

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

To St. John's Seminary

March 20-22, 2018

Visit Team:

Paul Fitzgerald, President, University of San Francisco (Chair)

Philip Clayton, Professor, Claremont School of Theology (Assistant Chair)

Nicola Pitchford, VPAA and Dean of the Faculty, Dominican University of California

David Geriguis, VP of Financial Administration, La Sierra University

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 WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). 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 WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History
- B. Description of Team’s Review Process
- C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions
- B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees
- D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation
- E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
- F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence
- G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

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

APPENDICES

- A. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)
- B. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

History of St. John’s Seminary

The mission of St. John’s Seminary is “to prepare candidates for service as Roman Catholic priests by assisting them to grow as disciples of Jesus Christ, discern the vocation to which God calls them, root themselves in Word and Sacrament and the Church’s theological tradition, integrate the spiritual, human, intellectual and pastoral dimensions of their lives, and develop skills for ministry, leadership and evangelization in a culturally diverse Church.”

St. John’s Seminary opened in 1939 with 10 faculty members and some 70 candidates for the priesthood. Administered by the Vincentian Fathers, it was built on 100 acres above what is now the city of Camarillo in Ventura County. Over the following decades most of the buildings that are now a part of the seminary operations were built. For example, by 1958 the seminary already offered 180 bedrooms for candidates to the priesthood.

The Seminary received its first accreditation from the Western College Association in 1951. In 1965 St. John’s Seminary College was built on adjacent property. What had been a program of six years at the junior seminary and six years at the major seminary now became three four-year segments: high school, college, and graduate school, with each institution situated at a separate location. At this point the Seminary moved fully to graduate level theological education and began offering its first Master of Arts degree.

Many changes came during the period 1968 – 1973 in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. For example, deacons began working in parishes on weekends and candidates for the priesthood were given internships in social work, hospital ministry, youth retreats, and other areas. It was also during this period that the seminary affiliated with the American Association of Theological Schools. The Pre-Candidacy Program for college graduates without previous seminary experience was launched in 1979. By 1982 future deacons were required to complete a six-month internship in their home dioceses.

Initial accreditation from the Association of Theological Schools came in 1976, and accreditation with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) came in 1978. The following two decades saw growth in academic programs, quality and an increasing focus on pastoral formation.

St. John’s Seminary College was closed in 2003 due to declining enrollment, and the seminary completed the “teach out” for the college seminarians over the following two years. Also in 2003 the Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry (MAPM) program was launched. The MAPM was built for lay ministry students. The MA in Theology was designed for either lay students or seminarians. In addition to the two MA degrees, St. John’s continues to offer the MDiv for candidates to the priesthood.

For fall 2014, 2015, and 2016 the institution reports enrolments of 98, 110, and 115 onsite FTE graduate students respectively. The headcounts for the same period were 104, 116, and 121 students respectively. There are no distance education or offsite educational programs, although the institution offers an extensive array of internship opportunities for the required internship programs.

Accreditation History

The seminary was accredited as part of St. John's College until May 1981. In June of that year the board voted to separate the college and seminary for accreditation purposes, and after approval by the WASC Commissioners St. John's Seminary became an independently accredited graduate school. For many years the WASC visits for reaffirmations of accreditation were done in partnership with representatives from the ATS. Only once was the institution placed on Warning (1986-88). Reaffirmation reports over the following years include recommendations on the topics of assessment, the implementation of quality improvement strategies, and a process for resolving student grievances.

The WASC Commission last acted to reaffirm accreditation in Feb., 2011. Over the last five years there have been no Substantive Change proposals.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

In accordance with the schedule established with the institution, WSCUC put together a Visit team, with membership confirmed on April 26, 2017. The Team was chaired by Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., President of the University of San Francisco. Philip Clayton (Claremont School of Theology) served as Assistant Chair; Nicola Pitchford (VPAA and Dean of the Faculty, Dominican University of California) and David Geriguis (VP of Financial Administration, La Sierra University) served as team members.

St. John's compiled a detailed Institutional Report, dated Sept. 21, 2017. It was accompanied by 19 attachments, addressing the WSCUC standards and offering a full picture of the state of the institution at that time. (More attachments were received at a later date, as described below.) Over the following two months the Visit team studied the Report and the supporting information. On November 10, 2017 the Team met by phone to discuss their observations from the materials and to plan for the upcoming conversation with the institution. The Team then met in person near the WSCUC offices for a number of hours on November 30, 2017 to discussion the institution's Report and to further prepare for the Offsite Review (OSR).

The Offsite Review itself took place on December 1, 2017. On the call held at the end of the OSR, St. John's was represented by the president and the ALO. The institutional representatives were well prepared for the call and provided detailed answers to the Visit team. The conversation focused in particular on Components 1-7 as addressed in the Institutional Report.

After the conclusion of the call, the Visit team evaluated the call and prepared three sets of materials to be forwarded to the institution. The Team first prepared a number of commendations based on the Report and the conversation:

1. The Visit team applauds the clarity of purpose and function of St. John's MDiv degree and finds that it is well integrated with the profession.
2. The institution states a clear commitment not only to collect data but also to use it for continuous program improvement.
3. In recent years St. John's has been strengthening the pastoral component in its programs. This includes the development of training in leadership, budget management, and personnel management.
4. The institution is engaging the CARA data after graduation and in the first five years after a student's graduation. St. John's is acquiring good qualitative data about its graduates from laypeople and other clergy as well as information from the new priests about their personal levels of satisfaction.
5. The institution has developed clear and effective rubrics for the MDiv and the MA.
6. The institution, including faculty, staff and students, has developed and revised plans for improving its overall educational project, for example by interviewing students, field placement supervisors, graduates, and their colleagues.

