

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Scripps Research Institute

Accreditation Visit September 17-19, 2019

Team Roster:

Don Straney, Chair
Vice President of Academic Planning and Policy, University of Hawaii System
Kathi A. Ketcheson, Assistant Chair
Director, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, Portland State University
Cyd Jenefsky
Vice Provost, Strategy and Educational Effectiveness
University of the Pacific
Harold Hewitt
Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer
Chapman University
Steven Casper
Dean, School of Applied Life Sciences
Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences

Richard Osborn, Vice President
WSCUC Staff Liaison

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

	PAGE
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	2
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	2
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	3
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	4
SECTION II - EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	4
A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions.....	4
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	6
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of degrees	13
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation	16
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	18
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence	19
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment.....	22
H. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement.....	24
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	25
APPENDIX	28
A. Federal Compliance Forms	28
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review	28
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....	30
3. Student Complaints Review	31
4. Transfer Credit Policy Review	32
B. Off-Campus Location Review	33

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

The Scripps Research Institute (TSRI) is an internationally renowned nonprofit biomedical research institute with campuses in La Jolla, California, and Jupiter, Florida. Its vision is to “advance scientific understanding, educate the scientist of tomorrow, and impact human health across the globe.” Founded in 1924 as the Scripps Metabolic Clinic, TSRI enrolled 287 students in its graduate program in fall 2017, 227 on the California campus and 60 on the Florida campus. Governance of TSRI is carried out by the board of directors’ governance committee, which includes the president/chief executive officer. Institutional leaders include a chief operating officer, three executive vice presidents, one vice president, and a chief financial officer. There are five academic departments: Chemistry, Immunology and Microbiology, Integrative Structural and Computational Biology, Neuroscience, and Molecular Medicine. In 2003, TSRI expanded its operations into Palm Beach County, Florida, founding a new campus dedicated to basic biomedical science, drug discovery, and technology development. TSRI also has developed a collaboration with the California Institute for Biomedical Research (Calibr) and the Scripps Research Translational Institute (SRTI) to create a new biomedical research entity.

The Scripps Research Graduate Program was first accredited in 1993, and also it graduated its first student that year. In June 2009, the WASC Senior Commission accepted the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) report and scheduled the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) for fall 2010. On February 18, 2011, the Commission received the EER report and reaffirmed accreditation for nine years. The next CPR was scheduled for fall 2019, with an EER visit in spring 2021. The Commission’s 2011 Action Letter also requested an interim report to be submitted in spring 2014 that would address strategic planning, program review, assessment of student learning, and efforts to improve diversity.

In 2012, the CPR and EER were changed to an Offsite Review (OSR) and Accreditation Visit (AV), following a new WASC accreditation process. In 2013, an OSR was scheduled for spring 2019 and a visit in fall 2019. To meet the new accreditation guidelines, the Mid-Cycle Review was scheduled for spring 2016. In 2014, the Interim Report Committee Action received the requested Interim Report and also requested a Progress Report for November 2016 that would include a strategic plan.

The OSR took place on February 5, 2019, and the AV from September 16-19, 2019. A separate visit to the Florida campus took place by visiting team member August 28-29, 2019.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

During the OSR, the team reviewed the self-study and supporting materials provided by TSRI, including copies of campus policies and reports, and documents required by WSCUC for the accreditation process. Following the day-long discussion, the team prepared Lines of Inquiry that formed the basis for the Accreditation Visit in September 2019. The team chair presented the Lines of Inquiry to the TSRI self-study team, via teleconferencing. Requests for additional documentation, including course syllabi, financial documents, and completed Federal Compliance forms were made via email to the TSRI Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO).

During the visit in September, the team met with the board of directors, faculty, administrators, and students regarding the Lines of Inquiry developed during the OSR and components of the review. Individual meetings were held with the TSRI president, executive vice president of research and academic affairs, chief finance officer, chief operating officer, vice president of philanthropy and community engagement, and director of the graduate school, who is also the ALO. There were two open meetings with students and two faculty meetings, including a conversation with women faculty to discuss diversity and climate issues, and meetings with a variety of student, faculty, staff, and self-study committees. The team developed commendations and recommendations that were delivered to the campus on the final day of the visit.

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

TSRI provided a thorough and well-documented self-study report. The report's discussion of student learning, achievement, and assessment was strong and demonstrated substantial progress in program review and rubric-based assessment since the 2011 Commission Action Letter. Information provided on the mission and organization of TSRI was useful for understanding its unique nature. Responses to previous commission actions demonstrated responsiveness to suggestions for improvement. Faculty and students were involved in preparing the report. The report included the results of external reviews of the Graduate Program on both campuses conducted in December 2017, which provided perspective on program developments since the 2011 Commission Action Letter.

The team requested additional details on several aspects of the report, and identified Lines of Inquiry for the site visit in the areas of diversity and climate, assessment, planning, support for student learning, career planning, and progress on the integration of the doctoral program at the two campuses (California and Florida). The report presented useful factual information, but the team sought to obtain more information on how TSRI supported effective learning and student development. It also was interested in learning more about the institution's responses to recent climate surveys and its work to further diversity goals. The team also noted a lack of sufficient financial information in the report; however, this information was provided in time for the visit.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

In its review of the self-study and supporting documents, the team found that TSRI had been responsive to previous Commission actions, specifically to the 2011 Commission Action Letter, which contained four recommendations: 1) develop a strategic plan that identified priorities, future direction, and alignment of academic, personnel, physical, and technological needs; 2) implement program review on a regular schedule; 3) clarify assessment rubrics and share results with students; and 4) show

leadership in increasing diversity among students and faculty. The Commission accepted the interim report on these recommendations in 2014 and commended TSRI for its approach. (CFR 1.8.)

