

REPORT OF THE WASC PATHWAY B VISIT TEAM

To Claremont Lincoln University

January 28–30, 2013

Team Roster

James A. Donahue, WASC Chair, President, Graduate Theological Union

David Fite, WASC Assistant Chair, VPAA, University of Redlands

Robert P. Allison, WASC Team Member, VP for Business and Finance,
Vanguard University of Southern California, retired

Kartikeya C. Patel, WASC Team Member, Faculty, Sofia University

Dennis M. Swanson, WASC Team Member, VP for Library and Educational
Assessment, The Master's College and Seminary

Richard Osborn, WASC Institution Liaison

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

Table of Contents

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT.....	3
Description of the Institution and Visit.....	3
Quality of the Institution’s Self-Study Report and Evidence.....	4
Description of the Team’s Review Process.....	5
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS	7
Standard 1: Institutional Purposes and Objectives.....	7
<i>CFR 1.1-1.3 Institutional Purposes</i>	7
<i>CFR 1.4-1.9 Integrity</i>	9
Standard Two: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	12
<i>CFR 2.1-2.7 Teaching and Learning</i>	12
<i>CFR 2.8-2.9 Scholarship and Creative Activity</i>	18
<i>CFR 2.10-2.14 Support for Student Learning</i>	20
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources.....	21
<i>CFR 3.1-3.4 Faculty and Staff</i>	21
<i>CFR 3.5-3.7 Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources</i>	24
<i>CFR 3.8-3.11 Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes</i>	30
Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement.....	32
<i>CFR 4.1-4.3: Strategic Thinking and Planning</i>	32
<i>CFR 4.4-4.8: Commitment to Learning and Improvement</i>	34
SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	39
Commendations.....	39
Recommendations	41
APPENDICES	44
A. Compliance Audit Checklist	45
B. Credit Hour Report.....	48

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution and Visit

Claremont Lincoln University (CLU) was established in 2010 as “the first interreligious graduate school in the United States” which “is at once a degree-granting institution and the hub of a consortium of graduate professional schools representing a variety of religious and ethical traditions” (p. 11). While it endeavors to be a unique institution, CLU draws on existing resources and has emerged from another institution, the Claremont School of Theology (CST). In 1956, the Claremont School of Theology was chartered as an ecumenical institution of the Methodist Church devoted to educating students across religious boundaries. In response to declining enrollments, decreasing United Methodist support, and a rapidly changing world, CST embarked upon a collaborative effort in 2008 called the “Claremont University Project” to develop a new kind of multireligious graduate university. CST’s consortial partners in the establishment of Claremont Lincoln University now include the Academy for Jewish Religion (California), Bayan Claremont, a Muslim graduate school, and the University of the West, a Buddhist university.

Operating as a division of the Claremont School of Theology, Claremont Lincoln University was granted WASC Eligibility in July 2011 “under the provisions of the policy that allows for a more rapid accreditation process for institutions that currently hold accreditation with an institutional accreditor recognized by the U.S. Department of Education, referred to as Pathway B” (WASC Action Letter, August 8, 2011, p. 5). The WASC Action Letter of August 8, 2011 affirmed that Claremont Lincoln University “has been found to meet all of the WASC Eligibility criteria” (p.

4) and made recommendations for additional actions that needed to be taken by CLU, particularly with regard to criterion 1: authority, criterion 4: governing board, criterion 5: chief executive officer, criterion 15: student services, criterion 19: financial accountability, and criterion 20: institutional planning. Following conferral of WASC Eligibility, Claremont Lincoln University has “committed itself to the arduous path toward the goal of Candidacy and Initial Accreditation” (p. 12), even as the Claremont School of Theology has become one of eight institutions currently participating in a pilot of WASC’s redesigned process of institutional review for re-accreditation.

Quality of the Institution’s Self-Study Report and Evidence

In preparing its WASC candidacy/initial accreditation self-study report under Pathway B, Claremont Lincoln University formed teams for each of the four WASC standards as well as for data exhibits and research and systems support. Existing institutional committees such as the Joint Curriculum Committee and Institutional Research Council also contributed to the self-study process and report. A WASC Review Steering Team, including the President and other members of the senior administration, oversaw and coordinated the self-study process and report. A total of eight administrators and one staff member served on the four WASC standard teams and WASC Review Steering Committee. There was faculty representation on these teams, albeit drawn mostly from the Dean’s Office.

The CLU accreditation self-study report is clearly written and candid in its acknowledgment of issues which CLU must address in achieving its mission and commitments to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness. The CLU report and exhibits present detailed discussion

and substantial supporting evidence of the University's efforts related to the four WASC standards and 42 criteria for review, which are clearly referenced and used to structure the report. Each section of the CLU accreditation self-study reports concludes with helpful summaries of next steps needed to ensure continuing progress and compliance with relevant WASC standards. In response to requests from the WASC Team, CLU provided helpful additional evidence including pro forma budgets, enrollment projections, and career opportunities projections for CLU graduates.

Description of the Team's Review Process

The Team carefully reviewed Claremont Lincoln University's accreditation self-study report and supporting documents in advance of the site visit on January 28-30, 2013. Based on its review of CLU's report and supporting documents as well as the WASC criteria and Pathway B process for candidacy and initial accreditation, the Team identified key issues related to both institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that were used to structure and focus the meetings and discussions of the site visit. These issues included mission, vision, and intended outcomes of CLU programs, planning and fiscal sustainability, organization and decision-making, faculty roles, responsibilities, workload, and governance, and the roles and relations of the institutional members of the CLU consortium. During its site visit, the Team met with a wide range of CLU and consortial representatives, including senior administration, Board of Directors, planning and governance committees, library and information technology staff, full-time and adjunct faculty members, staff representatives, and students. The Team made special efforts to meet with representatives of all the CLU consortium members, Claremont School of Theology, Academy for Jewish Religion, Bayan Claremont, and University of the West. Throughout the review

process, the Team worked closely and collegially with CLU's accreditation liaison officer and senior administration, who provided helpful support.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTION UNDER THE STANDARDS

Standard 1: Institutional Purposes and Objectives

CFR 1.1-1.3 Institutional Purposes

Claremont Lincoln University (CLU) has set forth on a bold course to create an institution that addresses some of the important issues and needs that have arisen in the world of theological education, in particular, the nature of theological diversity and the multi-religious dimensions that are integral to the future of theological education. CLU's statement of purpose describes a university dedicated to broad understanding, correcting misperceptions, removing suspicion, and promoting mutual respect. Furthermore, it lays the groundwork for peaceful collaborations among individuals from different religious traditions and offers a multi-religious curriculum developed and maintained in part by representatives of participating entities and religious traditions. This creates an education based on an ethical foundation from which practitioners can both study and marshal world religions to solve global problems that cross religious boundaries.