Second, the Team outlined five lines of inquiry, which would structure the discussions during the site visit. Finally, the WSCUC Vice President and institutional liaison forwarded to the St. John's ALO a number of requests for additional documents.

An additional seven documents (for a total of 26) were provided in a timely manner and clearly addressed the needs of the Visit team. The Visit team worked through the new materials and met again on February 26, 2018 to review them and prepare for the Site Visit. The Team's Assistant Chair worked with the ALO at St. John's to prepare the visit schedule and arrange logistics. A confidential email account was established so that students, faculty, and staff of the institution could communicate in confidence with the Visit team.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The Institutional Report prepared by St. John's Seminary was clear and thorough. It was well organized and clearly written and presented and accurately portrayed the condition of the institution. Because of the thoroughness of the document and the in-depth process

of preparation on which it reported, it was effective at addressing the Team's questions and concerns.

A wide range of faculty, staff, and administrators had been involved over a number of months in an extensive institutional self-study. Research by the administration provided data needed for institutional evaluation. A number of small committees and discussion groups had been convened. Their work on institutional self-evaluation covered most areas of the institution.

The eight chapters of the report addressed the WSCUC Standards and conformed to the guidelines for an institutional reaccreditation report. The report focused in particular on:

- Degree Programs
- Learning Outcomes
- Educational Quality
- Student Success
- Quality Assurance and Improvement
- Sustainability
- Educational Effectiveness and Plans for Improvement

Faculty were included in the discussions of these issues. The institution was involved in replacing a previous system for evaluating educational effectiveness, and the new systems had not yet been fully completed or implemented. This meant that some of the discussions of the topics listed above were at an early stage and planning was still underway. For these reasons, the institution was not yet able to provide extensive data on educational effectiveness or to show broad evidence of "closing the loop." The details concerning the difficulties with the old system and the process for establishing a new one were fully acknowledged in the Report.

The institution had clearly engaged in the self-study in a serious and probing way. The study had been conducted according to WSCUC guidelines, with strong involvement of the president and the ALO. Data and evidence were brought to support the claims made by the institution, especially in the area of financial sustainability. In the opinion of the Team, even if the procedures were not yet complete, the institution's process of self-review had helped its faculty and administration to understand what would be required to fully evaluate institutional effectiveness, to implement systems of quality improvement, and to assess student learning.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

As far back as the 1990s, Commission actions and reviews have included recommendations concerning financial sustainability, assessment, and implementing quality improvement strategies. St. John's has taken a number of steps to strengthen its financial position. For example, a major step that has occurred since the last WSCUC visit that may affect the Commission's evaluation of St. John's concerns the pending sale and development of a portion of its property. The sale will play a major role in the financial viability of the institution; further details are discussed below.

There have been no Substantive Change proposals submitted over the last five years, which means that the institution has not interacted frequently with the Commission during these years. In June 2009 the Commission acted to continue accreditation. It asked St. John's to respond to a number of issues raised in its Action Letter. The three identified issues were multiculturalism, strategic planning and enrollment planning, and assessment and program review processes. These three issues were also among the lines of inquiry raised by the Visit team during the March 2018 visit.

St. John's prepared to respond to these three themes during the Educational Effectiveness Review visit that took place roughly 18 months later, in October 2010. When it acted to reaffirm accreditation in February 2011, the Commission also requested an interim report, to be completed in 2014, that would again address assessment and program review processes, which remained areas of concern. Specifically, at the time of reaffirmation the Commission identified four issues as requiring the institution's attention. The Commission's action letter asked the institution to provide progress reports on:

- educational effectiveness, including program review and assessment of student learning
- strategic planning, including updated plans and reports on finances, development, and endowment
- diversity, including an update on faculty hiring
- leadership transitions

The institution supplied a detailed report on its continuing work in these four areas in the spring of 2014. The dean had developed a very detailed process for assessing educational effectiveness and student learning and for conducting regular program reviews. Efforts had also been made in faculty hiring, and the board had developed policies for leadership transitions.

In light of these new procedures, in May 2014 the Commission acted to receive the interim report. In two areas questions remained. The Commission thus requested a brief progress report for one year later (July 2015), which would review progress on strategic planning and the CQI

(Continuous Quality Improvement) process. This report was accepted by the WSCUC staff in December 2015 without further comment.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

In its Review under WSCUC Standards and in its institutional report, St. John's Seminary addressed openly and with transparency its current status in regard to WSCUC expectations and criteria (CFR 1.8). The institution operates with integrity and has developed clear and appropriate policies on most matters of institutional life. There appears to be an appropriate balance of orthodoxy and autonomy throughout the institution; for example, faculty are satisfied with the operation of academic freedom, within the particular context of a faith-based institution whose mission rests in part on the transmission of a specific theological tradition (CFR 1.3, 1.5). The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

Strengths include exceptional clarity of institutional purpose, values, and contribution to the public good (CFR 1.1) and published statements thereof. The high level of agreement and common understanding of the institution's goals and values among faculty, staff, students, and leadership allows for much of the institution's work to be conducted collegially and through informal communication, guided by these common values. However, this informal and consensual structure also results in a lack of clarity surrounding some policies, and some confusion regarding which policy documents have been fully approved versus those that remain under review or development; this appears to be the case with both the faculty handbook and the strategic plan (CFR 1.7). Student policies are clear and current (CFRs 1.6, 1.7).