The Commission requested a Progress Report in 2016 to include a strategic plan for both the Institute and the Graduate Program. This document was provided as Appendix 1-5 to the institutional report. In addition, TSRI began an enhanced, annual program review process in 2014, followed by an external program review every three to five years, for each campus. The process was documented in Appendices 1-11, 1-12, and 1-13 of the institutional report. Composition and procedures for the Assessment Committee were revisited, rubrics for assessing student work were revised, and the Graduate Office updated the curricular map, ensuring that all course syllabi include learning outcomes or core competencies: this work was documented in Appendix 4-1 and 4.2. Lastly, TSRI developed a multi-year, multi-phased initiative to increase faculty and student diversity and inclusion, including initiatives implemented by the Graduate School to attract and retain a diverse group of students.

The team noted that progress had continued in the areas requested by the Commission. The assessment and curriculum committees were active, examining and refining the effectiveness of rubrics for evaluating student progress and conducting detailed, ongoing evaluation of courses and the curriculum. At the time of the visit, TSRI was making progress in recruiting a diverse faculty and student body. Although the team noted that more should be done in this area, it was clear that the leadership had taken the issue seriously and had put recruiting and support mechanism in place to support increased diversity.

Most evident during the site visit was how clearly the institution's strategic vision informed the work of faculty and staff. Students, faculty, staff, leadership, and members of the board shared an understanding of where the institution was heading, the challenges it must face, and the steps being taking to achieve its goals. (CFR 1.1.) The team felt that the committees it met with understood the institution's direction and were motivated by a shared sense of purpose. Specific initiatives, such as the

campaign to endow graduate fellowships, provided concrete examples that reinforced the institution's goals.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining institutional purpose and ensuring educational objectives. In its review, the team found that the educational goals of the Graduate Program were evident in the structure of the curriculum, the evaluation of student achievement, the program learning outcomes (PLOs), and the quality and character of services to support students' academic and professional growth. There was evidence that students develop and master skills in research, critical thinking, scientific communication, and professional development, demonstrating mastery of these skills in coursework, laboratory research, and publications. TSRI published its student retention and graduation rates, as well as the research accomplishments of the students. (CFR 1.2.) Published policies of academic freedom and expectations of research conduct underpinned the program. (CFR 1.3.)

The requirements of the doctoral program were published, and new students received an orientation to the program at the beginning of their studies. Grading policies, grievance procedures, institutional research review procedures, and equal opportunity and non-discrimination policies were clearly defined in the Student Handbook and reiterated in course syllabi, as appropriate. There was a complaint process in place. (CFR 1.6, 1.7.)

As an institution dependent on federal research funding, TSRI maintained rigorous and transparent business practices. The team found that financial statements were prepared annually and were independently audited and determined that the institution has been transparent and open with its accrediting agency, communicating in a timely fashion when changes in organizational structure or curricula were considered.

The team noted the institution's efforts in increasing the diversity of its faculty and students. It had a clear policy on diversity and had established new offices to assist in recruiting and sustaining students from diverse backgrounds. Enhanced co-curricular support for students and active outreach efforts were signs of commitment to increase the number of underrepresented groups among its students, graduates, and faculty. TSRI recognized that, despite its progress in this area, it has more work to do. (CFR 1.4.)

Standard 2: Achieving educational objectives through core functions. A large, full-time program, the Doctorate in Chemical and Biological Sciences enrolled over 300 students in California and Florida. Researchers serve as voluntary teaching faculty for the PhD program. Over 150 faculty were participating in the program at the time of the review, ensuring that adequate faculty existed to teach courses and supervise PhD dissertations across both campuses. (CFR 2.1.) The team found that the doctoral program had clear entry requirements and well-defined learning outcomes (CFR 2.2) and a well-defined, cumulative structure, starting with coursework and progressing through laboratory-oriented research and a multi-year capstone PhD project. (CFR 2.2.) Program requirements, academic policies, learning outcomes, and course descriptions were available on the TSRI web-site and were well-organized and easily accessible. (CFR 2.3.) Course syllabi were found to have clearly stated learning outcomes, which mapped to broader program learning outcomes and taught at an advanced, graduate level. Syllabi also contained clear information about assessment of student learning in each course. Interviews with faculty demonstrated that formative assessment was widely used in advance of final exams and other forms of summative assessment. Some examples of formative assessment included homework, in-class problem solving, and 'journal club' presentations.

TSRI demonstrated a clear commitment to evidence-based assessment. (CFR 2.4.) It invested in a Graduate Office with expertise in assessment, which helped coordinate faculty assessment activities. Faculty were involved in the assessment of student learning at the program and course levels. Teams of

faculty regularly reviewed the curriculum and used evidence of student learning to develop strategies for program improvement. (CFR 2.4.) The doctoral program provided opportunities to apply foundational knowledge within challenging laboratory-based research projects. Faculty advisors and dissertation committees regularly met with students and provided feedback on progress, which was then followed-up by discussions and guidance from staff in the Graduate School. (CFR 2.5.)

Summative assessment, in the form of each student's PhD thesis, was linked to program learning outcomes and externally validated through peer reviewed journal publications. While publications were not required to graduate, a widely held norm with the program focused on publication as an indicator that the student was ready to graduate. Graduates averaged over five publications, a strong indicator that the program was achieving its overarching mission of preparing scientists. (CFR 2.6.) In addition to graded assessments of coursework, rubrics designed to track the mastery of program learning outcomes were regularly used in conjunction with formative assessments (the thesis proposal and regular advisory committee meetings over the four to five year period over which each student conducted thesis research in a laboratory). Graduate Office staff worked with faculty to systematically collect evidence of student learning. The visiting team found no major differences in either expectations surrounding student achievement (e.g. the need to publish), nor in how assessment activities were carried out across the Florida and California campuses.

