels of outcome coverage per General Education course (i.e., “introduced,” “developed,” and “highly developed”). Assessment planning had begun in the Annual Program Assessment. This review process had yet to cover all outcomes in its assessment efforts, and mechanisms for effecting a responsive change in the curriculum had yet to be enacted formally. The use of assessment results, once multiple cycles of the Annual Program Assessment have occurred, would move this aspect of the General Education program into a more evolved status.

Syllabus requirements in General Education included faculty publication of learning outcomes for students’ reference. In addition, GE faculty were able to participate in a faculty development program articulated at the NSAD Assessment Summit 2012, which broadened discussion of each outcome assessment and related improvements in the General Education program. The team found the GE faculty to be committed to teaching, dedicated to the values of GE, and active in shaping the curriculum. (CFR 2.2a)

#### Recruiting and Admissions Practices

The materials presented to prospective students during the recruiting and admissions processes were accurate in their depiction of the institution. Some compliance statistics that NSAD was compelled to provide to entering students adhered to unconventional definitions

of concepts that may be best articulated in different ways; however, that was no fault of the institution (see the discussion of Graduation and Retention Rates below). The academic program requirements were stated clearly in NSAD's publications, and advising maintained currency and provided ready support for students in need. Process and policy statements were accurate, current, complete, and available to students. (CFR 2.12)

### **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources**

#### Faculty and Staff

During the period 2008 through 2011, the institution grew both its faculty and administrative staff, increasing them by 110% and 82% respectively, while the student/faculty ratio decreased from 17:1 to 10:1. The growth in human capital reflected the upward curve of institutional resources provided by Laureate. (CFRs 3.1 and 3.2)

Faculty were retained on the basis of appropriate credentials, and full-time faculty evidenced the necessary commitment for institutional success. For an institution focusing on professional degrees, an appropriate percentage of courses was currently taught by adjunct faculty, whose credentials and commitment were similar to those of the full-time faculty. (CFR 3.2) As of fall 2011, NSAD had 23 full-time faculty and 117 part-time faculty. An orientation program for all new faculty was required. The institution used appropriate recruitment processes to ensure a broad candidate pool for all of its positions. Evaluations of full-time employees were done regularly and in a systematic fashion; the institution

acknowledged the need for an enhancement of its process of evaluating part-time faculty.

(CFR 3.3) Staff and faculty development were managed in different but complementary and thorough fashions. (CFR 3.4)

#### Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

The President and the Director of Administrative and Financial Operations managed the institution's financial affairs, supported by Laureate system resources. The team learned during the visit that institutional constituencies, however, did not have a firm understanding of the budget process or its outcomes. The team recommends that the administration engage the institution's stakeholders more broadly in the preparation of the budget and other fundamental planning processes. The institution's revenues had risen annually over the prior four years, with a single deficit year in 2011 due to the decline in the built environment industry. Laureate made significant commitments to the fiscal welfare of the institution, including over \$8 million in capital expenditures since its acquisition of the institution, as well as comprehensive system and staff support enhancements. The institution annually spent over 50% of its operational expenses in support of facilities, marketing, and general administrative activities. While the backing of Laureate boded well for future financial stability, it remained prudent for NSAD to examine the balance among functional expenditures, as compared to traditional academic institutions. (CFR 3.5)

The team notes the significant and comprehensive upgrades to information technology resources, both academic and administrative, that occurred in recent years. These

enhancements substantially expanded institutional capacity to deliver program content in anticipation of increased educational effectiveness. The institution maintained a physical library dedicated to the professional content of its programs, and supplied the materials required by faculty and students. The support of Laureate administrative systems gave the institution access to a wide array of sophisticated software and technological systems in support of increased management efficiency. (CFRs 3.6 and 3.7)

### Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

The institution recently reorganized to add the Office of the Provost, which integrated the administration of academic affairs. The NewSchool Academic and Policy Council (NCAP Council) was the principal faculty governing body for the oversight of academic matters.

