

**REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM**  
**ACCREDITATION REVIEW**

To

**CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY**

**25-27 September 2013**

John Eshelman, Chair

Provost Emeritus and Professor Economics Emeritus, Seattle University

Frances M. Sweeney, Assistant Chair

Director for First Generation Studies and Professor of Spanish, St. Mary's College

Jana Childers

Dean and Professor of Homiletics and Speech Communication,  
San Francisco Theological Seminary

Lindsay Desrochers

Professor of Public Administration, retired Vice President, Finance and Administration  
Portland State University

Gerald Winslow

Vice President for Mission and Culture, Loma Linda University

Richard Osborn, WASC Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 WASC Senior College and University Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission.

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

<b>SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT</b>	<b>3</b>
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	
B. The Institutional Report	
C. Response to Previous Commission Issues	
<b>SECTION II. EVALUATION UNDER THE WASC PILOT: REQUIRED ESSAYS AND STANDARDS</b>	<b>7</b>
Essay 1: Meaning of the Degrees and Ensuring Their Integrity, Quality, and Rigor	
Essay 2: Achieving Graduation Proficiencies	
Essay 3: Defining and Promoting Student Success	
Essay 4: Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness in the Future	
Optional Essay 5: Planning for the Changing Environment for Seminary Education in America	
<b>SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>32</b>
1. Credit Hour Review	
2. Student Complaints Review	
3. Marketing and Recruitment	
4. CST-Compliance Audit Checklist	

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

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

Claremont School of Theology (CST) is a free-standing seminary owned by the California-Pacific and Desert Southwest Annual Conferences of the United Methodist Church. It is located near the Claremont colleges and Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, CA. With twenty-two full-time faculty, it offers two PhD programs, two MA programs, two D.Min. programs and an M.Div. program. The M.Div. program is the largest single program. There were 242 students enrolled in Fall 2012, 216 of them in pursuit of a degree. Enrollees included 84 in doctoral programs and 132 in master's programs. The mix of programs offered is expected to change when Claremont Lincoln University (CLU), a new off-spring university of CST as fully explained below, achieves independent operation and accreditation.

Claremont School of Theology was founded as Maclay College of Theology in 1885. In 1890 it moved to the campus of the University of Southern California, then a Methodist-affiliated institution. In 1956, it separated from USC and relocated to its current location in Claremont. In the same year, it was chartered as an ecumenical seminary of the Methodist Church, the first seminary so chartered. In its new location CST developed a close relationship with Claremont Graduate University and shared many courses with it. As with many similar schools, CST saw a forty percent decline in enrollments from 2005 to 2009, but has managed to reverse the trend recently. It has been accredited by WASC since 1971 and by the Association of Theological Schools while it was still a unit of the University of Southern California.

CST's history has been one of recurring fiscal difficulties, difficulties that still afflict the institution. As in many seminaries, net tuition revenues have generated a relatively modest proportion of its budgetary needs, so the institution has been dependent on gifts and endowment earnings to cover its costs. For the past several years, CST has been spending from endowment at a rate exceeding endowment earnings, leaving the corpus under water. Issues of finance and institutional integrity, among others, led the WASC Commission to vote in 2006 to terminate CST's accreditation, a termination that was reversed in 2007.

As discussed in subsequent sections of this report, in the months before the campus visit, CST was in the process of creating a new institution, Claremont Lincoln University (CLU), and spinning it off from the parent institution, in order to offer inter-religious programs apart from its Methodist and ecumenical Christian offerings and to generate new enrollments and revenues to absorb excess CST resources. While the formal separation occurred July 1, 2013, CLU continues to offer its degrees through CST so that the degrees can be accredited through CST's WASC accreditation. At the time of the visit, no Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) had

yet been approved by the board of either institution and the relationship between the now two institutions was still in a state of flux. The ambiguity and uncertainty around the CST-CLU relationship became an underlying theme through the entire visit.

As the intended spin-off that was not yet spun off, Claremont Lincoln University was a constant presence in the CST report and in the CST community's thinking about its present and its future. CLU's origin is in a strategy intended to strengthen CST's enrollments and, therefore, its finances. The "Claremont University Project," was intended to transform CST from a Christian seminary to an interfaith and intercultural institution in order to keep pace with the changing religious landscape. It was hoped that this broader approach would increase CST's appeal and help reverse the decline in enrollments. However, the plans generated disquiet within the sponsoring United Methodist Church (UMC), reflecting fears that CST would no longer be clearly Methodist or Christian. In response, the board of CST decided in 2009 to incorporate the Claremont University Project as a separate-but-related institution that would be the degree-granting vehicle for an interfaith consortium. CST would incubate the new institution, as it has, in fact, done. However, before relationships were smoothed between CST and the Methodist Church, the possibility that the Church would withdraw its recognition of CST for training of Methodist clergy caused a significant decline in applications and Fall 2010 enrollments fell, further damaging CST's difficult financial situation. The decline in Methodist enrollments was reversed when the University Senate of the UMC approved CST for continued funding and as a place for preparation for ordination for UMC clergy.