Program review was in the process of becoming institutionalized at TSRI. The institution had created a strong internal program review process implemented at both the California and Florida campuses. (CFR 2.7.) The team suggested that TSRI continue to refine and strengthen program review processes and implement processes of co-curricular program review.

The team found little or no tension between research and teaching among the faculty. While teaching was voluntary, clear expectations existed, and student evaluations were systematically implemented to help create feedback loops surrounding faculty teaching effectiveness. (CFR 2.8, 2.9.)

Retention and graduation rates for TSRI PhD students averaged between 80 and 90 percent over the most recent five years, with no major differences across the Florida and California campuses. While the Graduate Office had not collected systematic retention and graduate data from other, similar elite graduate programs, retention and graduate rates were high and demonstrated a strong commitment to student success. (CFR 2.10.) In addition to supporting student clubs and wellness initiatives, TSRI offered a strong co-curricular program oriented towards professional development. (CFR 2.11.) Program course requirements were clearly communicated to students through the web-site. (CFR 2.12.) The Graduate Office provided support for students in need, with an emphasis on supporting program progress and career development. TSRI also invested in student counseling services and provided health insurance benefits to all PhD students. (CFR 2.13.) Assessment of co-curricular programs was under development at the time of the visit. At the time of the review, TSRI accepts transfer students into the doctoral program. (CFR 2.14.)

Standard 3: Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure quality and sustainability. TSRI President Schultz had established an effective working relationship with the Faculty Planning Committee relatively early in his tenure. The team met with the committee and learned about plans to hire five to seven new faculty members in the near future: this followed a period of limited hiring. While the Graduate Program had been subjected to financial constraints stemming from changes in federal research funding—something which affected the Institute as a whole—the committee expressed optimism regarding the future of graduate program academic support (CFR 3.1) and the anticipated benefits to teaching and collaboration that new faculty colleagues would bring.

The committee explained that the Graduate Program structure was consistent with the leading research programs nationally, and faculty resources available to support graduate students had remained appropriate and sufficient, despite the leveling off of federal research funds. (CFR 3.1.) This leveling is in contrast to other similar institutions which have been experiencing a reduction in federal

research funds. This assessment was affirmed by the students themselves in each of two open student forums held with the team during its visit.

The team found that TSRI had become financially stable by diversifying its revenue and maintaining a consistently high level of federal research funding, despite the changing federal environment. Audited financial statements showed positive trends in total revenue from the past four fiscal years, and interim unaudited financial statements for fiscal 2019 showed that the positive trends were continuing. However, the institution, including the Graduate Program, had operated with deficits over the past three years.

The Graduate Program had been managed so that expenses over the past three completed fiscal years were plus or minus 2.5% of budget, and all expenses after tuition for the first-year class were covered by research labs. In other words, the Graduate Program had no shown deficits in prior years. (CFR 3.4.) Furthermore, the team noted progress with the endowment campaign for the Graduate Program, another key tactic in diversifying revenue streams supporting the program.

TSRI's graduate program finances are unique, when compared to other institutions. The team received multi-year budget versus actual expense reports for the stand-alone graduate program and future budgets, but revenues were not tracked or displayed in a manner typical for most colleges and universities. The evidence on which the team based its conclusion that TSRI was stable and sustainable was the audited financial statements' record of positively trending research revenue through a challenging period in federal research funding. In general, TSRI provided technological resources, training, and services sufficient to meet its goals. (CFR 3.5.)

The team found evidence in its meetings with the president, the chief financial officer, and board representatives that TSRI operated with integrity, accountability, and clear decision processes

consistent with its mission and its standards. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9.) The team noted the president's leadership and the renewed vitality and engagement of board members in support of the Graduate Program. In particular, the board's leadership of the endowment campaign marked an important step forward for the program.

Standard 4: Creating an organization committed to quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement. The Graduate School demonstrated good progress in institutionalizing academic quality assurance processes. The institutional report provided sufficient data to support a culture of evidenced-based improvements. (CFR 4.1.) This included annual review of data on academic and non-academic programs at a bicoastal meeting followed by dissemination of an annual report; an external review every three years; development of rubrics and tracking student attainment of knowledge and skills across the program; and use of results from program review and assessment of learning outcomes for ongoing improvements in academic courses and co-curricular programs and services. The Graduate School had also formed discipline-specific faculty sub-committees to systematically and elaborately review its courses for currency, overlap, balance of pedagogical methods, coverage of program learning outcomes, and responsiveness to student needs. (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5.)

Evidence of faculty and Graduate School responsiveness to student needs was reflected in the evolution of students' Individual Development Plans (IDP), an annual report on student progress. As indicated in the report—and echoed in conversations with students, deans and the director of the Graduate School—use of the IDP was inconsistent both in its actual use by faculty advisors and in the committee's application of rubrics to evaluate student progress. A recent policy making use of the IDP mandatory, combined with insertion of staff support in the annual meetings, has strengthened the consistency and utility of the IDP process for students. This shift was confirmed in multiple conversations with deans, faculty, Graduate School staff, and students. (CFR 4.4.)

The Graduate School used multiple database platforms to capture, track, report, and analyze data on admissions, enrollment, student progress on key components of the Graduate Program, as well as various dimensions of student success, including attainment of learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates, and publications. Data on various quality indicators were disseminated regularly and used for ongoing improvement in the academic and co-curricular programs. Future enhancements identified included expansion of alumni data; addition of data on faculty participation in the program; and a comprehensive data clean-up project to improve accessibility and usability of data. At the time of the visit, TSRI had adopted Tableau, a data visualization software. The institutional research capacity for the Graduate School was strong.