The institution is clear about the qualities it seeks to develop in every graduate. Every program has learning outcomes (PLOs), published in the catalog (CFR 1.2); some of these are stronger and are likely to prove more useful than others, which are at an earlier stage of development. PLOs in the MDiv, for instance, are well developed, while those for the pre-theology program—which focus less on skills or capacities than on content coverage—may prove too broad and difficult to assess. The institution has developed a culture of evidence gathering that is authentic and to which all faculty appear to be committed; the recent reorganization into departments and degree-level committees has done much to facilitate and encourage collaborative discussion about student learning and evaluation. More might be done to disseminate evidence of student learning success.

Central to realizing the institution's mission is the education of priests for an increasingly multicultural Church and a particularly diverse archdiocese. The student body at St. John's is appropriately diverse, and the curricular and co-curricular programs demonstrate thoughtful attention to the training required to prepare graduates to serve diverse populations (CFR 1.4). Significant work has been done to improve the quality of learning for those students who are English Language Learners (ELL), with resources having been invested in supplemental as well

as remedial support. Field placements and the year-long internship are key sites where students engage with diversity and develop their intercultural competency, supported by classroom preparation in congregational studies. Internship placements, in particular, are crafted and selected to address those areas where each student needs to strengthen his linguistic and/or cultural capacities, and are supported by frequent reflective consultations. Less work has been done to incorporate awareness of diverse learners, learning needs, and cultural preparation into faculty pedagogy and assignment design across all academic classes. As at many institutions, some faculty view the range of students' backgrounds more as an obstacle to effective learning than as a potential resource.

All the proper parties participated in the Review. The Archbishop and members of the Board provided helpful information as to their commitment to uphold academic integrity, human formation, intercultural competence, and the financial security of the seminary. The President/Rector made himself available throughout the visit, including a meeting with the whole visit team and alone with the chair of the team. He provided valuable information about the recent past history of the seminary, the current trajectory, his strategies and tactics for continuous program improvement, faculty development, faculty turn-over, recruitment of students and financial stability. The team met with several groups of faculty, including the academic affairs committee, language faculty, pre-theology faculty, and a plenary meeting with all full-time faculty. The team learned that, while there has been a good deal of change introduced by the new Rector and the new Academic Dean, faculty morale was high, and most faculty were eager to embrace the changes, which they saw as improving student learning. In meetings with the students, the team learned that many students questioned the workload, the pedagogical style, and the pertinency of some course subject matter in regards their ultimate goal of ordained priestly ministry. Faculty and administrators were, however, aware of these concerns and expressed that they are working to address them. At a meeting with the staff, the team was told that the seminary needs to continue to improve internal communication systems in ways that are appropriate for the very diverse workforce.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The team found that the MDiv degree program was well designed for the needs of future priests (CFR 2.1). The expectations for student learning are high and the program is demanding (CFR 2.5), especially for students who are not native speakers of English.

The institutional report describes the development of internships over time. The team saw evidence that the internship programs are educationally effective and that they play a major role in the formation of the candidates for the priesthood (CFR 2.11).

The team identified some needs regarding the further development and use of student learning outcomes (SLOs) (CFR 2.3). Some faculty seemed to be at a relatively early stage in setting SLOs and standards, and some of the measures used to assess student learning did not clearly demonstrate achievement of the standards articulated by the institution (CFR 2.4). The team also

did not see a clearly articulated alignment up and down between mission, ILOs, PLOs, and SLOs.

More generally, faculty approaches to assessing student work were in many cases not built around and driven by SLOs (CFR 2.4, 2.6). The team worried that 30 minutes a year might not be adequate to evaluate a student's progress for that year (Report, page 32); in one case, it seemed that student success was being described using an anecdote (page 43).

The institution recognizes that the ongoing review of programs will need to more clearly include SLOs, retention/graduation data, and external evidence and evaluators (CFR 2.7). For example, the data collection described on page 14 of the institutional report shows room for improvement. On the other hand, interviews conducted by the team with students close to or after graduation did show impressive levels of achievement; there is no question about the rigor of St. John's programs. The institutional report mentions imposing stricter standards for admission (page 14), which may be necessary given the high academic standards. Of course, raising admissions standards might well have a negative impact on enrollment.

Recent developments at the institution did suggest movement toward becoming an institution with a culture of learning. For example, St. John's recently revised the course on Pastoral Leadership (PS 587) as a series of four "leadership modules" (Institutional Report, page 27).

Evidence was provided of ways that the institution is now collecting data on student learning in order to evaluate educational effectiveness. Surveys are attempting to identify needs of students, and student achievement is now being tracked more carefully, but there remains room for growth in tracking aggregated and disaggregated student achievement, satisfaction and campus climate (CFR 2.10).

The institution did not provide sufficient evidence on the role of scholarship in faculty evaluation; by contrast, teaching and service play a major role (CFR 2.9). Many faculty expressed concern that their heavy teaching and mentoring loads does not leave sufficient time for scholarship and publishing (CFR 2.8).

Faculty showed enthusiasm for their time in the classroom with students and for the value of student mentoring outside of class. Although institutional innovation was clearly occurring, the team was not able to acquire evidence of significant curricular innovation by the faculty as a whole (with important exceptions on the part of individual professors), nor was it informed of a concentration on pedagogy (CFR 2.8).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 2. Over the past years, the institution has moved from insufficient assessment (CFRs 2.1-2.7, 2.10) to an overly elaborate system that could not be implemented, and then back to insufficient attention to learning outcomes. More recently, academic leadership is working quickly to bring the institution into conformity with Standard 2. Faculty recognize the importance of these changes and are seeking to learn how to succeed at this task. It remains at this moment the area of greatest vulnerability vis-à-vis WSCUC standards.