The institution continued to refine its structure to reflect both its accomplished and anticipated growth, and the team notes the substantial progress achieved through the constitution of the NCAP Council. The Council's diligent focus on academic matters was a substantial initial step towards a well-functioning academic governance structure. (CFRs 3.8 and 3.11)

The Board was composed of a majority of independent directors; the Board members represented diverse backgrounds and talents. The Chair, however, continued to be an employee of the parent organization, and the majority of independent directors was a recent change in the Board's composition. With the deep integration of systems between the institution and Laureate, maintaining independent perspectives for academic development

will be essential as programs evolve. The team encourages the institution to work directly with WASC staff to align Board operations with WASC expectations as described in “Guidelines for Independent Governing Boards” (e.g., the need for the audit committee to function in an independent capacity from the financial affairs committee). (CFR 3.9)

The President and Chief Financial Officer were both full-time employees. Approximately 50% of the other full-time administrative positions were joint appointments with the parent organization, representative of a matrix organization. The team affirmed the primacy of the institution’s management to make personnel decisions within this matrix organization, and that the matrix structure provided for increased professional capacity. (CFR 3.10) The primary role of the NCAP Council provided a direct faculty link to the decision-making processes that regulated academic quality. As noted previously, the absence of faculty participation in budget development and approval should be addressed as part of the on-going development of institutional processes. (CFR 3.11) With decision-making structures emerging at the Board of Directors, administration, and faculty governance levels, the team recommends that the institution continue its consideration of the relationships among these entities.

With the support of the parent organization, the institution was able to weather the recent recession well. Its accomplishments of increasing capacity and charting the road to enhanced effectiveness, during a time of severe economic dislocation, were to be celebrated.

#### **Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning**

Since Laureate acquired NSAD in July 2008, NSAD's administrative areas developed procedures for accessing Laureate's resources and support in key areas, and NSAD's administrative, governance, and planning structures stabilized after a period of transition. Laureate's ownership and infusion of resources had positively affected NSAD's capacity to make capital improvements, to fund new programs, to collect and analyze data, and to begin to use assessment data to improve the institution. The team recommends that NSAD's next step be to ensure this capacity has taken root and to use this capacity to improve institutional planning, decision-making, and educational effectiveness in on-going cycles of improvement. (CFRs 4.2 and 4.4)

Strategic and budgetary planning was determined jointly by NSAD and Laureate personnel, as Laureate consulted on and reviewed NSAD's updated strategic plans and budgets prior to NSAD Board approval. NSAD budgeting was centralized with the President, and limited information was provided to the team on institutional criteria for setting fiscal priorities or making budgetary decisions. Similarly, little information was provided to the team on Laureate's budgetary decision-making. The areas of planning and budgeting were critical, as NSAD's strategic plan set targets for extensive expansion in the next few years. The team suggests that NSAD clarify the roles of NSAD staff and faculty, as well as Laureate personnel, in strategic and budgetary planning. (CFRs 3.5 and 4.1)

## Laureate's Proprietary Role

As a Laureate institution, NSAD engaged in institutional planning that was informed by its own specific needs as well as by Laureate's educational-financial model and long-term goals. Laureate provided educational, financial, technological, market research, human resources, facilities, and regulatory/compliance resources to NSAD, as its parent company. Ten NSAD Directors (Academic Advising, Admissions, Enrollment, Field Enrollment, Financial Aid, Human Resources, Registrar, Marketing, Public Relations, and Technology Services) reported to Laureate as well as to the NSAD administration. Laureate conducted planning retreats with its school Presidents to review and to discuss strategic planning issues in educational, financial, marketing, and regulatory areas. NSAD submitted annual budgets and strategic plan updates to Laureate for review, then submitted Laureate-reviewed budgets to the Board for approval. Three of eight Board members, including the Chair, were Laureate employees, with one Board position vacant. These multiple and concurrent relationships among NSAD, its Board, and its parent company created a complex structure. The synergy and support provided by this complex structure both warranted praise and continued review. (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 3.9, and 4.4)