The Graduate School provided evidence of ongoing adaptation to meet evolving needs of students in doctoral programs. (CFR 4.7.) Examples included adding new professional development opportunities to prepare students for non-academic jobs; enhancing student support and wellness services; and regularly updating courses as biomedical disciplines and student pedagogical demands evolve. The institutional report identified key issues in the changing higher education environment that have had particular impact on TSRI: adapting admissions policies to diversify the student body; Title IX compliance; sexual harassment within the academic profession; and creating a safety net for students with and food and housing insecurity. While the report provided no reflective analyses of how these issues impacted TSRI, nor evidence of addressing these changes, the team found clear evidence of responsiveness to the first three issues, as discussed elsewhere in this report.

TSRI also provided evidence of responsiveness to a changing higher education environment, especially to the increasing challenges of funding basic research. (CFR 4.7.) It had created a strategic alliance with two other organizations to create a through-line from basic biomedical research: TSRI, where the Graduate Program is housed, to drug discovery (Calibr), to clinical application (Scripps Research Translational Institute). This new partnership was designed to “reduce the costs and timelines

associated with the crucial early stages of drug development, and lead to the creation of a self-sustaining model for non-profit research in which drug development successes drive the funding of new scientific discoveries and medicines.”

The team found that TSRI is in compliance with all four Standards, subject to the independent judgment of the WSCUC Commission.

Institutional Effectiveness Indicators. TSRI provided a completed review of the institutional effectiveness indicators. As described in the institutional report, issues of faculty and staff diversity, assessment of co-curricular programs, and evaluation of faculty were given the highest priority, followed by provision of information on academic requirements, student support services, faculty and staff diversity, financial stability, and assessment. Through its review of the institutional report and campus visit, the team found that TSRI was addressing these issues and was continuing to make improvement.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degree

The team found TSRI to be a mission-oriented institution, dedicated to “the creation of basic knowledge in the biosciences for medical application and the betterment of human health.” The goal of the PhD program followed directly from this mission, focusing on the education of the next generation of scientists capable of producing advances in biomedical research.

The PhD program at TSRI had a well-defined structure that was aligned with the goal of educating biomedical scientists. Program learning outcomes emphasized skill development, focusing on four areas: research, critical thinking, scientific communication, and professional development. Much of the program emphasized the development of research skills. The first year consisted primarily of coursework, aimed at educating students in interdisciplinary knowledge in biology and chemistry needed in order to conduct original research. The remainder of the program consisted of multiple years of direct research experience in the laboratory of a TSRI faculty member. Critical thinking skills were developed primarily through the process of designing and defending research within the Scripps

scientific community, and within thesis committee meetings. Scientific communication was developed through internal and external presentations. Professional development was taught through several elective courses, as well as through workshop, speaker events, and other activities organized through the Graduate Office.

The team noted that TSRI employed systematic mapping of the development and mastery of learning outcomes across courses and doctoral dissertation research, and that faculty used rubrics to assess learning across the program. To ensure that rubrics were completed, Graduate Office staff attended all PhD student advisory committee meetings and worked with faculty to ensure completion. Graduate Office staff also took notes summarizing decisions and action plans developed at PhD student advisory committee meetings. Faculty and staff commented that this process helped improve the transparency of the Advisory Committee's work and reduced misunderstandings regarding the outcome of meetings. Quality assurance processes helped ensure the quality of the doctoral degree. These included program reviews held at both campuses, and on-going reviews of the curriculum and individual courses through meetings and workshops organized by faculty committees, with support by the Graduate Office.

External indicators were used to validate the quality of TSRI degrees. *US News and World Report* consistently ranked the TSRI PhD program within the top 10 nationally, in both chemistry and biology. Peer reviewed publications were an especially important indicator of quality within a science-oriented PhD program. While comparisons with other institutions were not provided, the five peer reviewed articles per graduate appeared to the team to be a very high average number of publications, validating the quality of the program. The data also suggested that nearly all graduates publish. While the data on publications was strong, additional bibliometric research could examine the impact factor of each publication (a measure of journal quality) and examine the number of publications in which the PhD student was the first author (an important indicator helping to show that the student was a primary

contributor to the research being presented). Nevertheless, TSRI demonstrated that the overall quality of its PhD degree was outstanding.

As scientific discovery is a fundamental aim of most pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies, employment of TSRI graduates in these companies was well-aligned with the goals of the program. However, the self-study noted that professional development activities do not adequately prepare students for what should be considered the dominant career track of conducting research for industry out of the program. Interviews with faculty at both campuses demonstrated a wide acceptance across faculty that it was important to prepare TSRI graduate students for variety of careers.

There was debate among faculty, however, as to the best strategy to accomplish this goal. Some faculty were in favor of developing extensive professional development programs to help prepare students for jobs in industry (and a course in this area was recently launched), and a few faculty favored letting students complete short internships with companies. Other faculty argued that world-class research publications were the best indicator of student potential. These faculty noted that prominent companies regularly recruited on both the Florida and California campuses and when doing so, prioritized research prowess. In summary, the visiting team recognized that TSRI faculty supported a variety of career outcomes for students, took steps to broaden professional development opportunities, and engaged in a healthy debate over the best strategy to accomplish professional development goals of students.