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

Under Standard 3 (Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability), St. John's Seminary has effectively addressed WSCUC's CFRs, highlighting areas of strength and areas for improvement. It has done so by connecting its mission to an improved financial position and its planned land sale and development project.

As it moves into developing its role in the 21st century, St. John's is cognizant of the need to advance a vision that responds to the ever-changing higher education landscape. As the seminary develops its next strategic plan, it is mindful of the need to have its budgeting processes and resource allocations driven by the strategic plan, including the replacement of retiring faculty with new faculty members who are well qualified (CFRs 3.1-3.3). As part of this transition, the Finance Office will need to start relying on more sophisticated and innovative management reports and assessment tools to make possible a more nimble decision-making process (CFRs 3.3, 3.5).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 3.

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

Under Standard 4 (Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement), St. John's institutional report reviewed each CFR with regard to current practices, identifying both strengths and areas for improvement. Strengths include the participation of the faculty and the administration in assessment activities and a commitment to program review and improvement, implementation of data collection (CFR 4.1), analysis, and interpretation to ensure evidence-based decisions (CFR 4.2), a commitment to be a learning organization in the areas of institutional learning and improvement (CFR 4.3-4.5). Areas for improvement reflect the change in leadership and the move from an overly burdensome Continuous Quality Improvement regime to a more streamlined suite of assessments (annual holistic interviews with Formation Advisors, essays before and after the internship year, multiple capstone exercises graded by faculty using common rubrics). The seminary leadership wisely invested in a study by Georgetown University's Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) and gained valuable qualitative information about recent graduates who have successfully begun ordained ministry in parishes. Sending bishops, religious superiors, and vocation directors have also been queried on an annual basis.

The seminary has identified institutional research as an area to be improved (CFR 4.2). Even while the data-collection process is being designed, the analysis and dissemination of the results for improving curricula and pedagogy can be improved (CFR 4.4). The seminary knows that it needs to improve the way that it identifies data, disseminates and analyzes it, incorporates it in decision-making, and then communicates the adopted decisions more effectively to constituents

(CFR 4.1, 4.5, 4.6). The faculty should take on a greater role in academic strategic planning (CFR 4.6).

The seminary has updated its written materials and its program objectives (Standard 1). The seminary has also identified the need to raise the level of competence among English language learners and assess student achievement (Standard 2), improve communication among departments, reassess personnel needs, comply with personnel policies (Standard 3), and refine its use of data in quality improvement (Standard 4).

The arrival of a new dean and a new rector in a relatively short amount of time has led to a number of positive changes in assessment practices; the high morale of the faculty is a testament that the new leadership is leading and managing change rather well. The team is confident that the administration, faculty, and staff are committed to working together diligently on each of the areas of needed improvement in the coming years.

New learning outcomes for the MDiv degree are being defined by the US national bishops' conference and will be published in a new Program for Priestly Formation, in response to a new *ratio fundamentalis institutionis sacerdotalis* that was issued in Rome late last year. The seminary faculty members, working with the dean, have already begun mapping the MDiv curriculum in light of these changes, adding in particular a greater emphasis on the humanistic and spiritual development of the seminarians. Moreover, based on feedback from the CARA study, the faculty are instituting means to develop skills in leadership, budget management, and personnel management into the overall program learning outcomes.

In its self-study, the seminary acknowledges that while it collects meaningful data, "it does not always analyze it, build consensus for program changes, and plan for the future." The team's recommendations address these issues.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard IV.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

The team reviewed Component 3, concluding that the faculty and administration efforts to improve programs through PLOs in all three degree offerings — Master of Arts, Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry, and Master of Divinity — were demonstrated with evidence from their program reviews (CFR 2.1-2.7). In the team interviews with students, faculty, and senior administration, the commitment to teaching and learning was evident, again demonstrated in both collective affirmation and individual examples.

After reviewing the self-study during the Off-site Review (OSR), several interrelated questions were raised by the visit team as Lines of Inquiry (LOI) under Component 3. The team asked for further clarification of the means to assess competency at the end of degree programs. In the case of the MDiv, this included intellectual, spiritual, and human development (CFR 1.1, 2.1, 2.2). Competency in the MAPM program, a track pursued by lay students and a few seminarians, has

occurred through the review of integrative papers and a final project. Competency in the MA program is demonstrated either through a comprehensive examination or through a thesis. Very few MDiv students opt to pursue the MA simultaneously, and several of those who have done so in the recent past later opted out as they approached the comprehensive examination, a fact that led the Visit team to focus on the means for assessing competency at the end of the MDiv. The team learned that during each of the final four semesters of the MDiv program, students participate in capstone experiences, which present ministerial cases and real-life scenarios that the students are asked to role play. Teams of faculty observers use rubrics to score the responses and actions of each of the students.

Another LOI sought further evidence of SLOs and PLOs. The Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA) study of recent graduates provided good qualitative evidence of the holistic preparation for ministry that the MDiv candidates received, retained, and deployed in parish settings in the five years after their graduation and ordination. The reflection and plans for improvement in the near future will include work by the faculty to align individual course learning outcomes with the MDiv PLO's, collect and analyze evidence of student performance at this level, and use this analysis to further revise the curriculum.