Claremont Lincoln's purposes are clear, explicit, and embody fully the mission statement of the University. *"As an ecumenical and interreligious institution, Claremont Lincoln University seeks to instill students with the ethical integrity, religious intelligence, and intercultural understanding necessary to become effective in thought and action as leaders in the increasingly diverse multireligious world of the 21st century"* (p. 14).

Claremont Lincoln is to be commended for setting forth in a direction that addresses such important religious needs. The mission and purposes can best be described as being responsive to

identified shortcomings in the way that theological education has been formulated and delivered in its past and present forms. This responsiveness is an appropriate way to address shortcomings, and CLU is very clear that its mission and purpose seek to remedy these limitations. CLU's mission, purpose, and responsiveness to existing deficiencies raise the question of whether or not that responsiveness is adequate in and of itself to provide a focus for an entire graduate school of religion. While the institution's statement adequately addresses the current inadequacies, there needs to be a more robust and fuller understanding of how that mission statement will be embodied by future graduates of CLU (CFR 1.1).

One way of framing this issue is to ask what qualities and skills will be manifested by CLU graduates. What will they be in service of and for what will these skills be used? CLU needs to address in a concrete manner what roles and placement opportunities are intended by the purpose statement and the mission of CLU.

The educational objectives of CLU are clearly recognized throughout the institution, and Claremont Lincoln has articulated very clearly what its learning objectives are at the institutional, degree-program, degree-concentration, and course levels. The outcomes, which have been fully articulated, revolve primarily around four fundamental goals: integration of religious knowledge, demonstration of intercultural understanding, relationship between practice and theory, and development of a framework for ethical integrity. The indicators set forth by CLU are largely contained in the essay on Standard 2 in CLU's self-study report. There needs to be greater alignment of learning outcomes across the institution at all levels showing how CLU coordinates its educational objectives across the institution.

With regard to the placement data contained in the report, what is the relationship between graduates of CLU and these placement results for Claremont School of Theology? This will be an important issue that needs to be reviewed carefully with respect to both WASC and ATS standards. Questions remains regarding what the graduates of CLU will do with their degrees, what this might entail, and what those placements and the market for degrees provided at Claremont Lincoln might be (CFR 1.2).

Claremont Lincoln has done a superb job in assessing its needs for infrastructure, staffing levels, and leadership necessary going forward for sustaining the work of CLU. The University has successfully used the work that was initiated at the Claremont School of Theology (CST) to determine what the staffing levels and leadership levels will entail. The leadership team, President's executive team, integrated planning team to the President's Cabinet, and the assistant research council to the Academic Support Team are very clearly delineated and contain the essence of what is necessary to carry on the work anticipated by Claremont Lincoln University. The WASC Team was struck by the extraordinary support for the CLU leadership, as well as by the leadership's openness and responsiveness to listening to the concerns of all of its key constituencies.

CFR 1.4-1.9 Integrity

Claremont Lincoln clearly addresses issues of integrity by stating that the institution should be both ethical and transparent. The issue of integrity also entails the understanding of diversity and how Claremont Lincoln intends to address the issue of diversity in its administration and curriculum. CFR 1.4 is very clear about the importance of academic freedom, particularly in an

environment where diversity is at its core. The commitment to maintain mutual respect and compassion and to promote collaboration and trust across ideological and religious boundaries is well established at Claremont Lincoln's operational core, as exemplified in the memorandum of understanding among the parties that collaborate in the Claremont Lincoln University Project. The primacy of academic freedom and the commitment to mutual respect and compassion for differences are clearly expressed. A commitment to academic freedom is well established at Claremont Lincoln.

The University does a superb job in responding to the increasing diversity of society that is the hallmark of the institutional commitments and the mission of Claremont Lincoln, as realized through the multiple centers that exist at Claremont as well as the memorandum of understanding among the collaborating institutions. Besides the centers, there are well established and ongoing student groups, responsible for creating diversity, that have a more informal character. The response of CLU degree programs to increasing diversity is well articulated in that the degrees are intended to address the needs of the diverse constituencies that will be attending Claremont Lincoln and are also consistent with the core of its mission. The M.A. in Interreligious Studies, the M.A. in Interfaith Chaplaincy, and the Ph.D. in Practical Theology: Spiritual Care and Counseling should be particularly noted as being important to the core commitments of CLU. The University has also done a superb job by raising up those courses that address particular issues of diversity pertinent to the work of CLU. The policies and practices of diversity related to enrollment and the composition of the student body are commendable.

Claremont Lincoln is very cognizant of the fact that it will be important to maintain the appropriate autonomy for the component parts of Claremont Lincoln, as is reflected in its response to CFR 1.6 in its accreditation self-study report. This will be one of the important organizational and institutional issues going forward. Putting together the different institutions, centers, and curricular programs that are to be integrated in addressing the fundamental purposes and mission of CLU will require constant assurance that there is appropriate autonomy of the consortium members as they work to achieve a shared vision. There is also a fundamental commitment to sound business practices, creation of appropriate policies, and clear and open communication in all that CLU does, including its relations to WASC (CFR 1.8, 1.9).

Claremont Lincoln University has articulated two action steps that it believes will be important in moving forward relative to the criteria for review in Standard 1: 1. “Maintain momentum and our edge in the marketplace”; 2. “Begin to live out our mission, and live into the diversity that we profess” (p. 27).

In terms of Step 1, CLU must fully demarcate the marketplace that it seeks to capitalize on and attract for students, faculty, and donors. This connects to CLU’s articulation of its mission as a response to the need to “desegregate” religious education. CLU has established ambitious enrollment and fundraising goals. The marketplace for its potential enrollment and the particular skill set that its graduates will acquire and use needs to be more fully articulated. CLU is very clear about this in its self-study report when it asks, “Will we really be able to tap this huge new market for interreligious studies before others do?” (p. 27). CLU acknowledges that “the sustainability of our University depends in part on our continued our [sic] efforts to discern what

is happening in our market, and to develop academic programs that meet those needs” (p. 27).

The question is not just about how Claremont Lincoln competes with other potential institutions, but about being clear on what the actual market is for the products, degrees, and skills that CLU is proposing.

Action Step 2 articulates a desire to live out CLU’s mission to promote diversity. There is a very clear sense that much of what CLU is addressing has an appeal to certain audiences but will require some massaging in order to be more fully effective and attractive to broader audiences. CLU asks in its report, “Will there be room at Claremont Lincoln for conservative evangelicals? for atheists? for the non-affiliated? Can faculty and board members discuss the really hot topics ... or will we deteriorate into factionalism?” (p. 27). It is important that CLU continues to focus on these issues. The institution understands well what the issues are and how the formation of the new institution to address these issues will be important going forward. Perhaps the biggest issue for CLU relative to the criteria of Standard 1 has to do with understanding the marketplace for its work, the potential market for its students, and concrete placements for its graduates that are the outcomes of living out its mission.

