

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

**To American Jewish University**

**March 8-10, 2016**

**Gregory O'Brien, Chair  
President  
International Technological University, San Jose, CA**

**Eric M. Frank, Assistant Chair  
Professor of Art History  
Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA**

**Patrick Cavanaugh  
CFO, University of the Pacific, emeritus  
University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA**

**Diane Tickton Schuster  
Senior Visiting Research Fellow  
Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Los Angeles**

**Gregory Canada  
Assistant Dean of Admissions  
Mauer School of Law, University of Indiana, Bloomington, IN**

**Maureen Maloney  
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 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, as Relevant .....	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

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions.....	5
B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators.....	10
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees.....	24
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation.....	28
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation.....	31
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence.....	35
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment.....	37
H. Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes.....	41
I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement.....	41

### SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)..... 43

### SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW..... 44

### APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms	
1. Credit Hour Review.....	48
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review.....	50
3. Student Complaints Review.....	52
4. Transfer Policy Review.....	54

## **SECTION I- OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT**

### **A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant**

American Jewish University (AJU) is the result of a 2007 merger and re-naming of the University of Judaism and the Brandeis-Bardin Institute with campuses in the Bel Air section of Los Angeles and 2700-acre in Simi Valley. The Familian campus in Bel Air is the site for the university's academic programs, student services and residence facilities, while the Simi Valley campus is used for a long standing and prominent camping program, meetings, retreats and other events.

The institution (then the University of Judaism) was first accredited by WSCUC as an autonomous university in 1972. Prior to that date, the institution was accredited jointly by Middle States Commission on Higher Education and WSCUC as the west coast branch of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America since 1964.

The university has four degree granting academic units, the undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the Graduate Center of Jewish Education (GCJE), the Graduate School of Nonprofit Management (GSNPM), the Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies (ZSRS) and a continuing education unit, the Whizin Center for Continuing Education (WCCE). In addition the university has two academic institutes, the Sigi Ziering Institute of Holocaust Studies (SZIHS) and the AJU Israel Center (AIC).

The Mission of the university focuses on: "Learning and Scholarship, Culture, Ethics, Leadership and Peoplehood", all within the Jewish context (CFR 1.1, 1.2). The university defines its commitment to diversity in the contemporary Jewish context as described in the Peoplehood component of its mission "We are a pluralistic institution that embraces diversity within Judaism and values the contributions of all groups to the growth of Jewish Civilization." That said, the

university has clear and appropriate non-discrimination policies and no faith commitments for participation in any university activities except in the Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies, which follows the Conservative movement of American Judaism and has requirements for ordination in that movement. “Diversity for AJU has meant involving and welcoming not only recent émigrés (e.g., persons from the former Soviet Union, from Iran, and other parts of the Middle East), and members of the Sephardic community, but also promoting a safe and inclusive space for staff, faculty, and students of other backgrounds, faiths, and sexual orientations (CFR 1.4) (institutional report pg. 3).

## **B. Description of the Team’s Review Process**

The team’s process for gathering information in preparation for the Offsite Review (OSR) included the review of materials submitted by the institution including the institutional report and appendices, previous visiting team reports and Commission action letters. The team conference call on September 10, 2015, discussed the current context of the university and the issues identified in these documents. The team briefly reviewed recent media coverage regarding the Simi Valley campus and determined that the issues raised about the location of the 2,700 acre property owned by Rocketdyne and later by Boeing, and used for the testing of jet engines and nuclear reactors which was undergoing, undergoing environmental remediation did not pose a threat to the current operation of the university and its programs; and posed no unmanageable financial challenges to this well-endowed institution. During the OSR, the team identified lines of inquiry built upon the issues raised in prior WSCUC team reports and action letters. It was determined that a major focus of the Accreditation Visit (AV) would give particular emphasis to the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS), its enrollment challenges and their impact on the student experience and long-term vitality of the College. No recent substantive change visits required

follow-up in this review. The team concluded that the activities on the Simi Valley campus do not constitute an off campus-location or distance education location for the university's higher education programs (CFR 3.5) and did not need to be visited in this review.

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

The report prepared by the institution was thorough and reflective. It demonstrated transparency and the sincerity of the institution in addressing both Commission recommendations and the underlying issues those recommendations addressed.

The report was well organized and clearly written. There was some narrative redundancy in addressing issues separately in each of the academic units. But this is an appropriate approach to addressing the issues and did not pose a problem for the team. The report accurately and candidly portrayed the current state of the university and openly discussed some of the organizational challenges and even some earlier, sincere missteps in addressing these challenges, particularly that of enrollment growth. The process involved many components and units of the university community in addressing the issues covered in the report, with a clear and integrative approach by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and a small team in writing the narrative of the report and in linking relevant documentation.

As a small institution with several inter-related but semi-autonomous academic and support units, the review process was appropriate in breadth and comprehensiveness (CFR 4.5). In general, the data displays tied directly to the conclusions of the narrative, but some analyses could have been more in depth to help guide the institution in addressing the challenges it is facing. Reviews were sincere, but could have gone farther in helping the university identify additional strategies to address its challenges, particularly recruitment, enrollment, attrition and graduation in CAS. The team determined that those issues and the correlated impact of low CAS

enrollment would be a major focus of the Accreditation Visit to encourage more in-depth analytical thinking about these issues among various parts of the institution. While the sincere process helped moved the university community's thinking and understanding of these challenges, it was felt that process could have gone in a more strategic, forward-looking direction (CFR 4.2, 4.3). All in all the broad base of the review process and openness in addressing the institution's challenges led to advancing the understanding of a complex set of challenges the institution faces and laid the groundwork for renewed strategic thinking about how to address these issues more comprehensively in the future (CFR 4.7).

## **SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

### **A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions.**

The institution addressed its responses to the three reports and action letters it has received since its last Comprehensive Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in 2006 in an integrated way. Rather than describing changes in response to each of the three reports sequentially, the institution described actions to address the underlying issues, which were addressed in each of the three reports. This report shall use the same approach describing the institution's responses and the changes over time that were undertaken to address the concerns raised in the recommendations. These institutional responses fall into four broad categories:

- Addressing declining enrollment;
- Achieving financial stability in operating budgets,
- Creating a stable and more strategic leadership structure and staffing;
- Strengthening academic program review and developing program review in non-academic areas.

Recommendations were identified for each of these institutional areas in the 2006 EER visit and the 2010 Special Visit, as well as warranting continuing notice in response to the 2014

Progress Report. These four areas are interrelated and were reacted to by AJU with staffing changes meant to address each recommendation. Since 2006 the effectiveness of these staff changes in addressing these issues is uneven.

**Addressing declining enrollment:**

Enrollment declines and attrition have been a problem in the institution's undergraduate program since 2006. This decline has continued with few exceptions. The institution made significant investments in staff, including restructuring the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) position to be Dean of CAS and CAO in 2011 (CFR 3.1, 3.5). A new CAO/dean was appointed who focused his efforts on re-directing undergraduate recruitment. These efforts which attempted to reach local native and transfer students whose academic qualifications were weaker than those in past recruiting seasons proved not to be successful, furthering enrollment declines and raising attrition rates. In 2013 the university made the decision to change the CAO/dean and recruited an individual with more substantial academic and university management experience. The new CAO/dean, who is also the ALO, has worked with faculty to refocus the undergraduate program to increase its attractiveness and distinction from competitive institutions (CFR 3.10). The institution notes early indications of some enrollment growth but the numbers of new and continuing students is far lower than it should be for efficiency's sake and to support a more robust curriculum. As will be discussed more fully later in this report, the CAO/dean led a broadly based and universally supported effort to redesign the core curriculum of the College emphasizing concepts of social justice, community service and ethical action in the core. The requirements in major fields of study were also revised to reflect these values and added internship and capstone experiences to reinforce them. The team was deeply impressed with the thought and energy put into this revision and believes that this new more mission and community

relevant approach holds the promise to increase enrollment, student engagement and student retention (CFR 2.10, 4.6, 4.7). A courageous increase in admission standards has reduced behavioral problems on campus, which had been a major cause of residential enrollment decline. It is too early to tell if these changes will result in increased enrollment but the new leadership and clear focus of this curriculum and standards improvement are highly promising.

Enrollment has declined in each of the graduate colleges in recent years, for reasons ranging from the economic downturn, to competition from denominational training resources (in Jewish education), to the need for new leadership. By allocation of scholarship funds (and tuition discounts) the university has tried to increase the competitiveness of the Graduate Center of Jewish Education (CFR 3.4, 3.5). A new and very well respected dean was recruited for the Graduate School of Nonprofit Management, who appears to be restoring connections with the leading non-profit agencies in the community in order to strengthen both quality and program enrollment (CFR 3.6, 3.7) with promising results so far. The Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies has initiated community outreach locally and nationally as well as targeted recruitment in Israel for students with promising response (CFR 3.10).