Another line of questioning related to the plans for the future of the MA and MAPM degree programs. The faculty plan to continue to offer the MA option to the brightest MDiv students, in particular to those who may be sent on for doctoral studies. The MAPM program was recently downsized from an evening / weekend program for lay people to a "seats on the bus" model whereby lay people can enroll in MDiv courses offered for the seminarians. The presence of even the very few lay people who opt for this model was reported to be enriching for the seminarians. St. John's is considering the option of moving the MAPM degree off-site to a location that will be more convenient for lay students and where there may well be a larger market for this degree.

Finally, under Standard 4, the team included one LOI concerning the monitoring of academic rigor throughout all degree programs. The team learned that students compose a written evaluation of every course; these evaluations are then reviewed by the academic dean with each faculty member at an annual meeting, along with the faculty member's self-assessment and plans for ongoing professional development. This conversation is part of an annual formative and summative review of every faculty member. Faculty also have the option of formative peer review, but it appears that very few faculty members pursue this option. Given the learning needs of St. John's diverse student population, the Visit team recommends a systematic peer review of teaching as one important means for improvements in pedagogy that will, in turn, lead to improvements in student learning at all levels (CFR 4.4).

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

The Institutional Report prepared by St. John's Seminary outlines the methods used to assess student learning and achievement of identified learning outcomes (CFR 2.3). Students in the MDiv are evaluated regularly, thoroughly, and holistically through a number of means. These

include individual course grading, meetings with formation advisors and spiritual directors, an internship portfolio, reports from internship site supervisors, review of recorded homilies, an annual consultation of the full faculty in which each student is discussed and his progress considered, collective evaluation of the several capstone performances, and post-graduation professional evaluation conducted via the 2014 CARA “Evaluation of Priestly Formation” study. Faculty assume shared responsibility and work collaboratively to identify students’ strengths and weaknesses and to refer students to appropriate colleagues for a program of remediation when such need is identified (CFR 2.4). The institutional report and the site visit both provided strong evidence that the documentation and improvement of student learning is an authentic commitment on the part of the institution’s faculty and leadership that has been given significantly increased attention in recent years (CFR 4.3).

Evaluation of students in the Pre-Theology program and the small MA and MAPM degree programs is somewhat less comprehensive, although also regularly undertaken by faculty, both individually and collectively. MA and MAPM students complete a final evaluative project—either a thesis or an examination. Evaluation of Pre-Theology students’ learning is largely limited to individual courses and annual consultations.

While the systems in place for evaluating student learning are multiple and ensure frequent monitoring (CFR 2.5), the processes of documenting, responding to, and addressing areas of weakness in individual learning/performance tend to function—like many processes at St. John’s—more informally and individually than systematically. There are both advantages and disadvantages to such a personalized approach. The Visit team saw examples of both.

One area of remediation on which the institution appears to be taking thoughtful and serious action (identified in the institutional report as a particular concern) was the progress of students who are English Language Learners (ELL). Faculty concerns arising from the evaluation process had suggested these students’ learning needs might not be being met as effectively as those of native English speakers. A number of actions have been taken to address these concerns. At the beginning of the Pre-Theology program, all students take a placement exam in English. Students who perform particularly poorly on the exam may be assigned additional language coursework prior to beginning other classes; most ELL students, however, receive individual tutoring simultaneously with their content studies. This tutoring may be provided by language faculty and/or by fellow students.

If a student in the MDiv program exhibits weakness in English language skills, as identified informally or during any of the existing modes of evaluation, that student is referred to the English faculty for assistance, which creates the opportunity for personally tailored support. Over the last years St. John’s has hired a very strong teaching staff with expertise in ELL, multiculturalism, and diversity education. The team saw clear evidence of the positive effects of their efforts.

Meanwhile, the library has invested in additional software to support ELL students and is working to strengthen its Spanish-language collection to provide more opportunity for students whose Spanish is stronger than their English to proceed in mastering content in their primary language. Internship placements are deliberately devised to provide immersion opportunities in

whichever language, Spanish or English, is weaker for the student (regardless of his native language, which may be neither of those) (CFR 2.13).

These actions are to be praised, as is the responsiveness of the academic leadership in investing in new faculty to teach English, which bring additional strength in the areas of learning theory and effective assignment design for ELL students (CFR 2.21). However, the team did not see evidence that faculty across the entire seminary have incorporated changes to their pedagogy. Such changes would presumably include the re-design of writing assignments and the approach to out-of-class reading, both of which are necessary given the diversity of learning styles and needs in a linguistically and culturally diverse student body. Rather, despite the best of intentions, there is a certain degree of improvisation, and much delegation to the one-on-one work of tutors and the language faculty, in securing for individual students the resources they may need.

The response to identified learning weaknesses in the MA degree program, as documented in the institutional report, has included the requirement that all MDiv students wishing to earn the additional MA must prepare a pre-exam one month prior to sitting for their comprehensive exam, and then review the results with a faculty member, who reads through their outlined answers to the set questions for the comprehensive exam. In the year in which this new requirement was introduced, it resulted in the voluntary withdrawal from the program of three of the seven students who had planned to take the comprehensive exam. The change addressed quality concerns in terms of outcomes, but not the structural and curricular weaknesses that contributed to the learning gaps of those students who found themselves unprepared.

Later, faculty members also reviewed their exam questions, eliminating those that were not in sync with the current learning objectives that are supposed to be measured by the exam. While these measures create better alignment between the exam, the readiness of those students taking it, and the program's learning objectives, they address only the exam stage. Further review and revision of the coursework will also be required to ensure that fewer students get as far as the pre-exam without having the requisite level of preparation (CFRs 2.3, 2.6, 4.3, 4.4).