Standard Two: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

CFR 2.1-2.7 Teaching and Learning

The consortium faculty at the Claremont Lincoln University are actively engaged in teaching and creating a culture of learning where intellectual learning is integrated with and evidenced in its practical applications in real world situations. Over the last two years, the University faculty has come together as a community and made substantial progress in reaching a common and

energizing educational vision as reflected in CLU's four institutional learning outcomes (CFR 2.3, CFR 1.2). The institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) appear to be well-integrated with the program learning outcomes (PLOs) across all programs. As evidenced by discussions with the University and adjunct faculty during the WASC Team visit, CLU faculty are actively engaged in discussions about expectations of student learning (CFR 2.4). This involvement is also evidenced in syllabi, the CLU self-study report, and exhibits of student work from programs that have been transferred from the Claremont School of Theology (CST) and Claremont Graduate University (CGU).

The entry requirements for all degree programs are clearly defined and explained in the University Catalog, web pages, and other material. All courses are graded and the University Catalog clearly states the alpha (A-F) numeric (4.0-0.0) grading system in place. Courses, instructors, and students are evaluated at the end of the course. The degree requirements are consistent with similar graduate programs at accredited universities. For students enrolled in specific tracks such as the Ph.D. in Practical Theology with a concentration in Spiritual Care and Counseling, the training and graduation requirements are closely aligned with professional accrediting bodies such as the Association of Professional Chaplains (APC). CLU has a transfer of academic credit policy in place (CFR 2.10). At the M.A. level, CLU allows transfer of up to 50 percent of total degree units with courses completed with a grade of B and, at the Ph.D. level, CLU allows no transfer of academic credits earned at other institutions, but allows up to 50 percent of the total degree units from Claremont Graduate University or as a non-degree or Master's degree student at Claremont Lincoln University or Claremont School of Theology.

Systematic engagement with program-level assessment is being put in place at the departmental level. Educational objectives and expected program learning outcomes have been developed for all programs. These are published in the University Catalog, course syllabi, and on program web pages (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). The Joint Curriculum Committee (JCC) and the Office of the Academic Dean work to ensure that the institutional level learning outcomes and the program learning outcomes are properly aligned. CLU requires capstone courses, experiences, or portfolios for some programs although the Team did not see evidence that these portfolio and capstone projects are being systematically put in place for all programs or that they are identified as such for the purpose of program and student evaluation. In reviewing the published program learning outcomes at the doctoral level, the Team noted that, although the course curricula reflect the interreligious emphasis, the lack of specific courses on intercultural communication and understanding seems clear.

The substantive change proposal to WASC for the online degree program in Ethical Leadership included research data on the content, length, and standards from other programs with similar orientation as benchmarks to evaluate the design and feasibility of the program, thus providing evidence that this and other proposed programs are in line with the academic and professional standards (CFR 2.1). CLU also recently required its academic and administrative managers to undergo program management training that pays particular attention to exploration, initiation, execution, monitoring, and controlling the academic project. Such training is consistent with the program management standards set by the Project Management Institute (PMI). We commend CLU for this implementation, viewing it as a good practice worthy of emulation.

The online course delivery system used by CLU, Sakai, is an open-source Learning Management System (LMS) supported as a learning platform by Stanford, Columbia, Yale, and other educational institutions. This LMS with appropriate software modification supports both synchronous and asynchronous learning modes. Since CLU is in the process of rolling out its first online program, the WASC Team did not have an opportunity to evaluate engaged student learning in a real online class. However, the University provided the Team with a demo class access where the course syllabus, instructor information, and student learning outcomes for a proposed course were posted. The University has mandated online training for its faculty and students, has recently hired a Director of Online Learning, and is in the process of hiring an instructional designer to assist faculty and students (CFR 2.3, 2.11, 2.13). In reviewing the course syllabi for online and blended programs, the Team notes that the syllabi do not exhibit consistency in listing the components of online learning such as the grading of online discussion and participation, adaptation of learning theories for online instruction, privacy and confidentiality policies that protect students in an online learning environment, and ADA compliance policies that clearly outline the delivery of the course material to students with disabilities. CLU will need to modify and adapt its course syllabi designed for face-to-face learning and make them suitable for online learning.

Although the institutional learning outcomes appear to be well-integrated with the program learning outcomes, the reviewed course syllabi for both residential and blended (face-to-face and online) programs indicate that the institutional learning outcomes are not yet consistently integrated with the course learning outcomes. CLU will need to ensure that the institutional learning outcomes are well-integrated at the course level. In its self-study report, CLU notes that

"Member schools in the consortium specialize in the various religious traditions and offer degrees in those traditions. By contrast, degree programs at the University involve integration across the traditions—knowledge that builds upon the wisdom from the various traditions and ‘engaged religion’ that profits from the insights of all” (p. 42). As witnessed by the WASC Team, a culture of faculty involvement with program and curricular development exists between the consortium institutions; however, given that the institutional mission of CLU—integration across the traditions—is distinct from other consortium members, it is imperative that the University faculty are properly trained in integration of the institutional learning outcomes with the program and course learning outcomes, and that they are educated about the unique CLU mission. In addition to faculty training, CLU also needs to address student preparation issue for its interreligious curricula so that students can benefit from the instruction as well as group interaction. The inconsistent course syllabi indicate that the departmental follow-up and approval of the course syllabi on a regular basis is still in process (CFR 2.4, 3.2).

The formal program review (CFR 2.7, 4.4) process at CLU consists of two review cycles: Annual Program Review and a ten-year Comprehensive Program Review consisting of two four-year assessment cycles. The formal program review process is part of an overall institutional education effectiveness plan that takes into account the program learning outcomes (PLOs) and their relevancy to the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs).

The Annual Program Review is conducted by the Office of the Academic Dean in consultation with the Joint Curriculum Committee. The Annual Program Review consists of analysis of direct and indirect data on student learning such as student term papers for individual courses, data on

the course learning outcomes and their evaluation relative to the program learning outcomes, student self-evaluations, faculty advising, course evaluations, qualifying examinations and doctoral dissertations where appropriate, and evaluations by supervisors of student knowledge and performance during internships or off-site work, where appropriate. The Annual Program Review also takes into account the graduation and retention rates, placement data, licensure data, alumni data, and student satisfaction data on co-curricular activities. Data is also gathered on student work load, debt load, scholarship stipulations, scheduling of classes, and student services. The Annual Program Review data analysis and recommendations are reviewed by faculty at the fall faculty retreat and also by other administrative units for planning, budgeting, and tracking purposes. It is unclear whether there is a policy or a deadline for reflecting university-level outcomes in specific course syllabi (CFR 2.3, 2.4).

In addition to the Annual Program Review, CLU conducts a Comprehensive Program Review aligned with a presumed ten-year accreditation cycle and consisting of two four-year assessment cycles. The Comprehensive Program Review rolls multiple years of Annual Program Review assessments into the Comprehensive Program Review process and adds program self-study, and reviews of academic programs from collaborating institutions which help the individual programs in assessing the achievement of program outcomes or by external faculty in religion/theology fields (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6). The Office of the Academic Dean and the Office of the Dean of Student Life review the Comprehensive Program Review data in consultation with the Joint Curriculum Committee and Faculty Executive Committee and forward the data interpretation and recommendations to the Executive Team.