## Strategic Thinking and Planning

The two-year strategic planning process culminating in the June 2010 Strategic Plan engaged administrative leadership, faculty committees, a community advisory subcommittee, the new Laureate-Chaired Board, and Laureate personnel. (CFR 4.1) The final 2010 Strategic Plan

differed notably from the initial faculty-authored draft, and was considerably shaped by Laureate's review and long-term strategic plans for NSAD. The last strategic planning update occurred in July 2011, with annual update cycles in place. (CFR 4.1) Strategic planning updates enlisted NSAD faculty and administration, with Laureate's careful review and revision in light of its own updated strategic, operational, and budgetary analyses.

Evidence of NSAD's use of internal NSAD data to inform the strategic plan was somewhat limited, as it consisted of committee work in defining NSAD's mission and values, a preliminary 2008 faculty committee draft that was superseded by later versions, and a SWOT analysis. (CFR 4.3) After the Laureate acquisition in 2008, NSAD's use of data expanded to include Laureate's educational market analyses and Laureate's design trend analysis. In 2009 and 2010, NSAD's planning process was informed by its NAAB self-study process and by program reviews focused on NAAB re-accreditation. In 2010 and 2011, NSAD focused on aligning institutional, program, and course learning outcomes, and began surveying student, faculty, alumni, and employer groups to gather information on institutional effectiveness. (CFR 4.3)

Fiscal planning and decision-making were centralized with the President, and evidence for how fiscal policy and decision-making align with academic, personnel, physical, and technological resources was limited. (CFR 4.2) Program fiscal and curricular needs were submitted individually to the President for review and approval. The process for requesting capital investment from Laureate was centralized in the President, with limited data provided

to the team on how fiscal priorities were set or on the criteria Laureate used to approve NSAD budget requests. (CFR 4.2)

While there was enthusiasm at NSAD at the prospect of increasing enrollments by 100% in the near term, at developing a new and larger site for the campus within two years, and at adding as many as seven new programs in the next two years, the team was unable to find evidence of administrative processes or procedures in place currently with a capacity to manage this ambitious expansion. Evaluating the cost and success of these new programs would require a process beyond the Annual Program Assessment, which was not designed to concentrate on issues most important to such new endeavors. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4)

New program development brings immediate needs for increased resources, and NSAD's resource allocation procedures, policies, and decision-making processes were not yet geared specifically towards this growth. (CFR 4.1 and 4.2) The team notes NSAD's plans to increase enrollments through developing articulation agreements with community colleges and feeder schools at regional high schools, and yet the team recognizes the difficulty of effecting these arrangements without WASC accreditation.

### Strategic Planning Process

The strategic planning process was begun in March 2008 before the Laureate acquisition, with a Strategic Planning Committee formed to develop a five-year strategic plan.

Subcommittees for mission, academic and physical environment, institutional assessment, and new degree programs were appointed. These resulted in a vision and mission statement

with corresponding institutional learning outcomes linked with individual program learning outcomes developed over time. (CFR 4.1) A SWOT analysis indicating strategic internal and external strengths and weaknesses informed the planning. (CFR 4.1) The first draft was submitted to the then-existing Academic Council in December 2008. Seeing a need for more practical goals to be reflected in the plan, the President in consultation with the Academic Council asked the Advisory Board, then consisting of community architects, to appoint a subcommittee to review and recommend revisions to the strategic plan. This entirely new draft version was submitted to the President in April 2009, then submitted to the Executive Committee and the Board for review. The new Board made further recommendations, specifically that NSAD use Laureate educational resources for assistance in developing a strategic plan that reflected Laureate's access to varied educational and international resources. Laureate personnel provided input to the strategic plan at this time as well. The final strategic plan was approved at a special Board meeting on June 18, 2010.