In summary, the team felt that meaning of the degree was well-articulated and well-aligned with the overarching mission of TSRI. The institution had taken major strides to ensure that the integrity of the degree was high. Staff and faculty worked in partnership to regularly capture data on student learning, and used this information to improve the quality of its educational programs. Finally, outcomes of the degree were strong, as seen in graduate rates, external validation through publication, and career success of graduates.

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Overall, the team noted that TSRI exceeded minimum standards for assessing and demonstrating student learning. Students were expected to master the PLOs through a combination of five components of the PhD program: coursework, research, advisory committees, co-curricular activities, and dissertation defense. Students customized degree coursework according to individual research interests in various bio-chemical specialties, participated in one to two lab rotations early in the program, and then spent the majority of the program conducting thesis research in a faculty mentor's lab. The Graduate School closely tracked student progression through the degree, provided complementary activities to support students' professional and academic development, and provided ongoing advising to support progression and intervene for remediation when needed. (CFR 2.10.)

The Graduate School tracked longitudinal achievement of three PLOs (research skills, oral presentation skills, scientific writing skills) through rubrics used by the student's advisory committee at various stages in the PhD program. Summary analysis of 10 years of student results indicated steady progress in student demonstration of these skills as they moved through the program. The deans and Graduate Office systematically reviewed student results and committee recommendations at each stage, communicated the results and next steps to each student, and connected students to additional resources if needed to support their progress. (CFR 2.5, 2.12.)

Students addressed the final PLO, professional development skills, in co-curricular programming delivered and assessed by the Graduate School in partnership with the Career and Postdoctoral Services Offices and the Professional Skills Development Committee. (CFR 2.6, 2.11, 4.3.) This included activities such as journal clubs, seminars, scientific conferences, and an annual graduate student symposium. In these activities students had opportunities to exchange ideas outside of the lab settings and improve oral communication and writing skills critical for professional success.

The Career and Postdoctoral Services Office also provided a range of career-related support services, including career counseling, funding opportunities, proposal writing resources, peer editing, and review. Also, the office sponsored approximately 50 programs each year on topics such as academic job search, fellowship and grant writing, oral presentation, practice interview sessions, careers outside of laboratories, transitioning to industry, and a two-day Laboratory Management and Leadership Symposium. The co-curricular dimensions of the program were carefully mapped to PLOs, assessed, and monitored for ongoing improvement. Future plans for progress in assessment of student learning included working with faculty to revise the PLOs to scaffold student learning across courses in the program. (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 4.1.)

In addition to tracking student achievement of PLOs, the Graduate School tracked graduate student publications and citations, students' external fellowships, and career outcomes. (CFR 2.6.) Students were required to generate peer-reviewed research. While students were fully supported by the labs in which they worked, they were also encouraged to apply for external fellowships. The majority of fellowships were with NSF and NIH, with a few placements in research agencies and private industries. The Graduate School had recently begun tracking career outcomes data. These data indicated that the greatest number of alumni worked in pharmaceutical, biotech, or other for-profit industries.

There was consistent and strong evidence of outstanding student achievement of the educational goals of the institution and student praise for the quality of academic support they received. Improvement was needed in the overall quality of the learning experience. Students emphasized, in particular, a need for more community-building between students outside the lab, including a desirable student-only gathering place; more variety in engagement between students and faculty, also outside the lab; improvements in the technology and pedagogy in the bicoastal learning experience; and improvement in interpersonal communication within the lab, most notably in chemistry and biophysics.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

TSRI's recruiting and admissions process was well-designed to identify and attract students who were well-prepared to take advantage of and succeed in the opportunities the doctoral program offers. Through application materials such as a research statement, in-person multi-day visits to the campus, and discussions with faculty and current students the program was able to identify and recruit students whose academic background, research interests, and career aspirations match the educational objectives of the doctoral program. The careful and interactive admissions process contributed importantly to students' ability to succeed at TSRI, Admissions rates averaged between 30% and 40% and yield rates varied between 20% and 30%. Coupled with a first-year retention rates of 96%, these figures indicated a selective match between students and the program.

Students received evaluations from faculty at advisory committee meetings, providing feedback to the students in a timely fashion. Academic support, such as mentors for first-year students, teaching assistants, and programs offered by the Graduate Office supported student progress towards graduation. The existence of a terminal master's degree provided students who chose to leave the program with a degree reflecting work they had done while at TSRI. The expectation that students published results of their research early reinforced the learning outcome of scientific communication.

Cohort retention, graduation rates, and time-to-degree were roughly similar across race/ethnicity and gender. There were differences, though of up to 10% in some years between minority students and others. Although the cohort size was small, the team suggested that this was an area where additional in-depth study and reflection by the Graduate Office and the dean should be conducted.

The Graduate Office offered community-building activities throughout the year and collaborated with Counseling and Psychological services to assist students with work-life balance. There was a

graduate student council at both campuses, which conducted a yearly survey of student satisfaction to supplement other forms of evaluation of the co-curricular programs. The councils were instrumental in initiating sexual harassment policy and increasing graduate student membership on program committees,

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

As mentioned previously, the Graduate School had made good progress in institutionalizing academic quality assurance processes. These included annual review of academic and non-academic program data at annual bicoastal faculty meetings; robust external reviews every three years on both campuses; cyclical faculty evaluation of course currency, pedagogical methods, coverage of PLOs, and responsiveness to student requests; annual assessment of PLOs; and systematic use of results for ongoing improvements in academic courses, co-curricular programs, and student services. The Graduate School had clearly established a culture of iterative evaluation and use of results for ongoing quality improvements in the PhD program and its student support programs and services. (CFR 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5.)