The comprehensive program review cycle stretching for ten years seems rather long and almost guarantees that the findings of the program review will fail to be implemented in a timely manner. The Team recommends that CLU consider reducing the length of the comprehensive program review cycle from ten years to five years. The Team also recommends that the elements of program review be revised to include student demographics, faculty and staff support, financial feasibility of the program, faculty committee review, peer benchmarking that includes components such as best practices guidelines beyond an external review, and reviews of program outcomes from external sources such as the employers who have employed the graduates of the program.

CFR 2.8-2.9 Scholarship and Creative Activity

The faculty of CLU are esteemed for their professional expertise and scholarly works that links research, practical application, and teaching (CFR 2.9). The faculty is well published, and the faculty output in books and conferences is impressive, providing a good model of academic values for students. It is evident that faculty research in some cutting-edge programs is externally funded. Institutional support for research is recognized as an important institutional commitment; however, there does not seem to be a research funding structure in place for faculty on term contracts. Since CLU is adopting a non-tenure track, five-year renewable contract model for the University faculty, it needs to ensure that faculty are provided with adequate research leave time and funding for faculty travel to present at professional conferences and for research travel. There also needs to be a clear policy on allocated faculty research time for CLU faculty at the doctoral level (CFR 2.8).

CLU faculty have developed a thoughtful and systematic approach to research training for doctoral students, and practical training for students in professionally oriented degree concentrations such as spiritual care and counseling and interfaith chaplaincy. The students in research-oriented degree programs take the appropriate research methods courses, and languages are also required for these degree programs. Faculty and student research that requires the use of human subjects must be approved by the Institutional Review Board. The course readings are current and include classic as well as current material. The Team noted that peer-reviewed journal articles do not consistently appear in the assigned class readings and this should be immediately addressed when the course syllabi are reviewed.

The Team notes that faculty workload, full-time University Faculty, and full-time to part-time faculty ratios are important issues that CLU needs to address (CFR 2.1, 3.1). There are obvious inconsistencies in CLU's documentation as to who and what counts as full-time University faculty. The completed required summary data form dated 10/24/2012 lists 4.5 FTE as CLU University faculty whereas the faculty staffing plan submitted by CLU during the site visit states that CLU has a total of 66 University faculty. In using terms such as "University Faculty" or "Core Faculty," CLU needs to ensure that the terms conform to general usage in higher education. The Team notes that CLU is in the process of hiring its own faculty and, according to the Faculty Staffing Plan document, plans to hire three new full-time faculty over the next five years.

Since CLU plans to share faculty with the consortium members, the Team recommends that clear terms of agreements are worked out between CLU and the consortium members that takes into

account overall faculty workload at all member institutions including teaching, advising, and thesis/dissertation supervision, faculty compensation, and faculty development. It is imperative that programs at the M.A. and Doctoral levels are properly resourced (CFR 2.1) and that faculty have sufficient time to conduct research (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

CFR 2.10-2.14 Support for Student Learning

CLU is a highly student-centered organization that well reflects its values and professional activities in support for student learning. Students are supported by an array of services, including a tailored orientation, peer mentoring, and tutoring services (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13). With its visible focus on co-curricular activities and its emphasis on applied research in organizational settings such as communities, cities, societies, and governments, CLU offers opportunities for students to engage in co-curricular activities across many academic programs. The Office of Internships and Career Services and the Associate Dean of Student Life work with students for internship and placement. The co-curricular learning is also augmented by CLU's close relationships to centers including the Center for Sexuality, Gender, and Religion, Center for Engaged Compassion, Center for Global Peacebuilding, Institute for Postmodern Development of China, Rockhill Institute, Center for Jain Studies, Center for Sustainability and Spirituality, and Center for Process Studies. The University also has a number of student groups, including the Feminist Resource Network, Seminarians for Social Justice, Asian American Pacific Islander/American Association, and De Colores, to name a few.

CLU student services include the Office of the Registrar, Library, the Office of Financial Aid, the Writing Center, Career Resource Center, Field Placement and Internship Office, and the

Office of Student Advising that provide administrative support services to CLU students. CLU will need to ensure that its student learning support services are available to its online and at-a-distance student population and that these services are integrated with its new Sakai Learning Management System (CFR 2.13).

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources

CFR 3.1-3.4 Faculty and Staff

Claremont Lincoln University (CLU) by design is developing within a highly consortial framework, and therefore currently relies heavily upon associative members for key staffing needs. Most of CLU's key leadership positions are currently filled by personnel from the Claremont School of Theology (CST), with plans for new hires only as the institution matures. At the time of the Team visit, approximately six positions fully belonged to CLU, while the remainder of the staffing was supplied from CST at a level cost relative to their respective pro rata effort. Approximately ten individuals were in this "shared" category at the time of the visit. Because of this consortial arrangement, CLU is supported by experienced and seasoned personnel, sufficient in number at this start-up phase to carry out most of the functions consistent with its current programs. Most, if not all, of the key positions are filled with individuals adequately prepared for the positions they occupy (CFR 3.1). CLU has access to sufficient faculty from CST and its associative members to support the programs that it offers. CST has 22 full-time faculty members, with a student to faculty ratio of approximately 1 to 7, and has sufficient capacity for a significant increase in the number of students.

By the time of the Team visit, Claremont Lincoln had hired its first full-time advancement officer, seen as a key to the fulfillment of its aggressive fundraising aspirations. Another key position of institutional research officer has not yet been established in either CST or CLU. Rather, a presidential committee was appointed to oversee the institutional research function, but the committee lacks representation from the academic administration or faculty. When the committee was asked about student success data, the Team was referred to the Dean's Office, as that office collects and evaluates student success data. It seems clear that no centralized repository of data exists, nor does an overarching data collection plan. The institution should consider hiring or appointing someone to lead the institutional research function (CFR 3.1, 4.3, 4.5).

Plans call for six master's degree programs and two doctoral degree programs to be transferred from CST when accreditation issues for CLU are resolved. The 22 full-time faculty members employed by CST are more than enough for the number of students currently enrolled, as evidenced by the faculty to student ratio of 1 to 7. Significant growth can take place without the addition of more full-time faculty unless fields of study are expanded beyond the ability of the current faculty to adequately support. CLU plans to utilize members of the CST faculty on a cost-reimbursement basis to provide instruction to CLU students. The faculty appears to be fully engaged and even excited about the new direction of interreligious education. The qualifications of the CST and faculty from CLU's associated members are consistent with those typically found in U.S. graduate seminary education. For example, all of the 22 full-time faculty have Ph.D.s or other terminal degrees; likewise, the adjunct faculty also appear to be highly qualified, with the vast majority holding Ph.D.s or other appropriate credentials. The adjunct faculty members are

vetted through the Joint Curriculum Committee for CLU to ensure that their qualifications are consistent with the graduate classes they are engaged to teach. Claremont Lincoln primarily contracts with faculty members from consortial institutions, but does plan to hire a few of its own full-time faculty on a contract basis. The faculty members currently engaged, while employed by CST, appear to be fully prepared and committed to oversee the programs under their purview (CFR 3.2).