While the institution has made numerous efforts to reverse declines in enrollment, both external factors and leadership challenges leave declining enrollments a major and continuing challenge for this institution as it is for many other faith-based institutions (CFR 3.4).

### **Achieving financial stability in operating budgets**

While it must be noted that the university enjoys a very substantial cash reserve and a robust fundraising capacity that provides much needed operation support, sustaining a positive operating budget continues to be a very major challenge for the institution. With the demonstrated dedication of its faculty and staff, the university undertook across the board

reductions (6% of salaries in most cases) in pay and benefits (50% reduction in university benefits support) for virtually all employees (CFR 3.4, 3.5). By and large the entire university community took these cuts without complaint and continued their dedication to the university and its mission, and, as discussed later, most of these reductions have been restored as the institution has acted to make its compensation competitive with a group of peer institutions. Cost reductions, where possible in non-personnel expenses were also undertaken but fixed costs such as campus maintenance are difficult to reduce without adverse consequences. It is recognized that an institution cannot achieve fiscal sustainability by only cutting costs. Returning to financial sustainability will take a return to enrollment growth in the undergraduate program and a broader diversification of income sources, including development and scholarship support. During the visit the team noted several areas where limited budget allocations were creating competitive disadvantages in areas such as classroom technology, campus technology infrastructure, classroom furnishings, and web presence (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 4.7).

### **Creating a stable and more strategic leadership structure and staffing**

The Commission called for a stabilizing of leadership roles and organization; and the university responded directly. The role of CAO was re-configured removing many administrative tasks and focusing the role on strengthening CAS and managing (i.e. expanding) enrollment (CFR 3.5). Unfortunately as noted above the previous CAO/dean launched an unsuccessful strategy of lowering standards, reaching out to local students, both native and transfer who were less suited to a small liberal arts environment. Enrollment declined and attritions rose.

The university in 2013 decided to make the needed change in direction and CAO/dean leadership. The new CAO/dean re-directed faculty and staff efforts to re-brand the CAS and to expand recruitment (CFR 3.5). Faculty members were added in key areas of the undergraduate

curriculum ensuring full time faculty representation in all undergraduate areas (CFR 3.1). The full-time Business faculty member was scheduled to join but had not joined at the submission of the institutional report. The CAO/dean and the president added a Director of Assessment and Institutional Research (IR) (CFR 4.2), a new position for AJU. The importance of the position responsible for Communications and Marketing was recognized by upgrading it from an assistant vice president to a full vice presidency (CFR 3.1). New chairs of the College's academic departments, a new Dean of Students and Director of Residential life also joined the College's and university's leadership. Preliminary indications are positive that these changes are working, but the enrollment challenges are still very central to the College's viability.

#### **Strengthening academic program review developing program review in non-academic areas**

In response to repeated team and Commission recommendations for program review based on student learning outcomes at all levels the more recently appointed (2013) CAO/dean recruited an experienced Director of Assessment & IR (who also has experience in enrollment management support). Student learning outcomes were identified and promulgated for all undergraduate and graduate programs (CFR 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 3.10). Methods or rubrics for assessing those outcomes were identified and are being used. A multi-year program review schedule has been adopted (though not yet completely implemented due to its multi-year schedule (CFR 2.7). Initial program reviews were completed in all academic programs and implementation plans were developed and approved. Non-academic areas are now also identifying measurable and assessable objectives that will, likewise be subject to periodic review (CFR 3.5). It is worthy to note that this progress on assessment was undertaken at the same time the re-focused effort on improving the CAS's standards and recruitment strategies was being undertaken. Significant progress has been made and is ongoing in this area (CFR 3.5).

The university took to heart each of the recommendations of the several visiting teams and the Commission action letters. While some of the initial responses turned out to be ineffective (under the leadership of the former CAO/dean) the institution took the needed action to make changes and re-initiate efforts to respond to all recommendations. The institution also undertook a critical analysis of its challenges and strengths in their response to the recommendations (CFR 3.4, 3.5 4.7).

## **B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

### **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard. There was admirable transparency, seriousness and integrity in the way AJU has addressed the entire review process (CFR 1.8). We are especially impressed with the CAO/dean's meticulous work in compiling the exhibits and evidence for the review. While its mission statement is clear, current work on a new strategic plan may result in the need to realign the mission of the university with it (CFR 1.1). The team found that this plan will be critical to the future of the university, and especially to the future of the CAS, which is facing specific issues of enrollment and retention that are detailed in Standard 2. AJU comes late to the assessment of student learning, as many institutions do, and not all programs are consistently engaged in program review and assessment (CFR 2.7). AJU recognizes the need to improve in this area. Although a great deal of energy has been put into establishing learning goals, it remains to be seen how the institution will use the data gathered from these assessments, although it states that plans are underway to use these data for improvement. All CAS educational components have developed an instrument mapping student learning outcomes to program learning outcomes (PLOs), and the team observed that in many

instances each school is in a slightly different place in the implementation of these goals (CFR 2.7). While documents like these, and other assessment instruments are extant, it is unclear how they will be implemented, and exactly where they are in the implementation process across the university. It is important that AJU continues to focus on the institutionalization of a culture of assessment and the way assessment can be used to improve student learning. In schools with a relatively high percentage of new and adjunct faculty assessment over time can become problematic, and the ability to change then even more so. The team cautions AJU to be aware of this particular challenge. Improving the academic program may have the result of helping the institution be more attractive to students who are deciding where to attend. This is a critical issue for AJU.

It is clear that AJU's curriculum has been developed very thoughtfully, and within the frame of Jewish education, embraces diversity transparently and central to the core of the institution clearly protects all forms of academic freedom (CFR 1.6, 1.7). Many documents, including the Student Handbook and the History of American Jewish University speak directly to founding principles of academic freedom and its related role in fostering an atmosphere of academic openness. The Student Handbook and other institutional offices clearly and accessibly state policies regarding finances, student conduct, and grievance procedure (CFR 1.7).

The AJU website is a transparent and accessible introduction to the character of the university. Information about academic life, student life, tuition costs, the relationship between AJU and the resources of Los Angeles are all clearly stated (CFR 1.6, 1.7). The clear and transparent manner that AJU completed this review is a testimony to their own stated sense of the central importance of ethical institutional behavior. The committee commends AJU in this regard (CFR 1.8).

## **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

As a university with component schools, the team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard (achieving its educational objectives through teaching, learning, scholarship, creative activity and support for student learning success). However, there are a number of areas of vulnerability, especially within the undergraduate (CAS) program, that the team notes with concern.

Baccalaureate program limitations (CFR 2.2a, 2.3, 2.5) Given the extremely small size of the CAS student population, the team wonders about how a climate of genuine academic discourse is created and sustained for undergraduates. While AJU's high faculty-student ratio affords important opportunities for students to receive close-in mentoring, the absence of genuine student cohort experiences potentially compromises students' intellectual development. Also, given the high admission rate to CAS, questions arise about how college-ready these students are and whether considerable time during their undergraduate experience must be devoted to readying them for college-level work. Since the institutional report indicates that there is a need to strengthen service learning experiences, the team further wonders about the actual limitations of current service learning opportunities—where are they occurring? Why are they not sufficient or successful?

Co-curricular programs for undergraduate students (CFR 2.11) With such a small student body, to what extent can students have high-quality co-curricular experiences? This is an area that needs to be addressed, and one that specifically undermines the character of a residential liberal arts college. A small student body (with only ten students and 2 Resident Assistants, i.e. RAs, in

the residence hall) is a challenge for on-campus programming. As AJU moves forward, the residential life component and its attending co-curricular programming must be improved.

The team also calls attention to four further issues raised in the AJU's Compliance Checklist: Assessment and program review (CFR 2.7) Since 2014, AJU has placed a high priority on assessment and program review. A regular cycle of assessment of program learning outcomes at both the undergraduate and graduate levels has been established, but not all programs have yet consistently engaged in the assessment process. The university acknowledges that future assessments "could be (and will be) more data-driven and less based on anecdotal evidence." The team has questions about which programs have yet to engage in assessment and how AJU perceives this delay in data gathering.

Faculty appointments (CFR 2.1, 2.8) Why has a full-time faculty member in the GSNPM not yet been hired? To what extent does the absence of a core faculty in this program compromise program integrity and support for students?

Faculty promotion criteria (CFR 2.8) While the Faculty Handbook delineates tenure and promotion criteria for scholarship or activity, has the fall 2015 update been completed?