Because of the importance of the relationship with the UMC for CST finances and enrollment of Methodist students, the WASC Institutional Review Team (IRT) interviewed by telephone the bishops of the two conferences of the UMC that legally own CST. The two bishops are also members of the CST Board of Trustees. They assured the IRT, as did other trustees with strong connections in the UMC organization, that the relationship between CST and UMC is on solid ground and that there is no likelihood of future withdrawal of approval of CST, given CST's current path. It should also be noted in this regard that the new president of CST is currently serving as a member of the University Senate of the UMC and chair of its Commission on Theological Education.

The IRT had less success in gaining a clear understanding of the relationship between CST and CLU going forward because the relationship is still in flux. The CST Institutional Report written in January gave a reasonably clear picture of the expected relationship, a picture that was confirmed in the video conference during the Off-Site Review between the IRT and the leadership of CST, which included the soon-to-be leadership of CLU. The picture was of CLU as the vehicle for a new and creative approach to inter-religious education in an institution that would substantially ameliorate CST's financial challenges by purchasing much of CST's excess resource base, thereby achieving the major goals of the original University Project.

Because so much of the CST functioning at present relates to the degree of success of the CLU relationship, during the visit the concerns about the CST-CLU relationship became a primary underlying theme for review of all aspects of institutional effectiveness, from achieving core proficiencies, to assuring educational effectiveness and assessment, to support for students, to enrollment, to institutional capacity. In many ways the IRT experienced a review of two distinct faces: on one side was a picture of CST administration, faculty, and staff assiduously committed to and successful in demonstrating compliance with WASC standards. Moreover, CST portrayed a strong and dedicated academic community passionate about their mission and about student learning. On the other side was a very opaque picture of what, precisely, the future holds; so far as the IRT can understand, the relationship with CLU envisioned by CST, as presented to WASC staff two years ago which resulted in a shorter expedited process for CLU known as Pathway B, is not likely to materialize, with concomitant implications for the sustainability of CST.

The first external sign of a rethinking of the relationship on the part of CLU was the unexpected termination of the Provost, the chief academic officer, of CLU and, until his move to CLU, the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, and a senior professor at CST. Second, in an interview with the IRT, the senior leadership of CLU described a business-like approach to the relationship in which CLU would use services and resources of CST to the extent that CST offered them at terms competitive with other sources. The relationship described was less familial and more arms-length than seemed to characterize previous descriptions, with no apparent recognition of the very large sweat-equity that CST has already invested in the new institution. No major documents defining the relationship, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, have been approved, so the relationship is wholly dependent on annual negotiations for services. Which institution would offer which degrees was a key concern of the IRT, as well as division of purpose, enrollment and admissions recruiting. Currently the majority of these CLU operations are under the CST umbrella. Yet, even the terms on which CST will be compensated for the use of its faculty, staff and facility resources has not yet been put in writing. While some members of the CLU Board of Trustees affirmed that CST would be paid pro-rata for faculty time, other sources were concerned that CST faculty might be hired on an over-load basis or at rates comparable to those of adjunct faculty. This lack of clarity about faculty sharing epitomizes the lack of clarity that permeated the visit. While the IRT was repeatedly impressed by and commended the high level of energy and commitment to educational effectiveness demonstrated by CST, the underlying uncertainty of fundamental organization and governance between CST and CLU loomed large and left in question the degree to which CST can sustain itself or realize its mission.

The IRT was also conscious of the fact that CLU degrees are not accredited independently by WASC, but only through CST, so the direction taken by CLU will necessarily reflect on the image of CST in the market and on its academic integrity.

## **B. The Institutional Report**

CST prepared its Institutional Report under unique circumstances and should be commended for completing an organized and thoughtful, comprehensive report. First, it is part of the group piloting the new structure of review by WASC. In fact, it was the first institution to undergo the Off-Site Review and one of two institutions experiencing the single Accreditation Visit during the same week. Second, CST was and is in process of spinning off a new unit, Claremont Lincoln University, into a separate institution. Third, coincident with preparing the CST institutional report, CLU, still operating as a unit of CST, was preparing its own institutional report and undergoing review for separate WASC accreditation. Necessarily, the CST Institutional Report includes substantial material about CLU that will ultimately not apply to CST, but was important to understanding CST at the time of the report and at the time of the Off-Site review. Third, CST has a regular accreditation visit from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in spring 2014 for which it is preparing. The same ALO has been responsible for preparing the reports for WASC and ATS for both institutions and receives the team's special commendation for his herculean efforts.

CST chose to write five reflective essays, plus an introductory essay, choosing the option of keeping the first two essays separate. The report is notable for its logical organization and for its clarity, clarity that could easily have been lost in covering both CST and CLU. The report is also notable for the candor with which it discusses the challenges CST has faced and the challenges remaining. CST did have difficulty in making some of the required exhibits available to the WASC IRT on a timely basis; some of the exhibits only were received in the week before the Off-Site Review.