CLU has established recruitment, orientation, workload, and evaluation policies for faculty in its Faculty Handbook. Faculty positions are to be advertised widely, and in accordance with applicable law, in publications such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and on-line in *Inside Higher Education*. Adjunct hiring practices are explained in the Faculty Handbook. Faculty workload is also carefully described in the Faculty Handbook. Reviews for both full-time contract faculty and adjunct faculty are conducted by the Provost or School Dean, and the results are provided to the Joint Curriculum Committee. The Handbook does not provide for peer review in the customary manner, except in the case for recommendations for promotion. In this case, the Faculty Executive Committee is charged with evaluating the recommendation, and, if approved, sending it to the Provost, President, and ultimately the Board of Directors for approval (CFR 3.3). Criteria for faculty evaluations are carefully laid out in the Faculty Handbook, both for full-time and adjunct faculty, and include self-evaluation, evaluation by the supervising dean, student evaluations, including the students' assessment of how well the course satisfied the student learning outcomes specified in the class syllabus, and course proposals and syllabi. Grievance procedures, except in the case of dismissal, are not contained in the Faculty Handbook. The institution should consider revising the Faculty Handbook to include an over-

arching grievance procedure and creating an employee handbook which details staff evaluations, professional development, and other critical issues (CFR 3.3).

CLU provides professional development opportunities for its faculty, especially in their particular area, much in the same way that CST has for many years, \$1,000 per faculty member, and in addition provides on-site professional development opportunities for its faculty in the area of teaching development and online course development. Professional development opportunities for staff include on-site training, such as the project management workshop provided to staff within the last year, and professional development opportunities at professional associations during the year. WASC training has also been funded to assist the staff and faculty to fully complying with the assessment needs relative to its educational mission (CFR 3.4).

CFR 3.5-3.7 Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

As a new institution, Claremont Lincoln does not have a history of financial stability; however, the institution's start-up is well-funded by a multiyear gift of \$50 million from a single donor. To date, the institution has received just under \$10M of the gift, and the remainder will be received through a combination of a legacy gift and some funds accelerated to sustain the organization while it is in its infancy (CFR 3.5).

Much effort has been expended in creating the organization itself, and forming or gaining associative members, such as the Academy for Jewish Religion, and Bayan Claremont, the Institute of Islamic Studies. The Board of Directors currently has two members each from AJR and Bayan. CST is the third associative member, and others such as the University of the West

are in the process of becoming associative members. These associative members are viewed as key parts of an emerging consortium, made up of equal partners, surrounding and closely associated with Claremont Lincoln University. The structure of CLU is emerging and well detailed but still lacks some essential elements of a viable consortium. For example, a cost allocation model was approved by the CLU Board of Directors but has not yet been endorsed by the CST Board of Trustees. To date, the tricky issue of revenue sharing between and among the members has not been tackled, let alone been accepted as an operating paradigm by CLU and the associate members. Until both the cost allocation and revenue sharing methodologies are thoroughly thought through, discussed, and accepted by all of the associated members of the consortium led by Claremont Lincoln, the long-term sustainability of the consortium cannot be assured. Since this consortial model is central to the current vision and mission of Claremont Lincoln, its ultimate success is also not assured. The institution should move quickly to resolve key pressing consortial issues, as discussed above (CFR 3.5).

Enrollment goals for the institution are quite aggressive, increasing from a current enrollment of 60 at the time of the site visit to 230 by FY 2015. Most of the increase is projected to come from the M.A. programs, including 130 from the soon-to-be-launched Master's in Ethical Leadership program, the first entirely online program to be offered by CLU. Likewise, additional fundraising goals for CLU are very aggressive, totaling a significant amount, the majority of which will be endowment to support operations. Recently, a new senior-level administrative position, the Executive Vice President for Advancement, was hired to plan for an upcoming campaign. This hire is seen as a key to future fundraising success. The new President of CLU, for whom the search is underway, must also play a key role in meeting the goals of the anticipated fundraising

campaign. The institution needs time to demonstrate its ability to meet both aggressive enrollment and fundraising goals (CFR 3.5).

The overall business plan, in the form of a financial *pro forma*, was provided to the WASC Team, and it clearly demonstrates just how much depends upon fundraising success. The following table illustrates unrestricted and temporarily restricted fundraising and tuition revenue plans for the next three years, as well as the expenses associated with the running the organization:

	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16
Revenue			
Net Tuition & Fees	\$1,571,235	\$2,082,356	\$2,621,619
Contributions (UR & TR)*	7,000,000	7,600,000	8,200,000
Total Revenue	8,571,235	9,682,356	10,821,619
Expenses:	8,440,385	8,729,543	8,909,100
Increase In Net Assets	\$ 130,850	\$952,813	\$1,912,519
*Excludes Permanently Restricted gifts			

This plan illustrates the central part that contributions are expected to play in the operations of the University. The percentage of projected revenues from contributions is 82%, 78%, and 76% for the three years beginning July 1, 2013, respectively. This high level of needed fundraising support raises the issue of sustainability for the institution (CFR 3.5).

Applications for current programs have increased for the first time in several years, and enrollment staff report anecdotally that it comes as a result of current excitement generated by the interreligious nature of CLU. Other than the noted increase in applications, and pledged funds from a single donor referenced above, little evidence exists of the sustainability of the organization. While great effort has been expended building a new, exciting organization, sustainability remains in question pending actual, sustained enrollment and fundraising successes (CFR 3.5).

Claremont Lincoln has carefully planned for the proper alignment of its financial resources to support the institutional mission through an institutional planning committee, the Integrated Institutional Planning Team (IIPT). The committee has representatives from all areas of the organization and has formulated proposals for the President's approval, based upon an agreed-upon set of criteria. Ultimately, the decisions formulated by this committee have guided the institution's investments for the start-up phase of the organization. The institution should be commended for its work in carefully deciding how to invest scarce resources for the best return (CFR 3.5).

Claremont Lincoln is largely built upon the excess capacity available at CST. This excess capacity allows for use of facilities, instructional staffing, student services, and technology on a shared basis that helps both institutions lower their overhead costs. The WASC Team notes that the CST utilizes a 6.5% payout from its endowment, which is higher than prevailing best practices. It is not known whether CLU will follow this formula (CFR 3.5).

CLU must demonstrate the financial sustainability the institution by creating reliable and reasonable business plans; demonstrating success in enrollment and fundraising operations; and finalizing reasonable and sustainable cost and revenue allocation methodologies for and between the associated members of the consortium.