### **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures that Ensure Quality and Sustainability**

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard.

#### **Faculty and Staff**

As would be expected for a small, private institution, AJU has a staff and faculty of limited size. From the institutional report and related materials submitted, it is clear that many of these employees have multiple responsibilities, which typically would not be shared at larger

institutions. From these materials, as well as the discussions with members of the administration, full-time and part-time faculty, staff, and students, the team recognizes the significant commitment these community members have to the institution and its students. Noting this extraordinary commitment, the team believes that AJU has faculty and staff in adequate numbers and with sufficient competencies to accomplish the institution's current educational goals.

The key administrative leaders who serve on the president's management team appear to be well prepared for and committed to the responsibilities with which they are charged. Team discussions with faculty, staff and students support this finding. These institutional leaders are well qualified and deeply committed to the advancement of the institution they serve.

The key staff members in other leadership positions are professionally qualified and committed to the institution and its mission and goals. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec.7, #32 AJU Organizational Chart). While many of the key leaders have been with the institution for several years, others are relatively new. Some key leaders, such as the chief academic officer and chief financial officer, perform multiple responsibilities. Overall, the staff appears to be committed to the institution's mission and its students and is supportive of the institution's leadership. This is particularly impressive given the recent history of constrained operating budgets and limited compensation adjustments.

Overall, it appears that the staff members who maintain and support key operational functions of the university are competent and working hard to provide students a high quality learning environment and generally have adequate skills to provide adequate support to the institution (CFR 3.1).

Performance evaluation systems are in place for both faculty and staff. The faculty evaluation system is adequately documented and includes results of students' evaluations. (See, 2015

institutional report, Faculty Handbook). While the institution has staff and faculty policies and evaluation policies and procedures in place, it has recognized several of these policies, e.g. student complaints and faculty governance, need to be updated to reflect the current best standards appropriate for an institution with this size, complexity and mission and have made good progress to address these issues. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 1, #5 Employee Handbook). The institution's administration, faculty and staff are making serious efforts to update these policies and to keep the institution's community informed of these policy updates. (CFR 3.2)

The faculty members are clearly dedicated and appear to work closely and collegially with the university's administrative leadership. The Faculty Handbook reflects a process to ensure there is adequate faculty governance in issues of curriculum design and planning (See, 2015 institutional report, Faculty Handbook). Although budgeted resources for operations continue to be limited, the university is making efforts to provide for more focused faculty and staff development in the areas most needed by the individual employee and the institution. After several difficult budget years in which salary and benefits were frozen and even reduced, the institution has made good headway in developing a compensation plan using peer group institution comparisons and making adjustments to the salaries of its faculty. (See, Supplemental Materials, "Peer/Aspiration Groups and Faculty Salaries"). However, resources for adequate faculty and staff development remain a challenge to provide opportunities these employee groups need to enhance their current job skills, particularly in the availability and use of technology. (CFR 3.3)

### **Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources**

The team evaluated the extent to which the institution has managed its fiscal and physical and information resources in light of its aspirations expressed in its mission and its strategic plans.

## **Fiscal Resources**

As with its other recent audited financial statements reviewed, the university's most recent audited financial statements received unqualified opinions from a well-qualified external audit firm and reveal a relatively strong balance sheet for an institution of its size. (See, supplemental materials, June 30, 2015 audited financial statement, and 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #20, audited financial statements for FY 2012, #21 audit for FY 2013, and #22 audit for FY 2014).

AJU's endowment was \$22.6 million of June 30, 2015, (according to the most current audited annual financials). This translates into strong endowment assets per student of nearly \$200,000. In addition, the institution reports additional, non-endowment investments as of June 30, 2015, of nearly \$76 million, which is a particularly impressive invested asset base. Taken together, these two components of the university's investments represent a strong investment asset base, which, as of June 30, 2015, was approximately \$98 million, nearly \$9 million or 11% greater than it was at the end of FY 2011. Overall, the institution's net assets at the end of FY 2015 were an impressive \$113.6 million, 14.5% more than at the end of FY 2011. This provides the institution with a level of underlying financial strength greater than many larger institutions of higher education.

However, despite this strong and growing investment asset base, the institution has continued to operate on a tight, very conservative operating budget as it has continued to struggle with low enrollments. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec.1.15 Budget Increases; Sections 7. 24 Fiscal Budgets, 7.27 Approach to Finances and Budgeting; 7.28. Half-Year Budget Review). This was an issue of concern during the institution's last WSCUC review in 2006 (See, 2006 WSCUC Team Report, p. 8), and it continues. Despite its strong underlying asset base and efforts to improve enrollment and retention, the institution continues to struggle to avoid operating budget deficits just as it did ten years ago (See, WSCUC 2006 Report).

The university remains highly dependent on gifts, grants, and bequests, which have represented over 40% of its operating revenues for the past four years. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 1, #14 Finance Materials, and Sec.7, #24 Fiscal Budgets). This level of support from its loyal donor base is extraordinary, but makes the institution more vulnerable to uncertain variations in this support. The total operating expenditures in FY 2015 were \$1 million or 5% less than in FY 2013. Yet, despite extraordinary efforts to allocate budgeted operating revenues, the institution's audited financial statements reported operating deficits in FY 2013 and FY 2015. The institution's periodic budget reports reflect similar historical challenges in the annual operating budget (CFR 3.4). So, despite an increasingly strong asset base, the institution's challenge of avoiding deficit budgets continues.

Because the Brandeis-Bardin Campus (BBC) (described more below) does not serve as a site where the university's degree programs are delivered to any material extent, it was not an "Off-Campus Location" subject to onsite review by the team, under the WSCUC definition. (See, WSCUC Comprehensive Review for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, p. 129; 2015 institutional report, Sec. 1 #16 Brandeis-Bardin Campus Use). The institution's periodic budget reports indicate the camp has regularly generated a net positive contribution to the institution's finances; however, the allocations of revenues and expenses to the camp are not clear to determine if the academic enterprise subvents the BBC. Given the university's tight operating budgets, the issue of whether and to what extent the main campus subsidizes the operations and maintenance of the BBC is relevant to the understanding of the institution's budget challenges and budget priorities.

With the continued financial reliance by the university on enrollments, which remain small and difficult to predict and, finally, the heavy reliance on the extraordinary, but discretionary, donor

support adds risk to the institution's financial position even though it now enjoys a strong underlying investment base (CFR 3.5).

### **Physical Plant**

The physical plant appears adequate with an array of space resources for the various functions of the university. There appears to be adequate spaces available for the institution's key functions. The university has undertaken a systematic approach to the evaluation of its facilities conditions and developed a multi-year plan for facility maintenance and upgrade. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec.7, #29 Capital Improvements). That plan includes planned expenditures for the upgrade of facilities at the university's Brandeis-Bardin Campus, the 2700 acre property acquired in 2007, near Simi Valley, California, through a merger with the Brandeis-Bardin Institute (BBI). It is used for Jewish summer camps, the Brandeis Collegiate Institute, an intensive, non-academic program for young Jewish adults, sponsored by the university and other events suitable for this large, camp-like setting. This asset has a significant appraised value and is an important component of the institution's asset base for the refinancing of its long-term debt.

The university reports that at the time of the merger for BBC, it undertook the challenge of resolving BBI's operating deficit. That resolution has essentially been completed. The university has presented to the team the elements of its plan for facility maintenance and upgrade on the main campus as well as the BBC. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 1, #16 Brandeis-Bardin Campus Use).

It does not appear that there are significant facility capacity concerns for residences, academic facilities, administrative spaces, faculty offices, library facilities or other academic support spaces. The condition of university's library was a key issue of concern in the 2006 accreditation review. Since then, there have been improvements in the physical plant and technological infrastructure of the library to make it better able to support the institution's curricula, as well as

faculty and student scholarship (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 1, #17 Capital Improvements, #30 Technology Needs and #31 Technology Priorities). The institution has to continue to make challenging decisions within the constraints of its budget model to determine the annual additions to its collection of library materials to best support its faculty, students and academic programs (CFR 3.6).

### **Information Resources**

Within the limits of its constrained budget, the university has made good efforts to provide training and support for faculty members who use technology in their instructional activities. (See, AJU – Campus Technology Department Report, 12/10/2014). Systems are in place to determine and prioritize the institution’s most pressing technology issues. The role of technology in the library is an area continuing to require attention. The institution has an effective and informative web presence providing current and prospective students, faculty, staff, donors and other stakeholders with information and policies regarding the institution. Subject to the limitations of a constrained operating budget, the institution has generally operated its information technology functions with competence. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #31, Technology Priorities) (CFR 3.5, 3.7).