## **C. Response to Previous Commission Issues**

The last full visit to CST by a WASC team was in 2004 for an Educational Effectiveness Review. The visit resulted in the Commission placing CST on warning because of non-compliance with respect to, finance, planning, and institutional integrity. A spring 2006 Special Visit found continued problems with compliance and led to termination of accreditation. CST requested a review and provided updated information, which included information on a change in leadership in the presidency in June 2006. On review, the Commission restored accreditation in November 2006. However, the Commission also issued a Show Cause letter and scheduled a Special Visit for the fall of 2007. As a result of the Special Visit, accreditation was continued and the school was placed on probation. In 2009, probation was removed, accreditation reaffirmed and a progress report requested on enrollment, finances and implementation of a strategic plan. The progress report was accepted in January, 2011.

Following the installation of the new president in 2006, the composition of the board of trustees was changed and a new chair of the board of trustees appointed. Under the new leadership, CST has exhibited renewed energy to achieve compliance with WASC standards and appears to have worked steadily and diligently to address the issues of concern to the Commission. Those issues that were fully under the control of the institution, e.g. institutional integrity, have been fully addressed. The relationship of CST to Claremont Graduate University has been revised, so that the relationship is no longer a drain on CST resources and some doctoral programs offered by CGU were transferred to CST. Budgets have been balanced, despite mixed results in the effort to grow enrollments. A broadly participative and effective planning process was utilized in developing the University Project which became CLU, though it appears the process did not become a fully implemented, ongoing planning process. The progress in addressing the many issues can be tracked in the reports to and correspondence from the Commission and in the movement from termination to reaffirmation of accreditation. However, one financial element that has drawn repeated expressions of concern from the Commission, the high spending rate from endowment, continues unchanged at 6.5% and the corpus of the endowment has not been restored. The institution identifies a long-term goal of bringing the spending rate down to 4.5%, but there does not appear to be a clear plan for achieving that rate. Neither is there a plan for restoring the corpus of the endowment.

## **SECTION II. EVALUATION UNDER THE WASC PILOT: REQUIRED ESSAYS AND THE WASC STANDARDS**

### **Essay 1: Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring their Quality and Rigor**

#### *The meaning of the degrees*

Claremont School of Theology has, in their Mission Statement and Institutional Learning Objectives, successfully defined the meaning of its degrees and the values that undergird that meaning with a clarity that is not easily available to colleges and universities with a wider range of programs. CST knows its educational goals and why these are the goals. Their programs in academic and practical theology fit comfortably into the framework. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2)

As noted, CST was in an unusual situation when they wrote a mission statement and institutional learning objectives (ILOs) because it was and is in the process of developing a sister institution, Claremont Lincoln University, and writing a mission statement and ILOs for it, too. No doubt the double task of defining the meaning of degrees for the two institutions caused them to think especially carefully about each part of the task, since the meaning of the degrees of each institution would necessarily identify the reason for two institutions, rather than one, and the role of each in the marketplace for theological education. They helpfully chose to include discussion

of both institutions in Essay 1, a choice which gives the reader a much clearer picture of the purpose of CST and the meaning of its degrees.

Though CST and CLU are intended to be separate institutions with separate mission statements and institutional learning outcomes, the two units share much of the same DNA, a fact that is reflected in their mission statements. They share a commitment to preparing “ethical leadership for emerging intercultural and multi-religious contexts” and both are described in their individual mission statements as ecumenical and inter-religious. The differentiation between CST and CLU is by a continued commitment to Christian theological education in CST and a greater multi-religious emphasis in CLU. The Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) of CST and CLU flow from their individual mission statements, captured in the summary that “the primary meaning of a Claremont degree is found in graduates who make a difference in the world---who are committed to think deeply about religion, lead ethically, embrace diversity, and work for justice and peace.” Though not covered in the first essay, CST has developed Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for each degree program that flow from the ILOs and, in turn, Student Learning Outcomes for each course that connect directly to the PLOs. (CFR 1.1)

The CST Mission Statement and its Institutional Learning Objectives are published in the Catalog and on the School’s website. Each degree program has an Academic Advising Handbook that contains the PLOs for the program, and all course syllabi include the SLOs for the course. In summary, the mission statement and learning outcomes at the institutional, program and course level are well defined in a logical structure and they are made available through print and electronic publications. (CFR 1.2)

At the time of the Off-Site Review, it was not clear to the IRT which degrees will be offered by CST and which by CLU after the formal separation takes place. As originally envisioned, the academic doctoral programs would move to CLU. During the visit, the question of whether or not CLU would even offer doctorates became a primary emphasis of the IRT interviews, with the conclusion that final decisions have not been made. More troubling is that there does not seem to be a clear process in place for how such decisions will be made and by whom, or the degree of academic expertise into the deliberations, or a timeline for decision-making (CFR 1.3). Placement of a degree in CLU will have implications for the PLOs and SLOs to be consistent with the Mission Statement and ILOs of CLU, as well as implications for the work done by CST. There was also remaining confusion about the differences between the M.Div. from CST and the MA from CLU.