Claremont Lincoln will contract with CST to provide its primary library resources. These resources, along with the services provided by Claremont Lincoln's affiliates, appear to provide a robust library system to students within the programs that will be transferred from CST to CLU. New programs that are anticipated will need additional library materials. The CST Library boasts more than 208,000 books, 650 print journal subscriptions, more than 70 online databases, 17,000 electronic journals, and a library computer lab that is open to students 24 hours a day and also features photocopiers and scanners for student use. In addition, the students have access to the library resources at the Academy for Jewish Religion and the University of the West. CST also has access to the Claremont Colleges libraries, which supply additional library resources. The University is a member of the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium, Southern California Area Theological Library Association, and the American Theological Library Association. JSTOR, Oxford Scholarship Online, Academic One File, ProQuest, and ATLA Religion database are some of the online electronic databases that students can access to engage in information research and knowledge gathering. Library staff stated that they serve the more traditional Christian theological areas quite well, but budgets have not significantly increased to support the newer programs that are anticipated. Online services are provided 24/7 and 365 days per year. Claremont Lincoln, or CST as the library provider for Claremont Lincoln, will need to clarify existing contracts to ensure that Claremont Lincoln students have the same amount of

access to library support as they did prior to the transfer of the programs. The Team also notes that the position of Library Director is vacant, and that two other senior staff are near retirement as well. In this time of significant change, good leadership is needed to ensure that library needs are addressed in a timely manner (CFR 2.3, 2.13, 3.6, 3.7).

CLU must address its library planning needs in order to ensure adequate library support for the University's expanding mission of interreligious studies. Specifically, CLU must address current and acute library staffing issues, acquisition of the required knowledge to maintain and expand library holdings necessary to support multifaith religious students, and ensure that the level of access to library resources currently enjoyed by CST students will be available to CLU students after the two entities achieve greater separation.

Claremont Lincoln's information technology infrastructure relies heavily upon CST infrastructure and platforms. In addition to those IT resources supplied by CST, Claremont Lincoln has supplemented the IT infrastructure with SAKAI, a well-known student learning management system, a new VOIP telephone system, a new student information system, Empower, and state-of-the-art video-conferencing equipment. Together with the CST infrastructure, the Claremont Lincoln infrastructure appears to provide sufficient support for the type and number of academic programs currently being offered. Several faculty members noted that the IT support was adequate, but not equivalent with other institutions in the region. Since the current general ledger accounting system is not designed specifically for higher education, the institution should consider replacing it with a system more frequently found in the industry (CFR 3.7).

CFR 3.8-3.11 Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

Claremont Lincoln appears to have established well-defined decision-making processes, including those regarding academic policies. The originating documents of the Board of Directors clearly define the educational nature of the organization, and the by-laws outline the duties of the officers of the corporation, the directors, and the committees of the Board. The President's role is also clearly defined as the chief executive of the institution, serving as a member of the Board, and leading the efforts of the University. The faculty is organized with two standing committees that have clear charters and decision-making powers. The faculty as a whole ratifies (or not) decisions made by the two committees at the regular faculty meeting. The Provost meets regularly with both committees and chairs the Joint Curriculum Committee. Organizational charts are clear. The Faculty Handbook describes faculty decision-making processes in detail. Job descriptions for all academic administrators are included in the Faculty Handbook (CFR 3.8).

Claremont Lincoln University currently has a small governing board of seven individuals, several of whom should be considered "interested persons" as they serve on affiliated boards. The by-laws of the corporation describe these representatives as "Founders." These Founders are representatives of associated higher education institutions, and have two seats each on the Board of Directors. During the organizational phase of Claremont Lincoln, this appears to have added commitment to its mission by more firmly drawing in representatives of different religions and faith traditions; however, because the best interest of Claremont Lincoln must be paramount for its board members, this could create conflicts of interest between these individuals' respective

roles. The WASC policy on independent boards should be carefully reviewed to ensure that the Board is sufficiently independent. In addition, because of the small number of members, the institution is not conforming to another section of the WASC policy document requiring a minimum of an Academic Affairs Committee, a Finance Committee, an Audit Committee, and a Nominating Committee. The Board of Directors approved an Audit Committee charter but it has not yet been populated and is not functioning. The Team notes that the CLU Board members are passionate about the mission of the organization and are zealous about securing the future of the organization (CFR 3.9). CLU must establish a fully independent Board of Directors, sufficient in size to populate required committees, so as to fully accomplish the Board's fiduciary and other responsibilities.

CLU currently has part-time executives filling both the CEO and CFO roles, as their time is split between CST and CLU. The President of CST has estimated his time involvement at 65% for CLU. Claremont Lincoln is conducting a national search for its own President, effective July 1, 2013, and will begin a search for a full-time CFO in June (CFR 3.10).

The CLU Faculty Handbook includes the following description of the role of the faculty:

The University Faculty of Claremont Lincoln University shall consider, prescribe, recommend, or advise in all matters related to the educational work of Claremont Lincoln University. Among its general responsibilities are the following:
admissions, curriculum, degree requirements, graduation, academic rules,

grading, academic honors and awards, educational effectiveness, continuing education, and faculty work and well being.

CLU's faculty appeared actively engaged with discharging the roles and responsibilities defined in the Faculty Handbook. However, because there are several full-time, or near full-time academic administrators, and faculty from the respective associated members, it was not clear to the Team just how active a role the faculty really has. It is clear that programmatic and curricular matters are reviewed, discussed, and approved by the Joint Curriculum Committee, but the level of participation of faculty vis-à-vis academic administrators, either from CLU or one of its associated institutions, is not as clear. The role of the Faculty Executive Committee appears more purely faculty-based than does the Joint Curriculum Committee. The Faculty Handbook allows decisions made by either committee to be overturned. Claremont Lincoln should consider ways of clarifying the role of the faculty in curricular and programmatic decisions (CFR 3.11).

Standard 4: An Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

CFR 4.1-4.3: Strategic Thinking and Planning

Claremont Lincoln University (CLU) will have unique and ongoing challenges with regards to strategic thinking and planning as it coordinates the multiple constituent parts of the whole.

While each individual school (such as the Academy for Jewish Religion) and center (such as the Center for Jain Studies) will engage in strategic thinking and planning unique to its own individual purpose, CLU will have the task of ensuring that an effective and cohesive whole continues to be formed, evaluated, and revised out of the individual consortial interests.

The CLU has an important tool in its Institutional Integrated Planning Team (IIPT), and the development of this team has been foundational and successful in setting the tone, communicating its mission, and prioritizing the allocation of resources. This team has provided excellent guidance in these formative years while, perhaps of necessity, being strongly tilted toward administration and staff input. Going forward, it will be imperative that faculty participation in institutional planning be expanded (CFR 4.1).

The planning processes of CLU, while centered in the IIPT, are still in an emerging stage of development. This seems particularly true in terms of academic programs. The “project manager” model and a “sponsoring member” of the President’s Cabinet for new programs will require more integration into the overall institutional planning process. While CLU has precisely defined its objectives, alignment, especially academic, is a topic of concern. The discussion of “new programs,” while admirable and necessary for growth, is perhaps premature while CLU determines the effectiveness and sustainability of its current programs using real assessment data.