Since its last review, the institution’s technology enhancements in the classrooms have been limited to only six classrooms labeled as “smart classrooms.” While tech equipment carts are available, without further improvements in this area, the institution’s competitive disadvantage with students and faculty will increase. Although the university has an adequate website, the university has identified additional improvements to make the institution more connected and comparable to other institutions. A summary of the Campus Technology Department prepared a thorough and very comprehensive status report and plan for that department. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #30 Technology Needs) (CFR 3.5).

## **Organizational structures and decision-making processes**

Based on its review of supporting information provided to the team before and during the visit, the team is impressed with the competence and commitment of the institution's management team (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #32 AJU Organizational Chart). There appears to be little ambiguity among full-time faculty regarding the processes the institution has in place and published regarding evaluation. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #19, Faculty Retreat Training Sessions) (CFR 3.8).

There appears to be good engagement among the university's primary stakeholders in the strategic planning process. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #34 Strategic Planning Committee Information). Achievement of the sort of common commitment found across the AJU community requires a focused and dedicated effort to achieve. There are regular meetings of senior staff and the Deans Council to collaborate on institutional issues of mutual concern. The board, administration, faculty and staff each understand and appreciate their own role and the roles of others in the development of institutional policies and their oversight.

The institution has been extraordinarily cooperative and responsive to WSCUC and the team for the current review. It is clear the key leadership of the university, administration, and faculty are committed to the institution's successful and transparent completion of the accreditation process. (See, 2015 institutional report and supplemental materials). This approach of openness, transparency and accountability is also evident in administration's actions to respond to the questions raised in November 2015, regarding the BBC environmental concerns (CFR 3.6).

The key administrators appear to be well prepared in their disciplines to provide adequate and appropriate leadership in the functional areas for which they are responsible. The president (CEO) and vice-president for finance, administration, and technology (CFO) are qualified administrators who work in their capacity full-time on behalf of the institution. (CFR 3.8).

The members of the leadership team communicate well among themselves and share a commitment to advance the institution in a manner consistent with its educational purposes and mission. Again, in this regard the institution is benefited by its relatively small size and the resulting ease of communication that substitutes for more formal and rigid structures of communication often found at much larger institutions. Despite limited staff with multiple responsibilities, key administrators have made continuing efforts to be fully responsive to information requests required through the accreditation review process. (CFR 3.8)

Each senior administrator meets regularly with the president of the university to present progress on various assigned initiatives and to discuss general trends in the functional areas for which the administrator is responsible as well as about general issues confronting the institution. In addition to these meetings, the senior administrators meet as a group every month. (See, 2015 institutional report, p. 67-68).

The institution's Board of Directors is independent and has members with a broad array of skills and interests useful in advancing the university. (See, 2015 institutional report, p. 69, Sec.7, #35 Members of the Board of Directors). The board appears to have successfully made the transition following the merger of the Brandeis-Bardin and AJU boards, which was completed in FY 2009. (See, 2015 institutional report, Minutes of Board of Directors meetings, Board's Executive Committee Meetings, Board's Finance Committee Minutes, Board's Investment Committee Minutes, and Board's Audit Committee Minutes, Sec. 7, #35 through #46.) The university's by-laws reflect an appropriate relationship of accountability and oversight by the Board of Directors to the university and its administration. (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #47 AJU Board of Directors By-Laws).

The board has been appropriately active in setting its expectations of the president and key administrators, securing on a regular basis the information to ensure accomplishment of those expectations, and systematically evaluating the CEO for successfully progressing toward those expectations. However, that the board does not have a process in place yet for self-review and evaluation has been identified as an area for future consideration and action. (CFR 3.9). The minutes of the board and samples of its standing committees' minutes were made available to the team. Those sets of minutes indicate the board is regularly presented with key issues of the university and provide senior leadership with counsel and direction as appropriate. In particular, in its meeting with the team, the board's executive committee demonstrated extensive knowledge of the proposed plan to improve the undergraduate school's enrollment and, importantly, expressed its strong support for the plan.

The policies and practices for the institution's faculty to exercise its leadership role regarding the academic standards of the academic programs are well summarized and described in the Faculty Handbook. (See, 2015 institutional report, Faculty Handbook). This includes the maintenance of an effective "culture of evidence" to inform decisions for academic and administrative program effectiveness and progress. (CFR 3.10).

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

The team's finding, subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with the Standard. AJU's continued commitment to promoting a culture of evidence is well supported. AJU, and the CAO/dean in particular, has done a commendable job developing a comprehensive and thorough assessment process and procedure aimed at promoting institutional improvement (CRF 4.3). The university has thoughtfully

overhauled the manner by which it collects, analyzes and interprets data about new curriculum and program approval processes, period program review, and assessment on student learning, resulting in a solid set of quality assurance processes that cover both academic and non-academic areas (CFR 4.1). It is apparent that the leadership at all levels including faculty, staff and administration have become involved in laying the necessary groundwork for improvement (CFR 4.3, 4.6); however, it remains unclear to what extent other important stakeholders, including alumni, employers, and students have or will play a role in making future enhancements to the academic and co-curricular life at AJU.

One of most important advances made by AJU with regards to Standard 4 has been its effort to develop the capacity for institutional improvement (CFR 4.2). Following a previous WSCUC recommendation, AJU hired a Director of Assessment and Institutional Research (DAIR) in spring 2014. The benefits of this hire have been significant for AJU. The DAIR has been instrumental for determining and measuring program learning outcomes (PLO); has helped develop a consistent manner for reporting and measuring PLOs across the four schools through the use of templates and curriculum maps; and has helped AJU determine where mastery level learning is occurring (or not) within the curriculum (CFR 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

AJU is commended for committing the necessary resources for creating this position and are impressed by the capacity for continued improvement the DAIR makes possible.

While AJU has done an excellent job creating an organization committed to quality assurance and institutional learning, we believe that AJU still has some way to go using the information gathered and analyzed for concrete improvement. AJU states that plans are underway to use this data for improvement, yet it is not readily clear how they will be implemented, and exactly

where they are in the implementation process across the university. It is important that AJU continues to focus on operationalizing its burgeoning culture of assessment and develop tangible ways this assessment can be used to improve student learning and other vital concerns, including those involving enrollment management (CFR 4.3).

Final determination of the compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

### **C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees**

AJU's mission statement articulates five core values that shape the university's educational mission: Learning and Scholarship, Jewish Culture, Ethics, Leadership, and Peoplehood. Each constituent program at the university also has a mission statement or set of program learning outcomes that restate these values and demonstrate how the particular program's degree requirements are consistent with AJU's general objectives (CFR 1.1).

At the undergraduate level, a distinctive learning outcome differentiates AJU degrees from standard undergraduate programs. As part of their education at AJU, students will learn to “articulate the place of Jewish cultural and intellectual traditions in the development of [their] personal identity and character, and the relationship of these traditions to those of other groups and nations.” Core courses that require CAS students to engage “big questions” and “contemporary issues” contribute to the students' critical thinking about their Jewish identity in a changing world. [Details in 1.1-Architecture and Playbook.] If successful, students graduating from CAS will feel strong connections to Judaism and their degrees will reflect their engagement with relevant questions. Given the team's particular focus on the challenge currently facing CAS and the need for more careful program assessment the distinctive learning outcomes at AJU should be incorporated as part of the normal assessment process (CFR 4.1, 4.2).

At the graduate level, AJU's programs focus on professional preparation in three career areas, and each program is engaged in thoughtful assessment of the quality and integrity of its degrees. Specifically,

The Ziegler School (ZSRS) prepares rabbis to “lead the Jewish people in a renaissance of talmud Torah (learning), shmirat mitzvot (observance), and gemillut hesed (acts of social justice and personal compassion).” Graduates of the school are expected to energize Conservative Judaism (as distinguished from other strands of Jewish observance) and the Jewish community throughout the world. The ZSRS's program review has included curriculum revisions and the development of assessment strategies. The current curriculum map was developed as a collaborative effort of the school's administration, faculty, alumni, and students and maps program learning outcomes to the school's curricular offerings. A 2015 program review focused on one particular capstone course and its final project as a tangible tool to measure success with each PLO. The results of this assessment indicated that, through the capstone projects process, ZSRS students “emerge in their senior year well capable of mobilizing a range of Jewish texts to topics of contemporary concern, to translating the words and to distilling the meaning of the texts in such a way that they are accessible to a broad swath of people who turn to rabbis to meet their existential, spiritual and communal needs.” Appendix 1 of the ZSRS Program Review (WASC EER For Ziegler School of Rabbinic Studies) provides additional evidence that the ZSRS leadership is engaged in regular and thoughtful assessment of the curriculum design and is committed to “integrate and improve the material and the way it is taught.” The faculty is now meeting regularly to review the developmental needs of students, types of mentoring available, student competence in Hebrew and text analysis, and student readiness to function effectively as rabbis in the field. Beyond assessment, the ZSRS is tracking its alumni and showing stories of

graduates in video stories on their website. Overall, the team found the integrity of the Ziegler degree solid and was impressed by the dedication of the faculty to provide a relevant curriculum that prepares students for professional competency and success (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6).