### *Ensuring quality and rigor*

In their Reflective Essay 1, CST takes two approaches to assessing the quality and rigor of their degrees: first, the once-traditional approach of looking at the quality of inputs into the

educational process and, second, a still-developing approach of examining evidence of learning outcomes. In assessing the quality of inputs, CST points to its 128 year history in theological education and strong reputation; a strong, experienced faculty; the systems in place to assure compliance with the norms of graduate education; its ties with graduate institutions of other religions; its excellent library resources; and support structure for various elements of a student's educational experience. A Teaching and Learning Committee, whose membership includes senior faculty members, the Dean of Library and Information Resources, the Director of the Writing Center and English as a Second Language, and the Associate Dean for Curriculum and Assessment, monitors "course content, degree requirements, learning outcomes, assessment strategies and time in class." During the visit, the IRT observed that this is a highly effective and hard-working committee, embracing its responsibility to ensure quality and rigor. The IRT commends the committee for its efforts. (CFR 2.1, 2.2b)

One question is the degree to which peer data is used in evaluating quality and rigor. The institution has yet to implement a comprehensive program review that might address this question. The IRT recommends that CST consider how to integrate benchmark data, from outcomes to curricular offerings, to assessment activities. (CFRs 2.7, 4.4)

Overall, the IRT was impressed by the comprehensiveness of the quality assurance structure, as well as by the time and energy required of the faculty for it to be effective. There is regular and thoughtful, shared communication across faculty and the formal faculty committees, such as the Teaching and Learning Committee, the Assessment Committee, and the Faculty Policy Committee, which serves as the leading faculty voice. There is also a Consortium Joint Curriculum Committee of CLU with CST representatives on it. It is clear from the Institutional Report and supporting material that the goal of the quality assurance structure is the improvement of teaching and learning, as it ought to be. (CFR 2.4) An example is that the process of reducing credit hours in some of the programs included ample deliberation about revising outcomes and how these would be mapped throughout the curriculum. During the visit, CST demonstrated that the structures are embedded into the culture of the institution. (CFR 4.6) The IRT commends the work and is confident that the faculty of CST will continue their oversight of quality and rigor to the degree as they are able; the caveat is that it was not clear the extent to which faculty would be involved in some of the CLU curricular decisions, many of whose programs will impact CST. This could be especially critical as changes to degrees occur throughout the final decision-making of the CST-CLU relationship.

### *Analysis and Next Steps*

The third section of the essay describes the planning process whereby Claremont School of Theology thought deeply about the future of theological education and, therefore, of CST. Even as CST was in the midst of the University Project that would result in Claremont Lincoln

University, it recognized that the spin-off would lead to the question of the nature of CST as the Christian member of the multi-faith consortium of CLU. In response CST began planning in 2011 how it would navigate the continuing upheaval in the religious landscape while retaining its place as a cutting-edge seminary. The result was an action plan for “The New CST.” It calls for curriculum changes to make CST the leading seminary “for studying the postmodern turn in American religion” and preparing graduates to be leaders in “congregational settings characterized by religious, ethnic, and cultural hybridity and multiplicity.” In addition to curriculum reform, The New CST calls for delivering education in the communities it serves, placing more emphasis on interreligious education, and on serving in alternative and emerging forms of Christianities, in curriculum and delivery modes. These emphases will force them to do better than they have in relating to an ethnically more diverse population. However, despite their professed desire to better serve multi-ethnic populations, the IRT did not find evidence of how this goal would be achieved, except insofar as it coincides with multi-faith approaches. (CFRs 1.2, 4.2, 4.3)

CST deserves commendation for the courage and open-mindedness it has shown in looking at the future and for the willingness to rethink the content, methodologies and delivery systems of the education provided. Taken together, The University Project and The New CST action plan means revolutionary changes in CST in a short time period and a huge amount of work for the CST community. CST has wisely recognized that ensuring quality in the midst of all these changes will require special effort, and so is appointing “Project Management Teams” whose tasks include quality control.

## **Essay 2: Achieving "Graduation Proficiencies"**

In Essay 2, CST provides a cogent and comprehensive description of the institution's commitment to achieving core proficiencies, for graduate level education. Whereas Essay 1 treats the broad mission and overall quality assurance processes, Essay 2 describes the program and course level assessment structures in place. As articulated in the Institutional Report (p. 25), "in this essay we will describe the knowledge, skills, values and attitudes students should possess when they graduate." Essay 2 also describes the full assessment processes in place and success to date in developing a culture committed to assuring educational effectiveness. The IRT was able to confirm through the Off-Site Review and the campus visit that CST has developed a very complete and effective structure for its commitment to continuous improvement. (CFRs 2.10, 4.6, 4.7)

As noted in Essay 1, CST has clearly articulated outcomes at the institutional, program, and course level, with alignment across levels. Moreover, there was clear evidence that all of these flow directly from the institution's mission statement. These outcomes were also developed in

consideration of the outcomes articulated by the Association of Theological Schools (ATS). The IRT commends CST for this careful design and alignment (2.2b)

The institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and program learning outcomes (PLOs) are published in the Catalog and in the Student Advising Handbooks—which are detailed guides to the academic programs. (CFR 2.3) An institution with graduate programs only, the outcomes articulate core proficiencies appropriate for this level. Students are expected to develop independent research capacity, and the essay identifies some of the resources provided to support students in this area.