At this point there is a scarcity of empirical data on which CLU can base its decisions, and much of the data is based on past information from the Claremont School of Theology. The CST data, while important to its particular mission, may or may not have application to the other consortium members. One particular concern is that the institution’s report on “Career Opportunities: Projections for CLU Graduates” contains no real data or market analysis beyond anecdotal evidence from CST. Application of the projection extrapolations from CST’s history to

the other consortium members seems to be of dubious value, and the other career opportunity discussion is little more than a listing of possibilities. The planning processes of CLU will require significant input for the consortium members and a more rigorous use of data (CFR 4.3).

CLU in its self-study report makes note that CST subscribes to the *Institutional Peer Profile Report* of the Association of Theological Schools. However, ATS represents almost exclusively Protestant, Evangelical, Orthodox, and Catholic schools. The application of data to CLU's "interreligious university" may be overstated. Nor does ATS, according to its Senior Director of Administration and CFO, collect data on graduation or retention rates, despite the claims of CLU's self-study report (p. 60).

One note of concern is that while CLU has an "interreligious" education as the center-piece of its program, the Christian part of the consortium is exclusively CST, which is a liberal mainline Protestant component. There is no mention or demonstration of how Catholic or even Orthodox voices are to be integrated into the overall educational consortia.

CFR 4.4-4.8: Commitment to Learning and Improvement

Claremont Lincoln has set a methodology in place for assessment of institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) on a four-year cycle. Their current plan for a full program review to be accomplished after the second four-year cycle seems to coincide with an anticipated "ten-year accreditation." Granted that the data pool may not be as deep in four years, eight years may be too long to wait for a program review. It will also be important to "test drive" the program

review process to ensure it functions as anticipated, and that should be done sooner than eight years out.

The schedule for program review for the individual academic programs also needs more formalized development. CLU needs to carefully differentiate between an institutional review and the program review of its various academic programs. CLU needs to also ensure that these reviews are coordinated and based on a sustainable schedule. It is also unclear what role the Board of Directors plays in the program review process or if the reports are disseminated to the proper committee of the Board.

The use of “assessment days” and other faculty professional development will continue to be a central component of CLU, particularly as faculty from the various consortium members begin to align their courses in a more significant manner. With the abundant usage of adjunct faculty, it will be vital for CLU academic leadership to ensure that the culture of assessment permeates to the adjunct ranks.

CLU and its consortial institutions will need to further develop a collective culture of assessment. Alignment with the institutions will need to continue. For instance while CLU has four ILOs and generally the same number of program learning outcomes (PLOs) and student learning outcomes (SLOs), which are within the recommended and manageable number of 3–5, AJR has up to 14 learning outcomes in place.

With the newness of CLU, assessment data is significantly limited. Future data sources, such as surveys from alumni and employers, need to be considered and developed. As CLU matures, it will also be vital to create a mechanism for engaging alumni in its institutional assessment.

CLU has an Institutional Research Council (IRC) in place and has secured the services of Hanover Research Group to conduct research based on criteria objectives determined by the IRC. As a new institution, CLU's administration, staff, and faculty are multitasking at a significant level and institutional research is currently arranged on more of an *ad hoc* basis than through deliberate processes. The institutional research capacity of CLU is also hampered by a lack of appropriate data and comparable benchmark data from other institutions largely due to the unique nature of its mission and newness of the endeavor (CFR 4.5).

Articulated learning outcomes for all its programs are in place; however, ongoing effort to coordinate and align the student, program, and institutional outcomes is needed, and must be supported by more definitive data collection and institutional research processes. The Hanover services are important, but cannot be the mainstay of institutional research. Nor can these externally sourced reports substitute for internal institutional data.

There is a clear and compelling expectation of excellence at CLU; however, while CST has a sustained institutional history, the other members of CLU are largely untested in the area of educational assessment. It will be important that the culture of evidence-based assessment be instilled across the members of the consortium. The leadership for assessment, evaluation, and "closing the loop" processes appear to be largely driven by administration and staff. While the

faculty is clearly a part of the process, faculty ownership and leadership of assessment processes needs to be more fully developed as CLU moves forward.

The areas of assessment of the campus environment appear to be well developed and handled by the staff. There were some indications of communication breakdown; one site visit session made the point that the facilities had a lot of “excess capacity” available, while in another session the issue of “cramped quarters and lack of space” arose. CLU has a space utilization review and reallocation in process, but that information has not been widely disseminated.

As previously noted, the formative nature of CLU has been tilted toward administration and staff voices in the institution’s processes of assessment. The faculty is engaged in a significant “re-tooling” to adapt to a more hybrid online teaching environment. The assessment indicators to track student success and achievement in the SLOs are naturally new and will need to be closely tracked to ensure that learning outcomes at all levels (SLO, PLO, and ILO) are being realized.

The impetus for assessment has largely been “top-down” from administration to the faculty.

While faculty buy-in to these initiatives is apparent, there is a noticeable passivity on the part of the faculty. The planned hiring of a “curriculum design specialist” will be an important step to add support, but there is also a problematic potential to further embed the “just tell me what to do and I’ll do it” mindset within the faculty.

CLU’s self-study report noted that “three senior faculty members” have attended WASC training seminars. With 66 faculty members identified as “core faculty” at CLU, the opportunity for this

training and faculty development will need to be expanded, especially integrating the faculty of the consortium schools.

CLU admittedly has no graduates yet and thus acquiring stakeholder input for assessment is a future endeavor. CLU has an exciting mission statement and goals for reaching out to the community and creating future stakeholders. It will be important for CLU to have “shovel-ready” assessment instruments in place to gain the necessary data (CFR 4.8).

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In presenting the following commendations and recommendations, the Team is motivated by a desire to support Claremont Lincoln University's continuing development and its commitment to addressing central institutional needs in its candidacy for accreditation.

Commendations

1. CLU is to be commended for articulating a mission and vision that is clear, compelling, and bold. Its mission and vision is one that addresses some of the most problematic and challenging issues of our time, and CLU has set itself on a course to engage in serious education about these issues (CFR 1.1, 1.2).
2. CLU has created an institutional environment that has generated enthusiasm and support for the mission at all levels of the University, and the broad support for its goals and implementation has created a palpable and robust feeling of excitement about the future of CLU at all levels--faculty, staff, students, donors, and the larger interreligious environment (CFR 1.3, 3.8).
3. CLU has clearly created a set of programs that are realistic and in keeping with its vision and has put in place the necessary infrastructure and support and plans in terms of faculty and staffing to implement these programs (CFR 2.1, 3.1, 3.2).

4. CLU has successfully identified and articulated the student learning outcomes necessary to sound educational planning at all levels—institutional, programmatic, degree, and course (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4).

5. CLU has put in place strong leadership at all levels, particularly at the executive level, and there is strong support for this leadership throughout the institution. Leadership has shown an extraordinary ability to listen and be open and responsive to all of its constituencies (CFR 1.3, 3.8, 3.10, 3.11).