With regard to the MDiv capstone exercise, the institution's key site for evaluation of how well students in the Seminary's prime degree program are meeting program learning outcomes, the institutional report documents a thorough and collective process for scoring students' performance. A clear rubric has been developed that articulates outcomes and levels of performance, and which is revised via student input for each capstone exercise. In this approach, developing the rubric itself becomes part of the learning experience and strengthens students' reflection. Among other outcomes, intercultural competence is intentionally incorporated into every capstone case study (CFR 1.4).

Some challenges remain with regard to the capstone exercise and student learning evaluation. There is some indication that this process functions more effectively for some students, and with regard to some outcomes, than for others. For example, the team noted the absence in the capstone scenarios of any opportunity to evaluate skill in Homiletics. The institution is aware of this issue and has responded by recently adding a separate review of a recorded homily for each student. Faculty articulated some frustration in this area, noting that evaluating the performance

of students who are more reticent and quiet during the group capstone exercise is particularly challenging.

The strongest evidence provided by the institution that student learning outcomes are being met may have been the CARA report, documenting both the professional success and the satisfaction of recent graduates of the MDiv program. This report provides strong indirect evidence, from both novice priests and their parishioners and supervisors, that graduates of St. John's have the skills, knowledge, and personal capacities to perform effectively the work for which the MDiv was designed to prepare them. The faculty and administration's careful consideration of this report, as documented in the institutional report, also led to revision of the curriculum to address areas of perceived need, with the addition of four leadership modules for third- and fourth-year seminarians (CFR 2.6).

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

The institutional report presents a clear definition and vision of student success that is appropriate and particular to the Seminary's mission and its role in preparing men for ordination as priests (CFR 1.1). For graduates of the MDiv program, data points and benchmarks for success are clearly defined, including for example the percentage of graduates who are ordained and who remain in the priesthood for at least five years after graduation. With regard to these benchmarks, the Seminary's published data are very strong, with 100% of graduates in the classes of 2010, 2011, and 2012 (the three most recently available data sets) having met this target (CFR 2.6). Timeliness of degree completion is also strong (CFRs 1.2, 1.6, 2.10).

The Seminary's definition of student success thoroughly integrates academic outcomes, professional skills, and the development of personal characteristics necessary to work in the priesthood. The institutional report describes how this integration is effectively supported by the programs of the institution. A program of pastoral formation and field study is incorporated into all MDiv students' education. Both MDiv and Pre-Theology students undertake field placements that are supplemented by a weekly oral debriefing discussion with a faculty member. These are followed, after two years of MDiv study, by a year-long internship in a parish, which again is integrated with structured reflection. One aspect of learning that the internship is specifically designed to strengthen is intercultural competence. Throughout the pre-degree and degree programs, students meet regularly with both a formation advisor and a spiritual director. Annual evaluations address all aspects of the student's progress, not focusing solely on academic achievement.

The institutional report notes that improvements to the development of particular professional skills have recently been made, in response to feedback gathered in the 2014 CARA report, which suggested students would benefit from more training in parish administration skills. Faculty accordingly redesigned the Pastoral Leadership course into a series of linked seminar-style modules addressing central aspects of administration (budgeting, personnel management, and the like).

The question of student retention and persistence to graduation, as marks of institutional effectiveness, is differently nuanced for St. John's Seminary than for many other institutions of higher education. One of the five components explicitly included in the Seminary's mission statement is discernment. This assumes that among the students who enroll in the Seminary, some will be assisted in reaching the successful outcome of discerning that their calling is not to ordination; in such instances, non-persistence to graduation can be considered a successful outcome. Thus, while the Seminary's rates of persistence and graduation in the MDiv are comparable to the national norm, as reported by the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA), the institution also pays attention to the success of non-completers by ensuring an active focus on, and tools to support, the process of discernment (CFR 2.13).

The team requested and reviewed additional data on those students who departed prior to graduation from both the Pre-Theology (pre-degree) program and the MDiv proper. This data showed that 30 of 44 students who left the institution between 2013 and 2017, or approximately 68%, withdrew as a result of "positive discernment." Similar data were not provided for the MAPM degree, which does not lead to ordination but is, rather, designed for laypeople serving in the Church; however, persistence and graduation rates in this program are also solid.

The institution's persistence and graduation data do not suggest a meaningful gap in achievement by race/ethnicity; however, the report acknowledges the possibility that language ability may be a factor in differential graduation rates. This is an important area for further study and data disaggregation.

Overall, the institution's capacity in terms of institutional research (IR) is limited by its small size, which means administrative staff must wear multiple hats and there is no dedicated IR staff. In addition, the small "n" of most data sets creates the potential for shifts from year to year that are statistically significant yet not especially meaningful. This makes qualitative program review all the more important (CFR 4.2).

The institutional report does not address how the Seminary is currently making use of the WSCUC Graduation Dashboard, or how it might do so in future.

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

Due to limited resources, the Academic Office also carries out the institutional research function. It collects data and attempts to decipher trends to assist in decision making. For example, the institution analyzed the dropout rates for students with the goal of lessening the attrition rate. Although valuable information was gleaned and action plans were formulated, through the process the seminary learned (CFR 4.2) that the methodology was inadequate and that the head of Institutional Research needs to collect and analyze data in a more systematic and deliberate way.

St. John's faculty and administrators delved into assessment practices with the goal of developing rubrics based on objective criteria (CFR 4.3). Because of the relatively small sample

size, statistical data were not always helpful. As a result, the faculty used a more qualitative approach to interpreting data through conversation and observation of students. Nonetheless, further effort should be made to hone in on a more robust assessment process that focuses on continuous program improvement.