In terms of institutional structure, CST is to be commended for building a community dedicated to continuous improvement. It was clear throughout the IRT visit that discussions of student learning occur both formally and informally across faculty groups, programs, and academic committees. CST has two committees dedicated primarily to curriculum development, oversight, and assessment: the Assessment Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee. Moreover, the leadership team of the faculty, the Faculty Policy Committee, is regularly involved in promoting faculty-wide dialogues on curricular issues, and helping share communication between individual programs, these two committees, and middle and senior administration. The IRT found there to be appropriate and effective vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum oversight and assurance of learning at CST. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 4.4)

The processes undertaken to review the mission statement and develop ILOs, PLOs, and SLOs led CST to a rather comprehensive cultural shift around assessment. Many faculty attended WASC sponsored conferences to learn about outcomes-development and assessment structures and methods. CST instituted all-faculty retreats to educate each other about assessment, develop the outcomes, and develop rubrics and matrices for assessment of their outcomes. These have evolved into an annual assessment day at which certain ILO's and PLOs are evaluated by all faculty. (CFR 2.4) The IRT met with formal committees, individual program faculty, and a sample group of faculty-at-large across programs; the IRT also held an open-faculty session attended by approximately twenty faculty. Throughout these conversations, there was ample proof that the CST community has created a culture of inquiry and evidence. During the site visit, many faculty commented on the learning they have had, the richness of the discussions about their students' academic progress, and the changes it has made to their thinking about their own courses and teaching. Moreover, the task of aligning outcomes across course, program, and institution also heightened this new "effectiveness-driven" culture, as well as the now regular annual attention to evaluation of PLOs in alignment with ILOs. (CFR 4.6)

In terms of demonstrating how assessment is used for continuous improvement, CST has developed course, program, and institutional level practices. As noted, the revision of the mission and institutional outcomes led to changes in program and course outcomes. The

processes of revision and assessment are overseen by the Assessment Committee and the Teaching and Learning Committee. The Assessment Committee is comprised of four people and charged with overseeing each year's assessment exercises. These include the collection of student samples identified as "signature assignments," and the coordination of hosting the annual, all-faculty day to assess the assignments, and developing the annual Educational Effectiveness report for the campus community. The Teaching and Learning Committee has five faculty members charged with the responsibility of "the evaluation and planning of curriculum and instructional environment, and resources, including overall design of curriculum, new courses, issues of educational effectiveness and assessment, continuing education, catalog review, credit hour compliance, and the oversight of audio visual services, the library, and the bookstore" (Faculty Policy Handbook).

The assurance of learning structure is well-embedded into the culture. It includes a four-year cycle, with one ILO being evaluated each year, and testing the PLOs against it. Throughout the interviews, CST representatives offered evidence of how they used this direct evidence to make changes to outcomes, course content, or pedagogy. In one case, the results of writing proficiency led to a rethinking of how writing assignments are scaffolded throughout the program coursework, and changes to submission dates for thesis-related assignments. In another case, when the institution sought to reduce required credit hours, without sacrificing the achievement of outcomes, they used the evidence from the annual assessment day to rethink and revise curriculum of the introductory M.Div. courses. These samples attest to faculty commitment and flexibility within and across programs, as well as the ability to close the loop with findings.

Assessment of achievement of learning outcomes has several components. All students complete a self-evaluation at entrance. During the program, students submit the "signature assignments" noted above. At the end of the program, students also complete a summative exercise as part of their program, either a thesis, a capstone course, or some equivalent, which is evaluated by the faculty using agreed-upon rubrics. There is also indirect evidence reviewed regularly, mostly in the form of course evaluation forms, which includes how well students felt the course fulfilled the ILOs and PLOs.

In the meeting with the Assessment Committee, the faculty discussed the next steps of their assurance of learning strategies. They noted that while they are very pleased with the progress made, and the widespread support by faculty for these new practices, they also worry about issues of faculty workload and energy, as well as the parts of the collection and coordination that are not very efficient. They now seek means to develop more efficiency, perhaps through electronic support. When the IRT met with other faculty groups, some faculty also mentioned the drain on time, especially time that otherwise might have been dedicated to research and

scholarship. The IRT commends this substantial progress and encourages CST to continue to seek means to enhance the efficiency of the processes now in place.

It should be noted that the process of developing CLU and its initial interreligious curricula has meant more revisions to outcomes and syllabi, as well as new levels of oversight for assurance of learning. The consortium Joint Curriculum Committee, overseen by CLU, includes membership of CST as well as the other interreligious organizations such as the Academy for Jewish Religion, Bayan Claremont, and the University of the West. This JCC has existed for two years and is charged with "the evaluation and planning of the curriculum and instructional environment and resources, including overall design of curriculum, approving new course syllabi, approving Adjunct Faculty as proposed by the [CLU] Provost's Office, designing and enforcing assessment practices, and evaluating educational effectiveness" (CLU Faculty Handbook).