The revised Long-Range Plan for 2011-2016 articulated NSAD's shortcomings with some benchmarked goals to overcome them. The updated plan acknowledged weaknesses in the form of staff turnover in Enrollment and Advising, low student satisfaction, and enrollment shortfalls. It set goals to double student enrollment, develop new programs, develop new online programs, open a new campus, use the international Laureate network to develop collaborative partnerships with affiliated schools, and develop new student markets in high schools and community colleges. Plans for new programs, concentrations, and program revisions were ambitious. Seven new programs were proposed in the next two years in the areas of Digital Design and Delivery, Interior Architecture, Urban/City Design, Civil

Engineering, Environmental Engineering, Fashion Design, and Industrial Design, and Animation and Game Design are planned new concentrations in Digital Media Arts.

#### Institutional Research

The team recognizes the hiring of a Director of Institutional Research and Assessment in June 2011 as the necessary first step toward NSAD's ability to assess educational effectiveness and to use the results to improve teaching and learning. (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7) NSAD was in the emerging phase of these efforts, as a consequence of the staff's arrival during the WASC self-study process. The next steps, acknowledged by NSAD and endorsed by the team, were to reflect on the results of initial assessments of learning outcomes, to devise new curricular or pedagogical approaches to improve student learning in these areas, to implement the new approaches, to assess them in a new cycle of assessments, and to analyze and interpret the data to see if the curricular adjustments have improved student learning. (CFRs 4.4 and 4.7) The team notes that such effort could develop NSAD as a reflective institution that is oriented toward improving learning effectiveness.

NSAD utilized Laureate's assessment tools regularly in the past two years to survey students, faculty, alumni, employers, and staff. (CFR 4.4) Based on student survey data indicating dissatisfaction with grading standards, the Curriculum Committee proposed the adoption of a standard grading rubric to be used within-course over time to obtain evidence of whether student performance improves. (CFR 4.7) In response to survey data that selection criteria were set too low and that entering students were not sufficiently prepared for college-level

work, faculty initiated a review of admission criteria, including consideration of studio placement procedures and portfolio evaluation rubrics. To address writing deficiencies noted in survey data, NSAD planned to hire a writing tutor for the Student Success Center. (CFR 4.7)

## Stakeholders

NSAD's involvement with stakeholders was consistent, with alumni and advisory groups meeting regularly, and NSAD used Laureate's resource expertise to survey alumni and employers. Advisory Boards composed of local professionals in architecture, construction management, and landscape architecture met monthly with the President or Provost in attendance. These groups were strongly committed to developing professional ties with NSAD alumni and students. The Advisory Board members with whom the team spoke praised the Career Services Department, which proactively met with local professionals to determine their professional culture and skill set expectations for hiring NSAD alumni and students. The alumni group met monthly with President or Provost in attendance. This group initiated an alumni mentoring program with 40 mentored students at the time of the visit. (CFR 4.8)

## Graduation and Retention Rates

The newly staffed institutional research function at NSAD possessed sufficient capacity to address the institution's needs and succeeded in creating detailed reports of graduation and retention rates and time-to-degree that were specific to entering cohorts and disaggregated by student demographics, major degree program, and other institutional and individual characteristics. (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 2.10, and 4.5) A subset of these student success statistics were published as part of the Annual Program Assessment. (CFR 2.7)

With so few undergraduate programs enrolling students for a sufficient span of time for the calculation of six-year graduation rates – i.e., only the bachelor's degrees in Architecture qualified for such a reporting time frame – the IPEDS-defined graduation rates at NSAD were vulnerable to fluctuation from a very small variation in the number of students completing degrees. Even when the team requested reporting for full-year cohorts instead of traditional fall cohorts, the small number issue remained. The cohort from 2005-06 consisted of 17 freshman entrants, and their six-year graduation rate was 35% because six (6) of the students graduated; in the prior year's cohort (2004-05) of 24 students, three (3) graduated within six years for a 13% rate, and in the year before that (2003-04), six (6) graduated from the 17-student cohort within six years, for a 35% rate. Rolling admissions, the historical count of undergraduate programs at NSAD, and a non-trivial percentage of transfer entrants to the undergraduate programs (as many as three times the number of freshman entrants) all further suppressed the historical NSAD graduation rate cohort size in comparison to the overall undergraduate headcount. The IPEDS cohort definition further restricted the cohort

group to incoming fall term first-time freshmen, which introduced even smaller numbers into the rate calculations. The most-recent IPEDS six-year graduate rate reported by the NCES website for NSAD was 43%, based on a seven-student entering-fall freshman cohort from Fall 2004 that graduated three (3) students in 150% the length of time to degree (five years for the Bachelor of Architecture degree program).