6. CLU is to be commended for building strong relationships with all the constituents and component parts of the CLU consortium. This has been done through both establishing levels of personal trust and creating the structural conditions necessary for the success of realizing CLU's mission and vision (CFR 1.3, 3.8).

7. CLU is to be commended for its success in securing the philanthropic support (through the Lincoln gift in particular) to create the conditions and opportunity to begin the planning and launching of this unique institution (CFR 3.5).

8. CLU has carefully planned for the proper alignment of its financial resources to support the institutional mission through a University planning committee, the Institutional Integrated Planning Team (IIPT), which has representatives from all areas of the organization and has formulated proposals for the President's approval, based upon an

agreed-upon set of criteria. The decisions formulated by this committee have guided the institution's investments for the start-up phase of the organization. CLU should be commended for its work in carefully deciding how to invest limited resources for the best return (CFR 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).

Recommendations

1. While CLU's planning has been sound, the University needs to substantiate its ambitious enrollment and revenue projections with careful planning that warrants confidence in its ability to achieve these projections. Similarly, while CLU has secured an extraordinary foundational gift of \$50 million, it must develop detailed, realistic plans for achieving its ambitious fundraising goals (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).
2. While CLU has articulated an ambitious and compelling vision, the University must provide the professional development support necessary for its faculty to realize the vision of CLU pedagogically, technologically, and culturally. This involves paradigm shifts from education in a particular religious tradition to an interreligious orientation, and from traditional face-to-face instructional modalities to an increasingly hybrid and online educational environment (CFR 2.8, 2.9, 3.3, 3.4).
3. While CLU has articulated learning outcomes for all its programs, the University needs to ensure the continuing coordination and alignment of institutional learning outcomes,

program outcomes, and student learning outcomes across the University and its member institutions (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4).

4. While CLU has comprehensive assessment and program review plans in place, the University needs to continue to follow through in implementing these plans and use the results of assessment and program review to both improve and validate its educational and institutional effectiveness (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8).
5. CLU must demonstrate the financial sustainability of the institution by creating reliable and reasonable business plans; demonstrating success in enrollment and fundraising operations; and finalizing reasonable and sustainable cost and revenue allocation methodologies for and between the associated members of the consortium (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3).
6. CLU must address its library planning needs in order to ensure adequate library support for the University's mission of interreligious studies. Specifically, CLU must address current and acute library staffing issues, acquisition of the required knowledge to maintain and expand library holdings necessary to support multi-faith religious students, and ensure that the level of access to library resources currently enjoyed by CST students will be available to CLU students after the two entities achieve greater separation (CFR 2.3, 2.13, 3.6, 3.7).

7. CLU must establish a fully independent Board of Directors, sufficient in size to populate required committees, so as to fully accomplish the Board's fiduciary and other responsibilities (CFR 1.3, 3.9).

APPENDICES

A. Compliance Audit Checklist

Compliance Audit Checklist for Special Visits and Pathway B Visits

Instruction to team:

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

Name of Institution: CLAREMONT LINCOLN UNIVERSITY

Date of Visit: 01/28/2013-01/30/2013

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

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

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

Comments:

1. CFR 1.8 and CFR 3.5, the team did not see evidence of regular independent audits.
2. CFR 2.2.1 Statement on GE requirements is not applicable.
3. CFR 4.1 and CFR 4.2.1, the strategic plan and operations plan are one and the same, there is no strategic plan implementation process review available.
4. CFR 4.5, a letter from the President describing the IR Council is available, no detailed schedule of IR Surveys was provided. There is no dedicated IR staff, the responsibility is divided among various staff members with dedicated responsibilities in other departments.
5. CFR 3.2, the List of Faculty Classification is available, however, it conflicts with other evidentiary data provided in the required exhibits.

Related to Substantive Change--According to WASC staff, no sub-change audit was required.		
1	Locations of all off-campus sites and programs offered at such sites (more than 50% of program)	
1a	Number of students enrolled at such sites	
1b	Date of first offerings	
2	Names of all programs for which 50% of the program is offered through distance education	
2a	Number of students enrolled in each	
2b	Date each was first offered	
3	Names of all hybrid programs	
3a	Number of students enrolled in each	
3b	Date each was first offered	
Accuracy and Availability of Records		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	
	Records are accurate and up to date	

B. Credit Hour Report



CREDIT HOUR REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution: Claremont Lincoln University

Type of Visit: Pathway B

Date: 28-30 January 2013

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	Minimally
	<p>Comments: The CLU policy is not clearly worded and is probably more confusing than illuminating. It is a verbatim copy of the CST statement, but there is no indication as to whether the other consortia institutions have a coordinated policy.</p> <p>There are also no guidelines for faculty to implement the policy coherently in their courses. For example, the policy states that an hour of outside work should "reasonably approximate" one hour of in class work. But no calculations are offered (e.g. reading is calculated at "X pages per hour"; Exam preparation is calculated at "X hours per examinee"; written assignments are calculated at "X hours per written page," etc.). Absent any guidelines, faculty members are left on their own to determine workload for a course and the policy has virtually no impact.</p> <p>There is no indication in the reviewed syllabi that the current credit hour policy was a factor in creating course assignments at any level.</p>	
Process(es)/ periodic review	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?	Yes (on paper)
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Not Observed
	Comments: At this point the review of the credit hour policy is stated to occur during program review. However, program review is not scheduled for at least five years and perhaps not for ten years. This has been noted in the Team Report as a matter of concern for CLU to address. The policy is supposed to be a part of a new course creation, but that was not evident.	
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?	Yes
	Comments: None	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	Both 10 syllabi were reviewed thoroughly MA programs
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	See Comments
	Comments: CLU has given faculty no direction in the policy other than "reasonably	

	<p>Comments: CLU has given faculty no direction in the policy other than “reasonably approximate.” So, for example what constitutes “one hour” of outside of class work may vary widely from one professor to another. In one course examined, the “required reading” was nearly 3400 pages. This reading load, even if calculated at well beyond normal standards for comprehension, would still have consumed more than double the stated policy (without accounting for any other writing assignments, exam prep time, etc.). Another course had a more reasonable 1400 pages of “required reading” (plus a large amount of reading from “articles and handouts”). The other assignments (written response paper, quizzes, mid-term, final) were not detailed in the syllabus sufficiently to know what was actually required of the student in terms of length, etc.</p> <p>Course workloads in relation to the Credit Hour Policy were so varied that there was no reason to believe that the policy had any impact on course development.</p>	
<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>What kinds of courses? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?</p> <p>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</p> <p>Comments: As noted above, there was an enormous range within the syllabi reviewed of workload. The majority were well over the policy limits, often excessively so. This seems to be caused by a lack of guidelines or examples in the policy and perhaps the faculty not being at all familiar with the policy.</p>	<p>See above</p> <p>No</p>