The program review process had improved considerably since the last reaffirmation of accreditation. At the time of the visit, the Graduate School demonstrated exemplary practice in program review. This included annual analysis and reporting on program data on a variety of quality indicators, accompanied by a bicoastal faculty discussion of this analysis every summer. An annual action plan was implemented and progress evaluated the subsequent year. Every three to five years, an external review was conducted on each campus, followed by a long-term action plan tied to budget. Programs demonstrated evidence of using the results of the process. The internal quality review processes were course-focused, while external review evaluated programs holistically. The team suggested that the

Graduate School consider a similar holistic approach for its internal process in order to integrate students' experience of the program as a whole. (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.2.)

The faculty process for cyclical review of courses was extensive and included broad faculty participation in disciplinary curriculum sub-committees, as well a curriculum committee, a joint body of faculty, students and administrators. The disciplinary sub-committee reviews focused on a variety of dimensions of curricular delivery, such as breadth of coverage, currency, scaffolding, duplication/efficiency, bicoastal integration of teaching and other resources, pedagogical variety, and student feedback and outcomes. The institutional report included evidence of using the results of these reviews. The Curriculum Committee had responsibility for overseeing the curricular review process, new course approval, course alignment with program learning outcomes, use and improvement of teaching evaluations, evaluation and implementation of new pedagogy, and the use of technology in the classroom.

Ongoing evaluation of teaching quality included review of student evaluations, individual course reviews by disciplinary sub-committees, and direct observation and feedback from course directors. Future improvements identified by the Curriculum Committee included increasing ethnic and gender diversity of course directors, continuing to improve the culture of teaching, and improving student evaluations and feedback to students. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5.)

In order to provide students on both campuses with expanded and equitable learning opportunities, TSRI increased the availability of distance learning through bicoastal courses and the addition of guest lecturers from other research universities to address topics not covered by faculty available in the Graduate School. TSRI also had increased the number of bicoastal courses taught by faculty on the Florida campus to match the proportion of the student body located on that campus. It was unclear whether the Graduate School evaluated distance learning pedagogy, or disaggregated learning data to assess how quality and satisfaction compare between those learning at a distance and

those face-to-face. While acknowledging recent improvements in technology used in the courses, students indicated more improvements were needed in technology, facility with its use, and in pedagogical approaches used in distance learning.

The Graduate School also regularly assessed co-curricular programs and used the results for improvements. It also reevaluated whether changes were successful. The institutional report included extensive evidence of the review of professional skills-development curriculum. These applied courses covered a range of skills needed for students' academic and professional success, including research-related skills, leadership, mentoring, networking, teamwork, scientific writing, career development, oral communication, perseverance, goal setting, and resilience. The offerings were adapted and expanded over time in response to student demand, assessment results, and national trends of incorporating professional development into graduate education. (CFR 2.11, 2.13.)

The director of the Graduate School also served as the director of Institutional Research (IR). The IR office, which comprised the director and one data analyst/programmer, provided data analysis and reporting on admissions and enrollment trends, student progress and achievement, and alumni placement and professional achievements. A recent advance in the use of data for decision making at the program level, as well as by faculty, was the development of dashboards containing both program and student-level data. At the time of the visit, IR had begun piloting the dashboards with a small group of departments to refine and enhance the data displays before launching them more broadly. Institutional data were provided to the president and leadership, and the team noted some evidence of its use in planning, budgeting, and decision making.

Commensurate with the relatively small enrollment in the Graduate School, TSRI used a home-grown student information system. The two-person IR office entered, verified, analyzed, and reported all student data to the campus. Recent adoption of the data visualization tool, Tableau, helped provide this information in useable and more easily accessible formats. In its meeting with the director and

research analyst, the team noted the IR staff's clear commitment to meeting the data needs of the campus. Broader use of data was supported by TSRI's leadership.

The team noted that the learning environment had been evaluated with a climate survey, along with additional data collected by the ombudsperson. It saw evidence of progress in responding to survey findings of sexual harassment, bias, and discrimination. (CFR 1.4, 4.2.)

Clearly, the Graduate School deployed a mosaic of evaluative methods for ongoing and institutionalized quality assurance. Each committee involved in quality assurance (e.g., deans, Curriculum Committee, and Professional Skills Development Committee) demonstrated a genuine curiosity about the quality and impact of the group's work. Campus interviews also indicated broad engagement in using results from their quality assurance processes for ongoing improvements in teaching, learning, curriculum, student research, and student support. The processes were widely known among all groups interviewed by the team. They adhered to good practices that included systematic review of data, making recommendations to the deans or faculty who then used the recommendations to make decisions (e.g., policies, proposed initiatives, other improvements) which were subsequently communicated back to committees. (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4.)

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

As previously noted, the team found evidence that TSRI had maintained and increased total grant revenue, which was the primary source of support for the Graduate Program, through a succession of challenging events beginning with the Great Recession in 2008, and including changes in federal priorities for research funding beginning in 2016. A key metric was presented in the audited financial statements.

The team also found evidence that TSRI had made significant progress on its \$100 million endowment campaign for the Graduate Program, first identified in the 2015-2025 Strategic Plan under "Priority 6: Increase Institutional Effectiveness and Sustainability." The team met with key board

members and with leaders of the advancement office staff, and were apprised of the current state of the campaign, which was launched in January 2018 with a lead gift from the Skaggs family. When fully funded, the endowment was expected to generate approximately \$5 million annually and would fully replace the \$1.3 million to \$1.4 million that TSRI funds in support of tuition for first-year students in the Graduate Program.