As time progresses and the program review process at the institution matures, the team notes that the demand for degree completion data will grow, their probative value will accrue, and additional studies will suggest opportunities for intervention to enhance students' completion of their studies at NSAD. The team did not find that specific interventions had been implemented to address disparate graduation rates calculated for individual racial/ethnic groups, and this may have been in part because the institution's current five- and six-year graduation rates included such small disaggregated groups – one or two students at times per ethnic category – rate fluctuations could be attributed to slight changes in the count of degrees awarded from year to year. When the team considered the success of Hispanic students, for example, the group's graduation rates for freshman entrants varied from 13% to 43% to 14% with the population remaining relatively stable in size from 2004-05 through 2006-07 (seven or eight students in each full-year entering cohort). Two (2) additional Hispanic students graduating in the first and third years of the time series would have led to a level trend line, with 2006-07 awaiting an additional term of degrees yet to be awarded that could ultimately increase the rate further. Prior to the visit, the nature of efforts to boost student completion had been undertaken by the institution on an ad hoc basis. (CFR 2.13)

The team recognizes from its professional experience that graduation rates for Architecture undergraduates can be influenced by incoming students' optimistic perceptions of their future performance in an academic field in which they may possess no prior experience; the discipline's challenges prove formidable. NSAD's six-year graduation rate compared reasonably with those of a team-selected cohort of similar institutions. One selected peer institution -- in terms of student diversity and studio arts focus, as well as an emphasis on Architecture -- had a 53% six-year graduation rate according to the NCES site (2004 cohort); another institution with a similar emphasis and student population had a 29% graduation rate; and a third similar institution had a 54% graduation rate. NSAD's IPEDS-reported six-year graduation rate fell only two percentage points below this three-member comparison group's average six-year rate. (CFR 4.4)

When the team queried faculty, Department Chairs, administrators, and the Board, there was a limited awareness of the specific statistics the institution publishes as its graduation rate; however, when a number was offered by an NSAD-affiliated individual, as was the case in both meetings during which the question was posed, the statistic was an accurate citation from one of the various NSAD reports submitted for the WASC Self-Study: in one case, the 2005-06 full-year cohort's six-year rate of 35%; in the other case, the IPEDS Fall 2004 cohort's 43% six-year rate. The team notes, too, that NSAD was required to undertake compliance reporting, given the accreditation status it held at the time of the visit, that at times employed definitions and calculations that would be considered unserviceable by its regionally-accredited peers. For example, the "On-Time Completion Rate" NSAD was required to calculate, which sounds like a four-year or five-year graduation rate, instead

served as a component of time-to-degree and skirted the issue of what proportion of students drop out before degree completion. A hypothetical institution could have a 10% six-year graduation rate, but paradoxically publish an accurately calculated 100% on-time completion rate. The team suggests that NSAD continue its additional calculation and publication of statistics comparable to those presented among WASC-accredited institutions to describe cohort-based retention, graduation, and time-to-degree, as their clarity and value will benefit both the institution and its prospective students. (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 2.10, 2.12, 4.3, and 4.4)