The JCC established criteria by which courses from the participating institutions would be evaluated and approved to count in its new curricula. With respect to CST courses, then, there are courses approved within the CST mission and outcomes that might also be approved for CLU curricula. These courses then have to be re-approved by CST. The Teaching and Learning Committee articulated well the complicated processes necessary to assure compliance with both institutions' outcomes, as well as maintain quality and rigor, and use signature assignments from these courses for the purposes of CST assessment. Because the Teaching and Learning Committee has oversight of CST catalog submissions, it also noted it has the final "check and balance" of CST/CLU approved courses, and has had cases in which a JCC-approved curriculum needed to be revised again because it was no longer aligned with CST requirements. The IRT commended the members of CST for this commitment to cooperation and oversight. However, it notes that again, it is this type of dual-institutional need that raises some question about how CST will continue to maintain its commitment to assessment and improvement, especially as the institutions achieve more autonomy. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4)

The remaining piece of assessment pertains to program review. Thus far, initial planning has occurred, without any approved final structure. The planning envisions adding a fifth year to the assessment cycle. Whereas each ILO is evaluated on a rotating four-year basis, the fifth year would be dedicated to comprehensive program review. CST has demonstrated its commitment to assurance of learning and continuous improvement and the IRT is confident it can readily integrate the envisioned program review. The IRT recommends that CST move ahead from planning to implementation of this critical process to complete its assessment structure. (CFR 2.7)

Increasing emphasis on on-line and hybrid education has resource implications, both with respect to the technology infrastructure required and the necessary investment in course development. The IRT discussed this with the faculty committees. There was a commitment to maintaining the

quality of curriculum and for integrating these courses into the assessment practices, but not a clear plan for how that would be achieved. (CFR 3.6, CFR 3.7)

In sum, the efforts to increase both the rigor and the level of campus-wide engagement in the assessment of learning outcomes deserve commendation. CST faculty themselves noted the transition to being more fully a learning-centered community, and how this applies to them as well as to their students. The four-year cycle for gathering evaluative information about the institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) is a notable example. Each of CST's four distinctive ILOs has been studied in turn to complete the cycle. The most recent results for each of the degree programs are succinctly presented in the *Educational Effectiveness Report, 2012* (Exhibit 3:1). The amount of faculty and student involvement in this process is exemplary. During the WASC site visit, an open meeting with the CST faculty indicated a high level of commitment to the assessment process and faculty members were able to cite clear examples of responding to assessment data in transformative ways.

### **Essay 3: Defining and Promoting Student Success**

Essay 3 of CST's Institutional Report presents salient indicators of success for CST's students. With efficient brevity, CST offers impressive evidence that significant learning outcomes, consistent with the school's stated mission, are being achieved, and most students are realizing their academic and professional goals. On-campus interviews with alumnae and alumni as well as with current students also demonstrated evidence of high levels of satisfaction and achievement.

CST faculty and staff, throughout the meetings with the IRT, demonstrated not just a responsibility for assuring student success and well-being, but a true passion and commitment to building a student-centered, learning-centered community. CST has an Academic Services Team comprised of approximately 18 faculty, staff, and administrators, with a purpose to "enable all students to succeed in their academic programs." Members cross academic, student life, advising, registrar, and other administrative functions. This team identified itself as one that regularly shares information, consults horizontally and vertically about key campus climate and operational issues, and makes recommendations for campus improvements. It shared examples of securing improvements to advising and technology (email service) on behalf of students. The IRT also observed a high level of coordination and cooperation within this cross-representational group, and commends CST for its work in this regard. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

Noteworthy in CST's Institutional Report is the remarkably transparent presentation of concerns needing to be addressed. For example, attention is drawn to the fact that graduation rates for the M.Div. program are lower than would be expected when compared to similar institutions. The

five-year graduation rate for this program is reported to be 58%. Study of Exhibits 3.3 and 3.4 give some indication as to how this rate compares with an average of what are considered comparable institutions. There is frank acknowledgement, however, that a number of factors make clear comparisons difficult: “a better process for peer comparisons needs to be implemented.” The practice of collecting truly comparable data by peer institutions is still fairly new. But initiatives are being developed to create a more robust basis for comparison.

The way the data are presented also makes it challenging to discern trends over an extended period of years. (CFRs 2.10, 4.5) However, the willingness to discuss the issues openly, and the vigor with which they are being addressed, is commendable. Interviews with CST administrators and faculty during the site visit yielded preliminary information indicating that completions rates for the M.Div. are already showing marked improvement.

Also worthy of comment is the clear evidence that CST has given studied attention to students’ needs and to finding practical solutions for overcoming potential difficulties students face. For example, several steps have been taken, or are under way, to increase the accessibility and attainability of the degree programs for those who aspire to the profession of ministry. More courses are being planned as online offerings. On-campus classes are being scheduled so that trips to CST’s campus can be reduced to once per week so as to accommodate the needs of commuter students. And, in order to improve the completion rate for the M.Div. program, it is being shortened from 81 to 72 units -- a number more in line with many other peer institutions.