The full annual cost of the Graduate Program for fiscal year 2018 was \$15.9 million. The most significant component of those costs was student stipends and benefits of \$12.4 million. TSRI, in addition to diversifying its revenue sources beyond grants through its endowment campaign, also focused on translational research and technology commercialization initiatives, some of which noticeably impacted the fiscal 2018 financial statements. The evidence of progress toward establishing diversified revenue streams demonstrated the institution's commitment to financial stability and sustainability. (CFR 3.4.).

TSRI focused on student, faculty and staff diversity, the implementation of a thorough Title IX program, and implementation of support for housing and food-insecure students, in response to the changing environment in higher education. The team found evidence of a broad understanding across the institution among leadership, faculty and staff regarding the need to increase diversity. The minority student population increased from 15% of the 2010 class to 21% of the 2018 class. As mentioned earlier in this report, TSRI acknowledged that its efforts to increase minority hires, especially regarding faculty, must continue and improve.

In the team's discussions with students and faculty groups, faculty commented that the recent adoption of Title IX policies and efforts to train the campus community were helpful in increasing awareness and in handling complaints. The policy and its implementation were relatively new at the time of the visit, however, and the team noted that it would be important for the institution to document the impacts of the policy, including evidence of its effectiveness.

The team acknowledged efforts to address the needs of housing and food-insecure students and found that the annual anonymous survey of students regarding stipend levels was a good first step in tackling the challenge. Discussions with graduate students revealed that students were concerned about the welfare of some whom they know to be struggling. The team encouraged TSRI to continue its efforts to assess and address students who might need help.

(Component 8 not included.)

Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement.

The team felt that TSRI had articulated reasonable plans for improvement. Seeking an endowment for graduate fellowships and expanding experiential learning opportunities to better reflect the interests of students would be positive steps in improving the student experience. Faculty development programs could have a positive benefit on bicoastal courses, also improving the integration of the programs at the two campuses.

The team suggested that the institution should continue its efforts to build the diversity of its student body and faculty and to close achievement gaps based on ethnicity and gender. Creative approaches would be needed for recruiting underrepresented students and ensuring their successful completion. Because of the clear focus of the doctoral program, TSRI had the opportunity to adapt strategies successful at other institutions, and the ability to try new innovative approaches. TSRI's faculty and leadership were committed to enhancing the diversity of the program, but collective reflection and innovation would be needed to achieve success.

The team recognized TSRI for addressing bicoastal integration in its plans for improvement. Meetings with students revealed concerns about the limitations of the technology used for joint classes, as well as distance pedagogy and faculty facility with the technology. Students expressed appreciation for the program's efforts to bring California students together with Florida students, as well as their hope for more such opportunities.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team thanked TSRI for a successful campus visit. Special thanks went to President Schultz and ALO Dawn Eastmond for their flexibility and openness during the visit. The following commendations and recommendations followed the team's visit to TSRI during September 2019.

Commendations

1. TSRI has a clear, strategic focus to its plans and future directions. Faculty, staff and students understand the leadership's vision and view it as a strength of the institution. The Graduate Program lies squarely at the heart of TSRI's mission, building on and reinforcing the strength of the faculty and their research productivity and expertise.
2. TSRI has become a model of a multidisciplinary graduate program. Basic and translational research across multiple disciplines prepare graduates for a range of careers much broader than typical doctoral programs. The usual tension between discovery and application in science is a strength here, not a challenge.
3. Assessment and evaluation practices are widely embraced by the deans, faculty, and staff in the program and demonstrate nimble responsiveness to student and disciplinary needs. In an impressive cycle of organizational learning, these evaluation practices continue to evolve to better understand and adapt to student needs. These exemplary processes should be sustained and expanded as needs arise.
4. TSRI has a strong commitment to using data and evidence for decision making, supported by the Graduate Office and its institutional research function, which is well-developed and makes effective use of data analytics to communicate information to faculty and administrators.
5. The campaign to endow graduate fellowships is well-considered and appears poised for success. The campaign is widely viewed within the organization as a transformative opportunity. Focus

on endowing the Graduate Program confirms the centrality of the program to the TSRI while at the same time preparing for even broader fundraising efforts.

6. There is widespread faculty participation in admissions, curriculum development, and professional development. The faculty have established feedback loops to rapidly respond to issues with the curriculum when they emerge, in order to maintain the world-class status of its doctoral program.
7. The institution is committed to increasing diversity across the organization, and has taken steps to recruit more women and underrepresented minorities. The leadership team's commitment to creating an inclusive, safe, and tolerant campus is evidenced by the resources, policies, and programs put in place to promote of this goal.
8. TSRI has made impressive strides in bicoastal integration. Progress had been made in creating a unified admissions process, integrating more Florida faculty into teaching and student advisory committees, and in integrating professional development and co-curricular activities across the campuses.

Recommendations

1. As TSRI develops plans to increase the size of its graduate program, careful thought should be given to the size and function of the supporting programs, such as the Graduate Office and the Career and Postdoctoral Office. These programs have become central to the development and success of the students. (CFR 3.1, 3.5.)
2. TSRI should continue to prioritize increasing diversity within the Graduate Program. The institution is encouraged to seek out and develop innovative practices used at other, similar institutions, to continue progress in this area. (CFR 1.4, 2.10, 3.1.)
3. TSRI should expand activities to improve the sense of community for students, including more opportunities for faculty and students to engage outside the labs. (CFR 2.10, 2.11.)

4. Bicoastal integration should remain a priority. TSRI should continue to explore initiatives to improve the quality of online learning, such as faculty training in online delivery, and investing in technology to improve course delivery and student engagement (CFR 2.10, 3.5, 4.4)
5. The Committee for Gender Parity and Faculty Engagement should continue its work, with the goals of evaluating and improving the cultural environment of the institute. TSRI should continue to build on its efforts begun under Title IX implementation to improve campus climate and “become the place where inclusion is a habit and equity is a priority.” (CFR 1.4.)
6. Staffing levels in the area of philanthropy may be low by industry standards and relative to the Institute’s fundraising aspirations. The team recommends continued efforts to sustain and expand the initial success of the endowment campaign. (CFR 3.1.)