From NSAD's institutional perspective, retention rates seemed to be well understood in the self-study support materials (such as the minutes of various meetings) as a financial viability measure. From the NSAD student perspective, however, term-to-term retention spoke to the probability that one would eventually complete his or her degree. Entering cohort studies of retention are critical in recognizing how an institution's obligation to students extends beyond the ability to sustain operations throughout the year: a feasible path toward the degree must exist for all students who enroll. Consequently, NSAD faced a critical challenge to account for the particulars of student retention beyond an overall retention statistic's service as an estimate of whether tuition revenue would remain on target. (CFR 2.10) In recent planning documents, institutional growth was discussed at NSAD in terms of additional degree programs being introduced, instead of as a shoring up the current student enrollment to maintain those students' presence on campus. Regardless, efforts from the Student Success Center and from advising resources were informed and motivated in a general sense by graduation and retention rate reporting. (CFR 2.13) The team also found an admirable responsiveness from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment upon the

team's request for additional cohort-based statistics measuring student success and persistence in study at NSAD. (CFR 4.5) The team found the availability of data and their future use at NSAD to be promising.

The team suggests that the institution consider, for its internal purposes, a total of all term entering cohorts from a calendar year be tracked for graduation and retention reporting – the “full year” approach documented in the WASC Graduation and Retention Rate reporting materials recently distributed by the Commission to the region for comment. This would increase the cohort of students used in calculating the various statistics and would state the phenomena of graduation and retention in terms that are appropriately inclusive for the purpose of retention enhancement efforts. The team also suggests that greater detail be collected to describe the reasons for withdrawal of students from NSAD, in an effort to anticipate a more nuanced response from both the academic and student services areas at the institution when students express difficulty in continuing their enrollment. (CFR 4.4)

Learning about NSAD's ambitious plans for expanding the number of undergraduate programs at the institution, the team acknowledges that the front line of enrollment management at this institution will be best served by data collected and analyzed proactively.

### **SECTION III. COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Commendations:

The team commends NSAD for the many accomplishments it had attained during a short period of time. The institution successfully appointed individuals in the ranks of academic leadership, developed an institutional research function, and introduced a robust new faculty governance structure. The influx of professional and fiscal resources, human capital, administrative systems, and technological support signaled an impressive capacity for continuous improvement.

The team commends NSAD's high morale and the collegial spirit of its students, faculty, staff, and alumni. The institution's ties to the professional community enriched the students' educational experience and enhanced the capacity of NSAD. The atmosphere of the institution characterized its ability to stride towards its goals through the personal and professional investment of its many constituents.

The team commends NSAD's enthusiastic and wide-spread engagement in the accreditation process among students, faculty, and administrators. The institution's response to WASC's guidance during the candidacy application process characterized NSAD as an institution prepared to grow and adapt to whatever challenges it faces.

The team commends NSAD's impressive focus on its students and their needs as individuals, ranging from student-centered instructional approaches to noteworthy areas of service and support that include Career Services.

The team commends the NSAD Board of Directors for its support, involvement, commitment, and professional expertise demonstrated in its stewardship of the institution.

Recommendations:

The team recommends that NSAD:

- Articulate and integrate student learning outcomes across the curriculum at the course, program, and institutional levels, and provide support for faculty in their engagement with this outcomes development and assessment process. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.8, and 2.9)
- Fully implement student learning outcomes assessment as an articulated evaluation system to identify students' specific skills that need improvement and to allow programs to track the subsequent enhancement of those skills. (CFR 2.7)
- Make the assessment of specific student work products an intrinsic component of program review and use the results explicitly to inform resource allocations. (CFRs 2.7 and 4.3)

- More broadly engage key stakeholders in budget preparation and management. (CFR 3.5)
- Give continued attention to emerging decision-making structures at the Board of Directors, administration, and faculty governance levels. (CFRs 3.8 and 3.9)
- Develop a culture of evidence regarding institutional planning and functioning with systematic cycles of data collection and analyses, and with feedback loops that revise and improve institutional planning and educational effectiveness. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4)

## APPENDICES

### DISTANCE EDUCATION

Institution: NewSchool of Architecture and Design

Kind of Visit: Pathway B Initial

Date: March 14-16, 2012

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs<sup>1</sup> and for other visits as applicable. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and Courses Reviewed (please list)

General Education (selected courses) and Master of Construction Management degree program.