As it moves into developing its role in the 21st century, St. John's is cognizant of the need to advance a vision that responds to the ever-changing higher education landscape. As the seminary develops and implements its strategic plan, it should be mindful of the need to have its budgeting processes and resource allocations driven by the strategic plan. Special attention should be given to the goal of replacing retiring faculty with well qualified new ones (CFRs 3.1-3.3). Further, the Finance Office should rely on more sophisticated and innovative management reports and assessment tools to aid in a more nimble decision-making process (CFRs 3.3, 3.5).

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

Under Standard 3 (Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability), St. John's Seminary effectively addressed WSCUC's CFRs, highlighting areas of strength and areas for improvement. It did so by connecting its mission to an improved financial position, particularly through its planned land sale and development project.

The seminary has successfully demonstrated progress in diversifying sources of revenue by increasing student enrollment, realizing the resultant revenue (CFR 3.4), and hiring an in-house development officer to manage fundraising activities, coordinate the annual gala, and increase the size of the seminary's Doheny Endowment. It has further improved its financial picture by relying less on drawing down from the endowment, reaching a low of 3.9% in fiscal 2017; it has also paid down its debt to the archdiocese. Additionally, it is obvious that the parent organization (the archdiocese) is committed to supporting the seminary financially and organizationally. Nonetheless, the seminary is urged to continue to assure that the operating expenses and revenues are balanced and that financial sustainability is maintained.

St. John's Seminary is poised to benefit significantly from the impending sale of excess land to Shea Developers. The Environmental Impact Report has been filed with the City of Camarillo and approval has been received for developing approximately 83 acres. The seminary could realize proceeds of up to \$25 million. According to the institution's self-study report, this windfall may "make the institution financially stable for the next fifty years." This is certainly true in terms of assuring sustainability, at least for the near future. The seminary has the challenge, however, of structuring a financial model that guarantees alignment of the revenue stream from investments of the new endowment to institutional priorities. The team recommends that an endowment policy be developed. Such policy should clearly identify the spending priorities, especially for student learning and success and overall educational effectiveness (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.3, 4.6).

The seminary's governing body is a well-qualified independent Board that exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, adherence to mission, and fiscal responsibility (CFR 3.9). Representatives of the Board possess expertise and commitment to the mission of the seminary. Members are particularly focused on the land development project and on their role in the seminary's long-term goals and aspiration for financial sustainability and mission accomplishment. Particularly, through the Finance Committee, the Board assures accountability by overseeing that an annual independent audit is conducted. The institution has had unqualified financial audits (CFR 3.4).

The visit team observed that the seminary has clear roles and lines of authority through a rector, chief academic officer, and chief financial officer. The leadership officers, supported by other qualified staff, are characterized by integrity and fiduciary responsibility to the seminary. The seminary receives significant financial and organizational support from its parent organization, the archdiocese of Los Angeles (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8). Such support is magnified by the pledge of \$10.0 million to the seminary for the purpose of building a new student dormitory through an archdiocese capital campaign.

The seminary has an involved and dedicated faculty. This is demonstrated by high morale among faculty, who stated in a meeting with the visit team that on a scale of 1-10, (1, low; 10, high) their morale is 9 to 9.5. Faculty members exercise effective academic leadership, influence the academic budget, assure academic quality and the fulfillment of the seminary's mission (CFR 3.1). According to the self-study, in 2014 faculty salaries were raised in order to achieve a more competitive position among other seminaries. During the 2008 financial crisis, St. John's Seminary responded to budget pressures by utilizing the "natural attrition of personnel through retirement and transfer." This led the Seminary to balance its budget by "tightening its belt."

The self-study report describes the formation of a Technology Committee that meets regularly to assess information technology needs, and the visit team was able to confirm this development in campus interviews. The information technology function is mostly outsourced, but adequate funding and sufficient input from stakeholders is assured to satisfying the seminary's essential technological needs (CFR 3.5).

In meeting with the Rector, CFO, and director of facilities, the Visit team was informed that the campus's deferred maintenance liability is approximately \$250,000. The team recommends that a campus master plan, informed by the strategic plan, be developed. The master plan should map out the new campus (after the sale of the surplus land), incorporate any new facilities, obtain the necessary entitlements from the City of Camarillo, and assess the current condition of the facilities. The master plan will serve as a long-term road map for the physical development of the campus (CFR 3.5). Once the assessment of the facilities is completed, a systematic plan should be developed for addressing the needed on-going maintenance through fundraising, institutional budgeting, or funding of depreciation.

In the staff meeting, the visit team noted that working conditions for staff could be improved. Some staff feel overworked and not always promptly informed of decisions, events, and news concerning the seminary. Almost everyone agreed that the custodial staff could use more help. Others reported mild dissatisfaction with the condition of some of the facilities (CFR 3.5).

Addressing the facilities through the assessment and a resulting plan of action, as described above, should alleviate the areas of dissatisfaction.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Visit team finds that St. John's Seminary prepared fully for the comprehensive review. The team perceived that the institution was seeking evidence and ideas for improvement and that, even during the visit, the faculty, staff, and executive team were coming up with new ideas and drawing conclusions about other ways that they could organize their work. The Recommendations that the team is forwarding on to the WSCUC Commissioners appear below. First, however, members of the Visit team want to emphasize a number of Commendations to the institution and its personnel, which rose to the surface in our preparation for the visit and during the visit.