The Graduate School of Nonprofit Management (GSNPM) trains students to become effective managers of non-profit organizations. The school's Master of Business Administration (MBA) curriculum offer three tracks: Social Entrepreneurship in a Diverse World, Fundraising and Fund Development, and Jewish Community Leadership. Students may elect one track or choose to combine courses from all three strands. Completion of a track is noted on a student's diploma at graduation. Over the past decade, the GSNPM has made program review and assessment a priority (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). The institutional report includes a detailed history of program review, as well as recently revised program goals. The current curriculum map links program and learning outcomes to specific GSNPM courses, and these maps are being reviewed in an ongoing manner (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5). In addition to curricular reviews, in 2014 a graduate exit survey to assess GSNPM student satisfaction was conducted; these findings were supplemented by a survey of current students. In spring 2013, GSNPM developed an assessment tool for its theses and conducted an outcomes assessment of the thesis. Overall, the hiring of a new dean in fall 2014 has enabled GSNPM to further review its program, curriculum, and standards for student performance. Under the guidance of the new dean, the GSNPM constructed an Alumni Brain Trust to be used as an advisory board and recruitment tool for the MBA program. The team found that the integrity of the GSNPM degree itself appears to be robust; students express deep satisfaction with the program, its faculty and its leadership. With new, dynamic leadership, the GSNPM program's future seems bright and provides an important niche educational opportunity in Los Angeles.

The Graduate Center of Jewish Education (GCJE) offers programs in education Jewish education and teaching that “strengthen and nourish the pipeline of talent entering the field of Jewish education.” The GCJE’s program review mechanisms appear to be especially well developed and functioning smoothly. Every year the GCJE faculty steering committee meets to conduct a year-in-review reflection of its programs and its progress towards achieving its stated outcomes (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). Recently, the GCJE has taken steps that show a high level of openness to program review based on systematic assessment processes. Since 2013 GCJE has (1) revised its Judaic curriculum in order to strengthen students’ pedagogy and cultural literacy; (2) conducted a review of one of the primary GCJE assignments, the teaching portfolio, and concluded that while this assignment worked well, it also needed clearer guidelines and selected changes; (3) assessed the demands of its reflective practice course and modified project requirements to make them commensurate with what is appropriate for a one-credit course; (4) assessed the student capstone projects and determined that, for the most part, they met expectations as outlined in the evaluation rubric that had been designed to align with GCJE program learning outcomes; and (5) conducted a program review that ultimately determined that, for a variety of reasons the GCJE program should be abridged from a five semester program to a four semester program, with attendant realignment of when course content would be covered during the academic year. Beyond its internal assessment initiatives, the GCJE utilized an outside scholar to review its Jewish Studies curriculum and how courses in Judaica were being delivered to education students (CFR 2.7). The consultant’s endorsements of curricular changes GCJE was considered helped move the change process along. Stories of GCJE alumni are available on the school’s website. Since 2012, all of the school’s graduating students have obtained employment in the field in accordance with their professional goals. The institutional

report includes a list of recent alumni job placements. Overall, the team was impressed with the careful and thoughtful planning and assessment efforts being made by the GCJE under the leadership of a strong and visionary dean.

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

AJU's mission statement clearly establishes that, by the time of graduation, AJU students will have been engaged in a learning experience characterized by five core Jewish values: Learning and Scholarship, Culture, Ethics, Leadership, and Peoplehood. (These values as distinctively Jewish values are explained on the university's website.) Accordingly, students in each AJU program take courses and have field experiences that require them to develop the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes inherent in values that lie at the heart of Jewish tradition.

This section of the report will focus on the extent to which, for students in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) program, there is alignment between learning outcomes and WSCUC's core competencies and how and when student learning and performance are assessed. Since the learning outcomes for the three graduate programs are not specifically aligned to the core competencies, a discussion of those outcomes, by program, is found in the section on Component 3.

Learning Outcomes and WSCUC Core Competencies. Learning Outcomes for CAS students are spelled out in AJU's Architecture and Playbook document and in the curriculum maps for each major (CFR 2.3). As a result of their education at AJU, CAS students will

1. utilize multiple ways of knowing and tools of analysis, leading to evaluation and action
2. articulate the place of Jewish culture in his or her personal identity

3. employ the perspective or methods of an academic or professional discipline to analyze relevant situations and topics
4. understand diverse communication contexts and media
5. understand the causes and consequences of contemporary social concerns
6. cultivate and live within the framework of a diverse, tolerant and cooperative community

All students are required to complete a general education program of a three-semester Composition sequence, an oral communications class, and two service learning courses that promote ethical and civic responsibility as well as civic engagement. These mandated courses align with some, but not all, of WSCUC's core competencies (Written Communication, Oral Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking). Some CAS majors align certain core competencies with their discipline-specific learning outcomes (e.g, Quantitative Reasoning for Jewish Studies majors). However, it appears that the designers of each major are grappling with how to refine learning objectives so that they will come into closer alignment with the core competencies expectations (CFR 2.4, 4.4). Toward that end, each CAS major (Bioethics, Business, Jewish Studies, LCM [Literature, Communications and Media], Political Science, and Psychology) now has a curriculum map as well as a program review timeline.

AJU's Learning Outcome #2 is distinctive to the university's mission of fostering students' Jewish identity and engagement with Jewish culture and community. To that end, the undergraduate program requires that all CAS students complete two classes about Jewish & Israeli culture, history, and philosophy. It is not clear how the learning outcomes from these courses ties into the content of the majors themselves; with the exception of the Jewish Studies

majors, students in the other programs do not take Jewish content courses at the upper division level.

Assessment of CAS student learning. In spring 2014, AJU hired a new CAO/dean of the CAS and a Director of Assessment and Institutional Research (DAIR). Both brought extensive expertise in how to develop documents that could help faculty and staff construct appropriate and measureable program learning outcomes (PLOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the course level (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.3, 4.4). In 2014-15, assessment plans were developed for each undergraduate curriculum; these plans specify the time period (Academic Year, Semester, etc.) for assessment, who is on the assessment committee, what kinds of assessment data will be collected and analyzed, what direct and indirect evidence of student performance will be evaluated, and how the faculty will discuss and use/discuss/disseminate the results.

What has been learned to date from these new assessment strategies will be discussed in Components 5 and 6.

Timing of assessment and graduation. CAS assessment rubrics are incompletely provided in the institutional report. Nor is a syllabus included for any of the required senior capstone (COR 470) courses that presumably take place toward the end of the CAS student experience.

However, the Program Assessment Plan does provide some details about the kind of assessment that will eventually occur for the capstone process, stating: “Students will be able to synthesize their course work as well as their educational experiences and interests into a significant and practical capstone project.” It is anticipated that by 2018 an Assessment Committee comprised of the Dean and the Director of Assessment and Institutional Research (DAIR) will review key assignments from COR 470 (Senior Capstone) and will base their evaluations on direct evidence (final assignments and rubrics). After data have been collected in Spring 2018, a report will be

prepared that reviews the assessment process; this report will be completed in Fall 2018 (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).

### **E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention and Graduation**

AJU recognizes that recruitment and retention— two pillars of enrollment management -- are not only an important measure of student success, but are intimately connected to the quality of learning that the university is able to offer. Nowhere is this relationship between enrollment management, student success, and academic quality more apparent than with CAS, a school that holds a very special place at AJU. As a school of liberal arts where a rich exchange of diverse perspectives is essential, CAS requires a sufficient number of qualified students coupled with an adequate number of courses in order to deliver on its promise of cultivating future leaders, strengthening personal identity, and encouraging creativity.

Taking note of the new and returning enrollment numbers of CAS, it is apparent that, even for a school that values an intimate learning environment, AJU is falling short of offering a high quality liberal arts undergraduate education because of low enrollment and poor retention (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 3.1). There are simply too few undergraduate students matriculating each year. As a result, CAS students are unable to select from an array of courses taught by different faculty; instead, they run into the danger of being required to take the same courses with the same classmates and same professors each semester.