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

One program is offered solely (100%) online: the Master of Construction Management. In Fall 2011, the program enrolled four students. General Education has offered several course sections to date online; however, these courses are offered separately as on-the-ground sections as well. Online instruction began in Summer 2011 with a single General Education section, and the Master of Construction Management program began in Fall 2011 with two online course sections. Through Winter 2012, four online courses have been offered in General Education, and six online courses for the Master of Construction Management. Blackboard software serves as the platform of delivery.

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

The review consisted of interviews with the Director of General Education and the Chair of the Construction Management Department, with additional review of enrollment reports, course offerings/course schedules, and other supplemental materials. A student enrolled in the online degree program was interviewed during an open session with the institution's students.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.

## Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1)</p>	<p>Distance learning is conceived as a supplement to the institution’s other instruction: as a method for undergraduates to complete the General Education curriculum with flexible hours of participation and for working professionals to pursue the graduate degree program. The Master of Construction Management was part of the institution’s strategic plan and was supported by Laureate.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution? (CFR 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>In General Education, the students are concurrently enrolled in other sections on the ground; in the Master of Construction Management program, they are invited to participate in all student activities and gatherings. Thus far, the graduate program’s enrollment has been small, but participation at the institution has remained possible and has been valued by the student interviewed.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.7)</p>	<p>The DE Infrastructure is robust and effective for teaching and learning; however, the faculty participants look forward to the software version being upgraded for additional features and functions to be available.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> CPR: What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of the services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>The graduate program is in its infancy (only two terms completed), and as a consequence, an in depth assessment of the services’ effectiveness has not been completed. All services appropriate to the small number of enrolled students have been available to them during their studies.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>Eight adjunct faculty members teach in the Master of Construction Management program, which also has a full time program coordinator. All faculty are trained for on-line teaching during a mandatory orientation. Faculty members also teach on ground courses at other universities on the East Coast. Faculty meetings are held twice per quarter, and all faculty are involved in the yearly program review.</p> <p>For technical or platform issues, faculty members have 24/7 IT support.</p>	

<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (CFRs 2.1-2.3, 4.6) (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>The course content, course learning outcomes, and assessments are planned by the Program's Chair and a subject matter expert. The program and its courses are approved via the standard program and curriculum approval process at NSAD. The Chair notes that the program is unique and superior to similar on-the-ground programs. The delivery platform is supported by the Laureate IT team.</p>	
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>All data collected to describe NSAD's on-the-ground programs are collected for its online program. The program has not yet graduated any students (it was initiated in Fall 2011).</p>	
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Assessments are made via discussion question answers, course assignments, and final projects. These are tied to the course learning outcomes, which are a subset of the program learning outcomes. There is no on-the-ground comparison at NSAD, and data from other programs will be benchmarked; however, the assessment system is similar to other programs at NSAD that are offered solely on-the-ground.</p>	
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations</i>?</p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The institution now requires students in the online program to register earlier, and they are prohibited from registering after the third day of class. Evidence of effectiveness at this time comes from final projects completed by students each term; however, the program just began enrolling students and thus a summative review of program learning is not yet possible. The Master of Construction Management program review is scheduled for Spring 2012. The program is subject to the same review process as on-the-ground programs.</p>	

## Compliance Audit Checklist for Special Visits and Pathway B Visits

**Instruction to team:**

Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report.

Name of Institution: NewSchool of Architecture and Design

Date of Visit: March 14-16, 2012

CFR	Documents Required	
<b>Standard 1</b>		
1.1	Mission statement	x
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	x
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning	x
1.3	Organization chart (X 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	x
1.4	Academic freedom policy	x
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; Procedures for Special Accommodations	x
1.6	-	-
1.7	Catalog (online <u>  x  </u> , hard copy <u>  </u> ) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	x
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies	x
1.7.2.1	Policy for grade appeals	x
1.7.2.2	Records of student complaints	x
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	x
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	x
1.7.4	Staff grievance policies	x
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances and complaints	x
1.7.5	Employee handbook	x
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	x
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	x
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	x
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	x
1.7.6.5	Policies on tuition refunds	x
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit Processes for review of assignment of credit Review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	x
1.8	Regular independent audits of finances (X 3.5)	x
1.9	WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies	x
1.7-1.9	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation A list of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation	x
<b>Standard 2</b>		
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (X 1.7)	x