Other examples of attending to the needs and interests of today’s students include the work of the Office of Internships and Career Services (OICS), the Office of Student and Community Life, and the Spiritual Care Team. The work of the OICS is particularly praiseworthy. The extensive report of this Office, which was prepared for the IRT visit, details the important work that OICS is doing to ensure that students have successful, practical experience in a variety of settings. (CFR 2.10) Interviews with eight of CST’s current students indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the work of OICS. Of note, however, is that fact that interviews with nine CST graduates, including two who have returned to campus for additional work, revealed that none of them was aware of OICS. The IRT also found that OICS leadership is not aware of any process for establishing benchmarks for placement of graduates.

For a school that is significantly engaged in professional education, no indicator of student success is likely to be more significant than that of graduates finding placement in positions that fit the graduates’ education and aspirations. In this regard, the reported fact that 80% of CST’s M.Div.. graduates are occupying formal positions in ministry is satisfying evidence that this professional degree retains important relevance. Nearly all other recipients of this degree have professional employment with work for a variety of educational and service-oriented organizations. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7) Because of a relative dearth of information, with only one year of

data collection, the results for D.Min. graduates are less clear. The placement of Ph.D. graduates prompts some questions. CST's latest data indicate that only 30% of the school's Ph.D. graduates are in teaching positions, whereas 2010 data indicated 48% were in faculty positions, 29% of them in full-time positions. While other PhD graduates are serving in ordained ministry and other fields related to their training, this is a measure of student success that merits further discussion. Essay 3 rightly suggests that the trends for faculty opportunities in higher education "need to be watched carefully." And a process for collaborative establishment of clear benchmarks for placement should be helpful in creating legitimate expectations not just for OICS but for the entire institution.

Within CST's presentation of student success, one characteristic that prompts further scrutiny is the relative lack of *direct* evidence, especially direct evidence that can be compared reliably with evidence directly gained from comparable institutions. Note has been taken of the "Summative Exercises" and "Signature Assignments" reported in the *Educational Effectiveness Report of 2012*, and described under the heading of "Direct Evidence from Within the Curriculum." The effort to gain a convincing assessment of the PLOs is certainly laudable. However, the small Ns and the methods of analysis would not appear to meet the most rigorous standards for direct evidence. Many of the indicators of student success offered in Essay Three rely on indirect measures such as students' self-reports or the subjective perceptions of faculty members. For example, it is reported that "100% of students indicated at least a sufficient overall experience at CST in relation to leadership development and competency." This result was obtained, according to the report, through the scores given by a faculty assessment team to students' papers in an M.Div. capstone course. As valuable as such evidence may be, the addition of sources of direct evidence, such as standardized examinations or reliable statistical measures that can be compared with established and widely recognized norms should be encouraged. Discussion of the most useful types of measures may produce some fruitful ways to enhance the understanding and interpretation of student success. (CFR 2.10)

As is noted in CST's Institutional Report, strengthening of such outcome measures will benefit from collaborative efforts with other comparable institutions of higher learning. Brief mention, for example, is made in the *Institutional Report* of CST's student responses from the Graduating Student Questionnaires (GSQ) developed by the Association of Theological Schools. It is said that CST's students consistently give their faculty comparatively high marks for accessibility and instructional quality. Because the results of this questionnaire, including means and standard deviations for the part of the survey that asks students to assess their schools, are readily available (see <http://www.ats.edu/Resources/Student/Documents/Questionnaire/GSQ/2011-2012GSQ.pdf>), it could be helpful to represent CST's comparative results and their significance. For example, the 2012 GSQ results for "quality of teaching" as assessed by CST's M.Div. students yielded an average of 4.3 on a 5-point Likert scale. This is identical to the average of 4.3 (with a standard deviation of .8) for the total of 3217 M.Div. students who responded to the GSQ

that year. Even though this type of data is indirect, inasmuch as it relies on students' self-report of their perceptions, the comparison with a large number of students responding to an established survey instrument can be instructive.

The use of more graphic representations of CST's outcome data could be a useful enhancement throughout the *Institutional Report*. Depicting data such as student enrollment, time to degree completion, and professional placement graphically for a stipulated period of years and in comparison to trends for peer institutions could do much to make the report easier to follow and give it greater impact. An example would be the trends for time to completion for the Ph.D. and the percentages of those who find work as full-time faculty members after graduation. Charting such trends graphically could give a much more thorough representation of student success.

It is appropriate to end these comments on Essay 3 with affirmation of the CST's remarkable progress toward clarifying its mission, establishing learning outcomes that match the mission, and creating a culture of evidence that is always undergirded with a commitment to student success. The engagement of students, faculty members, and administrators in this journey of excellence is deserving of high praise.

#### **Essay 4: Ensuring Institutional Capacity and Effectiveness**

In Essay 4, CST articulates its commitment to institutional capacity and effectiveness. From the Off-Site Review and the campus visit, the IRT found that the key questions concerning capacity and, in turn, long-term effectiveness largely relate to financial challenges. Also, newly emerging governance realities between CST and CLU as well as between CST and its traditional affiliation with the UMC, must be addressed to thoroughly understand the likely capacity and long term effectiveness of CST. CFRs including 1.6, 1.8, 3.5 are pertinent to these discussions as well as the WASC policy on Independent Governing Boards (Policy on Independent Governing Boards, Adopted by Commission, June 15, 2012).