AJU recognizes this problem with CAS and has invested a considerable amount of money on several enrollment initiatives and different enrollment structures over the past decade. AJU first took a somewhat unusual path to growing enrollments by hiring a chief academic officer (CAO) in 2011. The CAO was both hired to focus on academic affairs, yet was also in charge of developing and implementing an enrollment management plan – not an easy task, especially

since the explicit desire to create the CAO position was to have this person focus on academic rather than administrative functions (CFR 1.6, 2.5).

One of the first initiatives that CAO launched was to partner with an undergraduate faculty steering committee on revising the CAS core curriculum based on a set of clearly articulated program learning outcomes and curriculum maps (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). The goal of this commendable effort was to provide the CAS admissions office and its hired partners (see below) with a “clearly defined and articulated product it could sell.”

To assist with its marketing and recruitment challenges, the CAO hired high-profile companies like Ruffalo Cody to help with strategic branding and Scannel & Kurtz (a division of Ruffalo Cody) to develop a non-need financial aid strategy to recruit academically talented first year undergraduates. And Noel-Levitz was hired to help develop a better picture of the type of student who would be best served and most attracted to a school like AJU.

In order to help with retention, the AJU took a few important internal measures during this time. As mentioned previously, a new curriculum was created to develop a more solid product to sell, but it was also designed to address the personal development issues commonly faced by CAS students that were hampering their educational success. With this new curriculum came close academic advising (CFR 2.3, 2.4).

Despite early problems with implementation and execution of certain parts of its new marketing and recruitment strategies, CAS did witness an initial increase with applications. In 2011, there were 41 applications to its programs. The following year it jumped to 77 (+88%). However, the yield on its offers did not improve. In 2011, the conversion rate on its offers was 92%, which gave CAS a class of 36 new students. The following year, a year when applications

surged, the yield on it offers dropped drastically to 58%, giving the school only seven more new students than in 2011.

The success enjoyed by CAS with its application pool was short-lived. In 2013, applications dropped by 27%. It also continued to witness a drop in yield, with only 44% of its admits electing to enroll. The fall of 2013 welcomed only 24 new students, 44% fewer than the previous year and 33% fewer than in 2011, the year the CAO had begun implementing CAS's new marketing and recruitment strategies.

During these years, things did not fare much better on the retention front. The graduation rate for first year CAS students between 2005 and 2010 was 57%. For transfer students during this time it was 77%. According to the last report received by WSCUC for years leading up to 2013, the average graduation rate for new freshmen after 6 years was only 41%. For transfer students, graduation rates only improved by 2%.

The failure to achieve significant improvements with recruitment and retention prompted AJU to find another CAO. After a nation-wide search they hired a new CAO/dean (in this section simply referred to as CAO) in 2014 (3FR 3.6). They also hired a Vice President for Marketing and Communication to help boost CAS enrollment. The new CAO launched a few retention initiatives, including clearly outlined academic assessment procedures and timelines. A student success committee was also created, and a new Assistant Director of Residential & Student life was hired to "provide a supportive, equitable, and robust student life."

It is too early to tell how much of an improvement in retention these new initiatives will yield, though there are some early signs of promise. The number of students who did not matriculate from spring to fall (i.e., those lost over the summer) reached its highest from spring 2014 to fall 2014, the year the new CAO was hired. The retention numbers from spring 2015 to fall 2015 and

from fall 2015 to spring 2016 have improved slightly, breaking a negative trend that began in 2011.

Another way the new CAO sought to improve the retention was to be more selective with its offers of admission and more generous with scholarship money for academically promising applicants. From 2011-14, the acceptance rate for CAS averaged 95%. Basically, everyone who applied to CAS was admitted, even if they were not prepared for the rigors of the college or a good fit for the school. Last fall, CAS admitted only 81% of its pool, denying three times the number of applicants it did the previous year. The result of this move towards increased selectivity was immediately felt by the entire AJU community. The quality of the classroom conversation improved, the new CAS students were characterized as being more engaged and better prepared, and these students more closely reflected the values and the aspirations of AJU (CFR 2.5). It's anticipated that this tactic will improve CAS retention and graduation rates.

The strategy to be more selective, however, did not pay off when it came to increasing the size of the CAS incoming class. Despite having the largest application pool in over five years, thanks in large part by the introduction of a common application, CAS was only able to yield 32% of its admits –the lowest in over five years. This left CAS with an entering class size of 22, the smallest in over five years.

While it is perhaps too early to tell, these measures have not readily helped to increase new student enrollments in CAS; in fact, enrollments continue to drop. According to the new Enrollment Management Plan that was provided to WSCUC, fall new student enrollment in CAS is the lowest since 2011. The total head count was its lowest for CAS in the fall 2015 (73), which is almost half of what it was in 2011.

It remains to be seen if AJU will meet the planned increased in 5% in new student enrollments it projects for CAS each year during the next five years. Though with the clever repackaging of the undergraduate curriculum, the introduction of a professional director of undergraduate admissions and a Vice President for Marketing and Communication who has a deep familiarity with higher education, there is promise.

We continue to be concerned that AJU, despite its commitment, has not been able to sustain upward enrollment that it recognizes it must achieve to realize its goal of offering a high quality education. We commend AJU, however, for taking the bold, innovative steps mentioned above to address these vital concerns (CFR 1.7, 3.6).

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

AJU has been exceptionally intentional in addressing matters of assessment and program review. As is detailed in the document “Program Review History” the first guidelines for program review were developed in 2001. As for most institutions which begin the process, some difficulties were faced at this start. There was no standardized form for each report, and the assessments depended, to a certain degree, on the opinions and experience of the program heads and department chairs. One undergraduate department (Bioethics), one graduate department (Ziegler School), and the CAS curriculum were subject to review in 2004, the first systematic reviews at AJU. Behavioral Science was reviewed in 2010 and Business and Jewish Studies followed in 2011. Bioethics and Zeigler completed 5-year interim reviews in 2010 (CFR 2.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). These reviews seem to have been mostly reflective, with faculty, program heads and department chairs assessing holistically the efficacy of their programs. Data collection, and the structure for data collection comes later to AJU. The pace and quality of the culture of review and assessment was a focus of the 2010 Special Visit, which also noted the challenges

that AJU had in terms of assessment and improvement. As the 2010 report noted, AJU's improvement strategy was primarily a "culture of conversation" rather than a data driven culture with the goal of institutional improvement.

All of this began to change in the spring 2015, when AJU hired a new CAO/dean of the CAS and a new Director of Assessment and Institutional Research (DAIR), both with extensive experience in the area of assessment and application (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). What they have accomplished in the last two years is impressive and commendable. As detailed in the institutional report (p. 48-58), they have worked assiduously to implement the institutional structures necessary for programmatic assessment over time that can be used for institutional improvement. Student learning outcomes (SLO) program learning outcomes (PLO), curriculum maps tied to the PLOs, and other instruments tied to specific timelines are now in place, and reviews are underway (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7). In addition, the lack of review processes for other institutional units (management, information services, plant, etc.), also cited in the Interim Report has been rectified. The committee understands the challenges for assessment at a small institution with a small full-time faculty, who tend to be overburdened by the nature of the workload in this environment.

What is a little more difficult to assess is how positively this new review and assessment structure will affect the future of AJU. Will these new structures have enough real commitment by the stakeholders to become fully institutionalized? This is a difficult issue for many institutions, and it is particularly so for AJU. A mechanism for implementation must be clear, and the team would suggest that examples of data collection, review process, assessment and implementation should be demonstrable (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6).

## **G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability; preparing for the changing higher education environment**

### **Fiscal sustainability: adequate and properly allocated resources**

In its institutional report, the university asserts its financial position is “very strong” (p. 15) and “very solid fiscally” (p. 59). Each of the four audited financial statements reviewed (FY 2012 through FY 2015) were “unqualified” and reveal a base of net assets that would be envied by many larger institutions. As discussed earlier in this report, the institution’s balance sheets in these audited statements reveal that from the end of FY 2011 until the end of FY 2015, university’s total assets grew \$12 million (or 8.6%) to over \$155 million and, during the same period, net assets increased \$15 million to more than \$113 million (or 15.7%). The bulk of this asset base is in an endowment of \$22.6 million, healthy for an institution of this size, plus additional non-endowment investments of over \$75 million. This extraordinary underlying asset base provides the significant institution strength.

On the other hand, these same audited financial statements as well as the budget status reports provided by the institution as part of its institutional report and supplemental materials, (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec 7, #3 through #6, #24 through #28) show operating expenditures that are allocated in a very conservative and constrained manner. For example, the operating expenses reported in the audited financial statements for FY 2015 totaled \$22.9 million, which was almost \$100,000 less than annual expenditures in FY 2011.