APPENDIX A

Federal Compliance Forms

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? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? On the intranet
	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)? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Through the program review process and new course approval process
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X 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? 30
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Chemical and Biological Sciences
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X 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? 30
	What kinds of courses? Sciences
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Chemical and Biological Sciences
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? One
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Doctoral Program in Chemical and Biological Sciences
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input type="checkbox"/> MA X Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Science

	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:

Date: 9/17/2019

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	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Scripps paid tuition and provided books, as well as a stipend.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

*§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.

Date: 9/17/2019

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? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? The policy is on the intranet
	Comments:
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly:
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Scripps Research has a student complaint review process, both academic and co-curricular. They have recently strengthened their sexual harassment and Title IX reporting and response capacity.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO If so, where?
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input type="checkbox"/> YES X NO If so, please describe briefly:
	Comments: At the time of the review, a process for recording and maintaining records of student complaints was being developed.

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Date: 9/17/2019

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? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? On the external and internal websites
	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? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The institution’s policy: Students who relocate to Scripps Research with their advisor may wish to transfer into Scripps Research's doctoral program. The student must submit transcripts, course syllabi for classes completed at other institutions, and relevant personal statements through Scripps Research's Online Admissions System. If accepted, the student must complete at least two core courses at Scripps Research prior to being eligible for the candidacy examination. Transfer credit is reviewed and awarded by the deans. While the final decision is up to the deans, a course that was not applied toward another degree generally receives transfer credit if it was completed at an accredited institution and a grade of B- or better was earned. Grades earned at another institution will transfer in for credit only and are not included in the calculation of the GPA.

*§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.

Date: 9/17/2019

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW-TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: The Scripps Research Institute, Florida Site
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer/s: Steve Casper
Date/s of review: September August 28-29, 2019

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. 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.

1. Site Name and Address

Scripps Research Institute - Florida
130 Scripps Way
Jupiter, FL 33458

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)

The Scripps Florida campus offers a doctoral program, which is jointly managed and fully integrated with the doctoral program at the Scripps Research Institute Florida campus.

The Scripps Florida campus has approximately 45 FTEs of faculty and about 100 PhD students enrolled.

The Scripps Florida campus was founded in 2004, with substantial funding provided by federal and state economic development grants. The goal of the campus is to be fully integrated with the educational and research programs within the La Jolla campus.

Scripps Florida is a satellite location.

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

Steve Casper, a member of the Scripps Research re-affirmation team, visited the campus for a day and a half. He met with faculty, staff, and students and was able to receive a comprehensive overview of the educational activities within the Florida site. In addition to meeting the site leadership, he was able to meet with faculty and staff involved with assessment, curriculum development, admissions, co-curricular activities, and outreach. He was able to meet groups of students and faculty as part of open meetings. Steve was provided a range of support materials surrounding teaching and learning within the Scripps Florida campus. The faculty, staff, and students were welcoming and forthcoming with information surrounding a range of topics and questions developed by the re-affirmation team.

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>For a recently approved site.</i> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</p>	<p>The site had undergone previous review. A key finding from this visit is that bi-coastal integration (a line of inquiry of the visiting team), had made significant progress since the most recent visit.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFR 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>Yes, there is a strong alignment of mission with Scripps La Jolla surrounding scientific research and education. We found strong operational integration surrounding the doctoral program. More generally, the site is well managed through the Graduate Office.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFR 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>We found deep integration and connection between Scripps Florida and Scripps La Jolla. The educational program is jointly managed, with classes taught by faculty from both campuses, and with faculty from both campuses routinely serving on PhD Advisory Committees. Significant advances have been made to better integrate admissions, assessment, and curriculum review across the two campus sites.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFR 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>Scripps Florida has a state of the art campus, with world-class research facilities and about 45 local faculty that work with PhD students. The Graduate Office has about 5 full time staff in Florida, helping to ensure operational integration of the management of the doctoral program across the two sites.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFR 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>The Graduate Office has hired local support staff in general program management, professional development, and local outreach. The two campuses share library resources (mostly electronic access to scientific journals). Computing services are excellent. Faculty and students have access to counseling services. Data generally show that the quality of services in Florida has improved significantly over the last 5-7 years and is on par with La Jolla.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFR 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>All courses are taught by faculty of Scripps La Jolla and Florida, and courses are jointly taught to students at the two campuses through on-line technologies (mostly video-conferencing as classes are small, with less than 10 students). Scripps Research has made an effort to have more courses taught by Florida faculty, which has helped create a sense of balance across students within the two campuses.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>Curriculum development is carried out jointly by faculty across the two sites – all teaching on the program is integrated. Courses are approved by a joint curriculum committee.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFR 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Graduation rates are about 80% across both campuses – a difference in graduation rates was not noted during the visit.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFR 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The Scripps Research Graduate Office uses an integrated system of capturing data on student learning across both campuses. In addition to data on student learning from courses, rubrics (with standards tied to PLOs) are used at all student Advisory Committee meetings, allowing data on student learning to be systematically captured at all stages of each PhD students time on the program. This program is well developed and carried out on both campuses.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFR 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Because the doctoral program is integrated across the two campus sites, program review and other quality assurance activities are carried out in an integrated fashion. There are few if any differences in how quality assurance is carried out on the two sites. Faculty committees charged with quality assurance have members from both campuses.</p>	<p>None</p>