Commendations

The Visit Team commends St. John's Seminary in particular for the following:

1. Clarity of purpose and function of the MDiv degree, which is effectively integrated with the demands of ordained ministry.
2. Strengthening the human development component in the institution's programs, including developing students' capacities for leadership, budget management, and personnel management.
3. Engaging CARA data from the first five years after a student's graduation. The institution is acquiring significant qualitative data about its graduates from laypeople and clergy, as well as information from the new priests about their personal levels of satisfaction.
4. Strong faculty support for developing rubrics for the academic programs and procedures for assessing program learning outcomes. In particular, the faculty and administration show a commitment to collecting data and using it for program improvement.
5. Diversifying sources of financial support and increasing enrollment and philanthropic efforts, providing additional resources for operations.
6. An exceptionally strong sense of commitment, community, and common purpose among the faculty, and between faculty and administration. The academic leadership is widely respected and credited for its contribution to an increasing emphasis on quality.
7. Drawing on the Catholic intellectual tradition to offer an integrated curriculum that affords graduates a strong basis for holistic ministry.

Recommendations

The Visit Team recommends that the institution respond to the following issues:

1. Complete the approval, implementation, and assessment of MDiv program learning outcomes. (CFR 1.2, 2.3)
2. Align individual course learning outcomes with MDiv program learning outcomes, collect evidence of student performance, and revise curriculum in response. (CFR 2.7, 2.10, 4.1)
3. Formulate measurable learning outcomes for the pre-theology program and a curriculum map that indicates alignment across these courses. (CFR 2.6)
4. Incorporate issues of cultural context and intercultural competence in classroom pedagogy and course content, for example in systematic and historical courses, in addition to the current focus on these skills in field placements and internships. (CFR 1.4)
5. Develop peer observation and other forms of collegial support for continuing pedagogical improvement, as well as administrative support for faculty development. (CFR 3.3)
6. Strengthen shared governance, including consultation in the areas of faculty hiring, academic budgeting, and academic strategic planning. (CFR 3.10, 4.6) Formally approve and implement a current faculty handbook containing faculty policies and procedures. (CFR 3.2)
7. Develop a campus master plan that supports the strategic plan, based on an assessment of the condition of the current facilities and on plans for future development of the campus. (CFR 3.5)
8. Develop an endowment policy that clearly identifies spending priorities and appropriate uses of investment returns. (CFR 1.7, 3.4)

APPENDICES

A. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

The IEEI review showed that St. John's Seminary has developed and published formal learning outcomes for each degree program. At the institutional level, the seminary collects data about the programs by means of annual reviews of each student's progress, the four Capstone experiences, as well as by public presentations of MA theses and MAPM integration papers and projects.

The MA and MAPM Committee studied the objectives for its two programs in the 2016 – 2017 school year. The committee found that the goal of publishing learning outcomes was a first step. The next step is their review and revision in light of student achievement and institutional needs. The faculty is committed to that next step for increasing the quality of the program and individual instruction.

The team also learned, however, that the MA program, which is an option for MDiv candidates to complete simultaneously, has relatively few participants. The team further learned that the MAPM program has a very small number and may be moved off the campus entirely. The Seminary intends to focus its efforts instead on candidates for the MDiv degree.

The team confirmed that the PLOs are published. The team also met with faculty involved in assessment. The team recognized a faculty commitment to assessment and continuous improvement (CFR 4.3). Developing expertise in these areas is especially important in light of the growth in enrollment, the diversity of the student population, and the number of English language learners, some of whom struggle in the two-year pre-theology program. That program was recently revamped in response to analyses of the capstone exercises (CFR 4.1). The survey of the history of philosophy was reduced to give more time to topical philosophical courses that provide intellectual tools for the study of contextual theology in the later years. The Pre-Theology program was also converted from pass/fail to graded courses in order to improve student engagement (CFR 4.3). Even though the Pre-Theology program is not a formal degree program, the team recommends that measurable learning outcomes for the program be formulated and a curriculum map be designed to strengthen alignment across these courses.

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WASCUC 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, teams complete these four forms and add them as an appendix to the Team Report. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations, WASCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

(i) It reviews the institution's-

(A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

(B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

(ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than —

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? P. 68 of St. John's Seminary Handbook
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	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)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? n/a
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	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) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 2
	What kinds of courses? Internships
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Pastoral Studies
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? Three
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Professional and Academic Graduate Degrees in Theology
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Master of Divinity, Master of Arts Theology, Master of Pastoral Ministry
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Philip Clayton

Date: May 10, 2018

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Comments:
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Comments:
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Philip Clayton

Date: May 10, 2018

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☛ YES ☐ NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Saint John's Seminary Student Handbook, Appendix A; as well as St. John's Seminary 2016-2018 Catalog, p. 64.
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☛ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: A student submits a grievance report to the grievance officer, and on the merits of the report, it is submitted to the President/Rector who convenes a Grievance Board within ten days before which a hearing is conducted in accordance with Appendix A of the Saint John's Seminary Student Handbook.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☛ YES ☐ NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☛ YES ☐ NO If so, where? The President/Rector's Office
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☛ YES ☐ NO If so, please describe briefly: Directors of various areas of formation are convened weekly and discuss among other things, student complaints so that they are addressed before the formal grievance procedure needs to be invoked by a student or group of students.
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Philip Clayton

Date: May 10, 2018

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO If so, where? St. John’s Seminary 2016-2018 Catalog, p. 68.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="radio"/> YES <input type="radio"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Philip Clayton

Date: May 10, 2018