The “Revenue/Expense Budget 2014/2015” represents that year’s annual budget as \$27.9 million. This includes contingency funds of nearly \$1.4 million for operations, employee compensation, technology, and deferred maintenance. This is a prudent level of contingent reserves although some are associated with liabilities for employee benefits. The budget report shows allocated projected revenue to each program name based apparently on the revenue

generated by each program. It does not reflect estimates of net tuition, gifts, or other revenue, but allocates those revenues against programs to reflect net costs or contributions from each program. (See, Revenue/Expense Budget 2014/2015, Supplemental Materials).

The challenges the university is facing with a low enrollment and highly dependent on the generosity of a remarkable donor are shown in the reports of university revenue during this period. The total operating revenue in FY 2015 was \$500,000 less than in FY 2011 even though the gifts, grants, and bequests during FY 2015 totaled \$2.5 million more than in FY 2011. Gifts, grants, and bequests represented 30% of the total operating revenue in FY 2011, but increased to more than 42% of the operating revenue in FY 2015.

So, with the FY 2015 operating revenues 2.1% less than FY 2011 and FY 2015 operating expenses 0.3% more, the university has understandably continued to struggle to balance its budget while its underlying base of net assets grew by double digits. In fact, the audited financial statements show the university's operating expenses exceeded its operating revenues in FY 2015 as well as FY 2013. While the strong asset base is key for any institution to sustain itself into the future and protect itself from revenue downturns, the institution should evaluate whether current investments in the human and physical capital are appropriate to enable the institution to achieve its mission and strategic goals as well as respond effectively to the demands of the changing higher education landscape.

The university has shared with the team elements of its plan for facility maintenance and upgrade on the main campus as well as the Brandeis-Bardin Campus (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec. 7, #29). The maintenance and upgrade costs associated with the BBC are not trivial, and raises questions of how costs and revenues have been allocated to reach the net contribution to or from each program shown in the budget reports. With the concerns of declining enrollments

continuing, the short-term and mid-term objective of keeping enrollment levels at a sustainable level, the costs of operating and capital costs at both the academic campus and the BBC campus and their impact on the academic mission of the institution is a source of concern.

During the team's preparation for its visit, the team became aware of questions raised about the alleged hazardous conditions at the university's BBC because of its proximity to the Santa Susan Field Laboratory. The team reviewed these matters with the university's leadership and is satisfied that it has appropriately responded to these concerns. The team is especially impressed by the efforts of the university to ensure the entire university community is fully informed about the issue. The university's leadership has placed a prominent link on its web site to comprehensive information responding to the questions raised.

In the audited financial statements and the budget report provided to the team, the expenditures are disaggregated by the following six basic functional areas: academic, auxiliary enterprises, department of general education, public services, management & general and fundraising. This presentation makes it more difficult to assess the reasonableness of resource allocations through comparisons with other institutions of higher education which use standard functional classifications prescribed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). Using the FY 2015 audit report of the institution's annual Statement of Activities, only 36% of its annual operating expenses were allocated to the academics. While it does separate fundraising expenses, the audited financials' Statements of Activities do not explicitly show depreciation expense and other expense categories commonly used. It also does not separate the expenses (or revenues) associated with BBC, as distinct from auxiliary services provided on campus. The absence of the NACUBO standard functional revenue and expense

categories makes it difficult to evaluate the reasonableness of the institution's expenditure allocations (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5).

### **Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment.**

Considering its relatively small staff and faculty, the university has made a strong and concerted effort to provide the team requested information and reports. Considering its constrained budget and history since the last review of turnover in several key administrative and academic administrators, this effort has been especially impressive (CFR 4.1). The institution has reported to the team that a strategic planning committee has been established including senior staff, deans and program directors, and representatives from the faculty and from the board. This group met every two to three weeks during the year to review and discuss information regarding higher education and the challenges the institution may face. So, the process of developing an updated strategic plan continues.

However, while the institution's faculty and administrators have worked hard to identify its primary challenges, it has recognized that stable student enrollment has been and will continue to be a challenge because of its small size, limited program offerings, and narrow appeal as a Jewish institution of higher education in the West. The institution has been generating lots of data and other information to better understand the environment in which it will operate. However, much of these data are in a format that makes analysis and comparisons with other institutions difficult. In addition to the budget and other financial data presentation mentioned earlier, some of the enrollment data does not differentiate between full-time and part-time students, but mere head counts. (See, Enrollment Data (Fall 2013 – Fall 2014)). However, progress has been limited on the strategic plan to present and prioritize the key strategic goals and actions (CFR 4.3).

This university has a strong base of financial assets, a highly dedicated faculty and staff, and good facilities at its Bel-Air and Brandeis-Bardin Camp campuses to be a high quality institution of higher education that will successfully compete and thrive in the rapidly changing environment of higher education. However, until a well-developed strategic plan and a commitment to adequately resource the enrollment management plan and the academic enterprise are in place, the achievement of that objective will remain elusive. (CFR 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

#### **H. Component 8: Institution-specific Theme(s)**

N/A

#### **I. Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement**

##### Component 9 Reflections and Plans for Improvement

The institutional report and our conversations with leadership, faculty and staff demonstrate the sincere reflection in which the university community has engaged over the past few years and in preparing for this reaffirmation effort. The institutional report was open and reflective in dealing with the challenges the institution has encountered during the last few years. The loyalty of the faculty and staff to the institution is evidenced by the willingness and positive spirit in which they accepted reductions in pay when operating budgets had to be reduced. There is very broad support and respect for the new CAO/dean and his leadership in curriculum reform, policy development, problems solving and collaboration with faculty and other leaders (CFR 2.4, 4.2, 4.3). This was affirmed by the board, president, senior leadership, faculty and staff. There is also strong mutual support among all the senior leadership (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.10, 4.3).

As was identified in the institutional report by the visiting team prior to and during the Accreditation Visit, enrollment in all colleges was identified as a fundamental concern. This is acutely true in the undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences, which became a major focus of

the visit. The institution has recognized these challenges in each of the graduate programs and has undertaken steps to make institutional, marketing and personnel changes to address these enrollment declines, as elaborated in Section I (CFR 3.6, 4.3, 4.5).

In the College of Arts and Sciences the university leadership and faculty carefully looked at the challenges that low enrollment has placed on the educational experiences of its students and the very sustainability of the college itself (CFR 3.1, 3.4). Despite financial challenges new faculty members have been added in most disciplines. A re-focused admissions process with appropriately higher admissions standards is targeting students who have greater likelihood of success in the college's programs. The newly appointed CAO/dean along with the faculty and Director of Assessment and IR have led a re-examination of the college's strengths and weaknesses and implemented plans to address the challenges of low enrollment (CFR 4.3). That said, the team devoted a significant portion of its time on campus to further understand and to ensure that the institution understands the serious educational and fiscal viability problems the college is facing and to assess the strategies the college plans to undertake to resolve these challenges. During the visit the team was very impressed with the serious and strategic thought the CAS Steering Committee devoted in the mission driven redesign of the core curriculum and undergraduate major requirements building on commitments to social justice, community involvement and ethical action (CFR 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6).

The team spent time on strategic plan development hoping to assess whether there was an overarching strategy to address the growth, sustainability, distinctiveness of the university as a whole and its several semi-autonomous academic components. (CFR 4.6). The team concluded that appropriate broad based participation in the strategic plan had occurred and that the emerging plan would effectively address many of the challenges the university is facing.

One aspect of the university's planning and thinking process that the team also explored with university leadership and faculty was how much of an integrative unifying vision exists for the university with all of its graduate, undergraduate and community outreach components. The interrelationships among the institution's overall mission and vision and the mission of each of the academic and outreach units was a significant topic of conversation (CFR 4.2, 4.3). While there are appropriate missions for each of the academic components, an overall institutional learning goal has not been clearly articulated, nor is there a clear identity and vision for the university as a whole. There is tempered hope that as the undergraduate college refines and strengthens its curriculum a fully integrated mission might emerge. That said, all components of the university felt that there was a strong unifying character to the university (CFR 2.2a, 2.3, 2.4, 4.3, 4.4).

This university is deeply reflective of its strengths and challenges, enjoys positive support as a university community with dedicated faculty and staff members and an open and honest assessment of its directions. Given that open and reflective climate the university has the opportunity to address its challenges and frame its identity as a newly integrated institution and it appears to have the wiliness to do so through dialog and visionary leadership in the academic sector.

### **III: OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE (such as Substantive Change)**

**N/A**

#### **IV: FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW**

The team was deeply impressed with the dedication, openness, frankness and mutual support demonstrated by the entire university community, including senior administrative leadership, deans, faculty staff and students. This extraordinary community demonstrated a sense of shared values that derive from the university's vision and mission.