<b>CFR</b>	<b>Documents Required</b>	
2.2	Complete set of course syllabi for all courses offered	x
2.2.1	(For associate and bachelor's degrees) statement of general education requirements (X 1.7)	x
2.3	SLOs for every program	x
2.4	-	-
2.5	-	-
2.6	-	-
2.7	Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention/graduation and achievement of learning outcomes	x
2.7.1	Regular schedule of program review (including for non-academic units)	x
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	x
2.9	-	-
2.10	Data on student demographics	x
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs	x
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate	x
2.10.3	Policies on student evaluation of faculty	x
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	x
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities	x
2.11.1	Policies on financial aid	x
2.12	Academic calendar (X 1.7 catalog)	x
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year	x
2.13.1	Registration procedures	x
2.14	Registration forms	x
<b>Standard 3</b>		
3.1	Policies on staff development	x
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program	x
3.3	Faculty hiring policies	x
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policies and procedures (X 2.10)	x
3.3.2	Faculty Handbook if available	x
3.4	Faculty development policies	x
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	x
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	x
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	x
3.5	Audited financial statements (X 1.8)	x
3.5.1	Appropriate financial records	x
3.5.2	Appropriate policies and procedures for handling of financial aid (X 2.11)	x
3.5.3	Campus maps	x
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	x
3.6.1	If online or hybrid, information on delivery method	x
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	x
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	x
3.8	Organization chart (X 1.3 and 3.1)	x
3.9	Board list	x
3.9.1	Board member bios	x
3.9.2	List of Board committees	x
3.9.2.1	Minutes of Board meetings for last two years	x
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual	x

<b>CFR</b>	<b>Documents Required</b>	
3.10	CEO bio	X
3.10.1	CFO bio	X
3.10.2	Other top administrators' bios (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority	X
3.11.1	Faculty organization chart (if applicable)	X
3.11.2	Minutes of last year's faculty meetings	X
<b>Standard 4</b>		
4.1	Strategic plan	X
4.1.1	Operations plan	X
4.1.2	Academic plan	X
4.2	Description of planning process	X
4.2.1	Process for review of implementation of strategic plan	X
4.3	-	-
4.4	New program approval process	X
4.4.1	Program review process (X 2.7)	X
4.5	Description of IR function and staffing	X
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (X1.2)	X
4.7	-	-
4.8	-	-

Comments:

<b>Related to Substantive Change</b>		
1	Locations of all off-campus sites and programs offered at such sites (more than 50% of program)	
1a	Number of students enrolled at such sites	
1b	Date of first offerings	
2	Names of all programs for which 50% of the program is offered through distance education	X
2a	Number of students enrolled in each	X
2b	Date each was first offered	X
3	Names of all hybrid programs	
3a	Number of students enrolled in each	
3b	Date each was first offered	
<b>Accuracy and Availability of Records</b>		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	X
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	X
	Records are accurate and up to date	X

## CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Institution: NewSchool of Architecture and Design

Kind of Visit: WASC Pathway B

Date: March 14-16, 2012

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

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments</b> (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	YES
	Comments:	
Process(es)/ periodic review	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?	YES
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Policy has been initiated.
	Comments: Program Chair responsible for review. To be included in Policies and Procedures Manual.	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	YES
	Comments:	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online How many syllabi were reviewed? 2 What degree level(s)? Graduate What discipline(s)? Construction Management	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	YES
	Comments:	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	What kinds of courses? Independent study, studio, internship, office practice, Exec Master  How many syllabi were reviewed? 5 What degree level(s)? Undergraduate and Graduate What discipline(s)? Architecture and Construction Management	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	YES
	Comments: In most cases the hours far exceed the minimum prescribed.	