While the team's review encompassed all areas of the institution, it focused especially on the undergraduate programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. The university has engaged in a thorough and broadly participatory review and re-design of its undergraduate programs in a manner that aligns well with the university's mission. This has the potential to rebuild the undergraduate student body with students capable and prepared for success in a well-focused degree program founded upon commitments to social justice, community service and ethical action.

The new core curriculum and refocused undergraduate major requirements with capstone experiences and internships hold great promise to transform and grow the undergraduate student body and enhance the student experience. While the student body of the College of Arts and Sciences is not large enough to be sustainable at the current level, the team believes that the revised curriculum, combined with effective marketing and recruitment efforts, offers a positive path for the college's future.

##### **Commendations:**

The university is commended for:

1. Clear and broad-based support for the important role of the College of Arts and Sciences on the part of directors, faculty, senior leadership and staff. All expressed positive expectations regarding the results of the re-direction of the undergraduate

- program. The team recognizes the Board of Directors for their thoughtful support of the university administration and the College of Arts and Sciences in their efforts in curriculum redesign and increased admission standards.
2. Re-thinking and redirecting the undergraduate program, which has promise to restore and grow enrollment of qualified students in a revised mission-relevant undergraduate experience. The team also applauds the willingness to raise undergraduate admission standards to help ensure that students admitted to the College of Arts and Sciences are prepared for and capable to succeed.
  3. A herculean effort to develop and review learning outcomes and rubrics for all academic programs, which are assessed properly with related implementation plans. Similar assessment plans are underway for all academically related support service units.
  4. Through the application of budget controls and strong annual giving, growing the institution's overall wealth markedly since the last review.
  5. The recruitment of well-prepared new leaders in academic affairs, student affairs, undergraduate admissions, departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School of Non-Profit Management and Marketing, who have helped re-energize these programs and services and have supported positive programmatic momentum. In less than two years with significant faculty and staff involvement, the new CAO/dean of the college has made extraordinary progress in advancing new academic curricula and policies while building a remarkable sense of trust and optimism among the faculty and senior administrative staff.

6. The university faculty for its dedication to quality teaching and mentoring of AJU's students.
7. The institution's good progress in establishing and executing a process for the broad-based development of a realistic and forward-looking strategic plan.

**Recommendations:**

1. The minimal growth in the operating budgets of the past five-years has prevented some critically important investments, which would enable the institution to grow or even to operate at an appropriate level, especially the CAS. The institution should strongly consider targeted investments that enhance competitive advantage such as technology, web presence, classroom environments, and facilities (CFR 4.7). The team believes that such investments at the front end will yield solid results in student enrollment and student satisfaction (CFR 3.4, 3.5).
2. The current array of student services and extra-curricular and co-curricular programs offered for students in the College of Arts and Sciences is not sufficient in scope nor is it aligned with the academic programs of the college (CFR 2.11). If the university wishes to grow the student population in the college, particularly in residential life, energy and investments in this area are needed to re-establish a positive environment on campus. The team believes that such activities are important for the quality of student life and also essential for an environment that supports enrollment growth (CFR 3.4, 3.5).
3. Visible investments in areas of campus safety and security are critically needed to restore a sense of safety and well-being among students, faculty and staff. In the increasing challenges of today's changing world, the institution should ensure that its

efforts to provide the impression and reality of a safe and secure campus are effective (CFR 3.4, 3.5). The institution should develop a more comprehensive enrollment management plan based on market assessment data, strategic recruitment initiatives such as publications, social media and enhanced web access, as well as student retention strategies (CFR 4.3, 4.6).

## APPENDICES

### A. Federal Compliance Forms

#### 1. Credit Hour Review

#### 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
	Where is the policy located? In AJU Academic Catalog, page 126
	Comments: clear policy on Credit Hours
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
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Clear procedure, as reviewable and implemented by CAO/dean.
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: see AJU Catalog, page 126.
	How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A No online or hybrid courses are offered.
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?

<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses</p> <p><i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	What degree level(s)?
	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 type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: N/A. No online or hybrid courses.
<p>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)</p> <p><i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	How many syllabi were reviewed? Internships from GSNM, ZSRC, CAS
	What kinds of courses? GSNM, ZSRC, CAS Internships
	What degree level(s)? MBA, MA (ordination), BA
	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: Catalog clearly proscribes internship requirements, both in terms of quality of experience and minimum number of hours required. See website for internship opportunities for each division.
<p>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</p>	How many programs were reviewed? All programs
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? GSNM, ZSRC, CAS
	What degree level(s)? BA, MBA, MA (Rabbinical)
	What discipline(s)?
	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: see above.

Review Completed By: Diane Tickton Schuster  
Date: March 8-10, 2016

## 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review

### MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</b>
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</p> <p>XX <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>After interviewing member of the AJU admissions, financial aid, and upper administrative staff, it is clear that neither AJU members nor hired third-parties are compensated in any way based on their success in enrolling students.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</p> <p>xx YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</p> <p>xx YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>AJU catalog is very clear regarding time and cost regarding each degree, undergraduate and graduate, that it offers. See <a href="http://college.aju.edu/freshman/application_faq/">http://college.aju.edu/freshman/application_faq/</a>; <a href="http://mba.aju.edu/">http://mba.aju.edu/</a>; <a href="http://ziegler.aju.edu/">http://ziegler.aju.edu/</a>, <a href="http://maed.aju.edu/default.aspx">http://maed.aju.edu/default.aspx</a>; as well as AJU's catalogue pg. 72.) See net price calculator, (<a href="http://www.aju.edu/npcalc.htm">http://www.aju.edu/npcalc.htm</a>).</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? xx YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? xx YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

	<p>Comments:</p> <p>On the AJU website, the university does a creditable job outlining the kind of careers and professional opportunities associated with each degree and academic program. Minor mention is made of actual employment rates for the graduate and professional programs, which hovers around 90% (<a href="http://aboutus.aju.edu/default.aspx?id=4740">http://aboutus.aju.edu/default.aspx?id=4740</a>; however, AJU does offer sufficient narratives and testimonials of where their undergraduate, graduate and professional students go upon graduation. (See, for example, <a href="http://mba.aju.edu/">http://mba.aju.edu/</a> and <a href="http://maed.aju.edu/">http://maed.aju.edu/</a>, <a href="http://college.aju.edu/undergraduate/majors/lcm/">http://college.aju.edu/undergraduate/majors/lcm/</a>, and <a href="http://college.aju.edu/undergraduate/majors/psychology/">http://college.aju.edu/undergraduate/majors/psychology/</a>.)</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.

Review Completed By: Gregory Canada

Date: March 8-10, 2016

### 3. Student Complaint Review

#### 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	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>With complaints management now under student affairs, uniform processes for time-stamp receipt and complaint disposition are in place. The new form for students to use to submit the grievance to the Office of Student Affairs under this revised policy has been included on the university's web site beginning in the fall, 2015. A review of that grievance form shows that it is adequate for its purpose. See:  <a href="http://currentstudents.aju.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Academic_Catalog/About_the_University/Student%20Grievance%20Form.pdf">http://currentstudents.aju.edu/uploadedFiles/Academics/Academic_Catalog/About_the_University/Student%20Grievance%20Form.pdf</a> )</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>The process has been communicated to all undergrad and graduate students in the Student Handbook (See, 2015 institutional report, Sec 1, #7 Student Handbook), catalog, new student orientation and university website (Student Affairs Division). Handbook for 2015-2016 and website reflects the process.</p> <p>All complaints must be submitted on an on-line form which is available on the university's web site with a clear statement of this policy since the beginning of the fall 2015.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Through interviewing staff and students, there is now a clear and understood procedure for handling student complaints.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where?</p> <p>In the Office of the Dean of Students</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>Good records of student complaints are now filed and kept in the Office of the Dean of Students</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Good progress has been made to institutionalize the process and procedure for student grievance and complaints since 2014.</p>

\*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

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

Review Completed By: Patrick Cavanaugh

Date: March 8-10, 2016

#### 4. Transfer Policy Review

##### 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? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? XX YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  If so, where? See: <a href="http://college.aju.edu/transfer/">http://college.aju.edu/transfer/</a>
	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?  XXYES <input type="checkbox"/> NO  See: <a href="http://college.aju.edu/transfer/">http://college.aju.edu/transfer/</a> for all divisions.
	Comments:  Transfer credits are accepted by the CAS, the GSNP, and by the GCJE. In addition, the CAS has articulation agreements with 2-year institutions, and also has a clear policy regarding Advanced Placement (AP) credit.

\*§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: Eric M. Frank

Date: March 8-10, 2016