The overall recent history of CST was well established in the Introduction as well as Essay 4. Significantly, the history of CST has involved ongoing financial instability due to declining enrollments over many years. Seven years ago, CST installed new presidential leadership and retooled its board of trustees. Much energetic activity ensued which involved immediate budget balancing efforts, establishment of a stronger board, overall executive leadership and better financial management, and, most important, a planning process intended to reassess and ultimately broaden the mission and programs of the institution in light of external realities concerning student demand and new interpretations what demand may be in the future (See also Essay Five). This planning process first led to the decision to create the "University Project" in cooperation with the Academy for Jewish Religion-CA and the Islamic Center of Southern California. And ultimately, it led to a plan for a new university, now known as the Claremont

Lincoln University (CLU), which would offer interfaith education and degrees, but its programs would be integrally related to CST in a number of ways, including the sharing of faculty and other key resources.

This past year, summer 2013, again brought leadership change to CST. The President, Jerry Campbell, who had steered CST through the change process described above, stepped down as president of CST, but postponed his planned retirement to accept the position as president of the new CLU, of which CST is a prime partner. CST, in turn, recently selected a new president, Dr. Jeffrey Kuan. Dr. Kuan spent important time with the WASC IRT at the outset of the visit. It is clear that the President is thoroughly familiar with the challenges, especially the financial challenges of the institution. Dr. Kuan emphasized the need for CST to place great focus on this challenge and the related challenge of re-establishing long range institutional planning as well as putting renewed emphasis on the relationship with the Methodist community. Further, Dr. Kuan is well aware of the need to establish appropriate relationships, including the governance relationship, with the new CLU.

In the past decade, CST financial challenges have been largely due to enrollment decline and/or continuing weakness in student demand. This is the core problem for CST. This section of the report addresses two main areas of concern. Most important, is CST's current and projected financial circumstances and related enrollment circumstances. And second, is its governance and in particular, its relationships with the CLU consortium and its partner members. A third area of concern is the future relationship with the UMC.

### *Financial Challenges*

As part of the new Pilot 1 Institution Review Process of WASC a special Finance Review Team has been established to review institutional financial statements prior to the Institutional Review process. In the case of CST, that committee, in a November 20, 2012 letter, identified four areas to be addressed in the 2013 review process: tuition's contribution to total revenues; the spending rate for the institutional endowment; balanced operations; and the financial aspect of the emerging relationship with the CLU. All of these issues were covered in CST's Essay Four.

This IRT approached the visit with substantial concerns with the implications of the ratios calculated by the Financial Review Committee utilizing 2012 financial data (FY 2011-12). A number of the ratios, as calculated, raised questions about both short term and long term viability for the institution and about its operations and strategies. The IRT pursued each of the issues pinpointed by the Financial Review Committee, seeking evidence from the Institutional Report as well as from on-site interviews in order understand and analyze the issues. While these calculations are useful as an immediate and recent set of indicators, a multi-year analysis of ratios would have been more useful; especially in this case. Due to significant fluctuations in

contributions from private sources (especially large gifts related to the newly emerging CLU) and in the costs of operations, the financial statements of CST vary considerably from year to year.

### *Tuition and Fees*

Like most institutions, CST's primary sources of revenue are Tuition and Fee revenues, the use of Endowment Income, and Donations and gifts. In addition, CST has received annual contributions from its sponsoring church, the UMC. Each of these primary sources needs to be examined to shed light on the overall financial circumstances of the institution.

After years of struggle in maintaining enrollments, Tuition and Fee revenue remains a significant challenge for CST. Net Tuition and Fee revenue has been a relatively modest part of all revenues, as shown in data for the past four years.

FY 2009-10 - \$1,466, 214 or 11.1% of all revenues  
FY 2010-11- \$1,073,489 or 10.8% of all revenues;  
FY 2011-12 - \$1,313,324 or 14.9% of all revenue;  
FY 2012-13 - \$1,120,345 or 18.5% of all revenue;

The pattern for CST Tuition and Fee actual revenue in the last several years is that it has been at too low a level to maintain budget balance without concurrent budget reductions or other sources of revenue. Tuition and Fee revenue did increase as a proportion of total revenues in the past two years, but a significant part of the apparent improvement was because total revenues for the institution were falling. Net Tuition and Fee revenue is projected to increase in 2013-14 to \$2,013,056, which is expected to be 26% of all revenues, a welcome sign if achieved. It is worthwhile pointing out that in the last eight years, Net Tuition and Fee revenue has not topped \$2 million. With the long term history of declining Tuition and Fee revenue, the most recent full fiscal year's decline in such revenue is worrisome.

Discounts on tuition remain high, 57% in 2012, 63% in 2011 and roughly in the 50% range for 2013. As noted above the current year budget assumes significantly higher Net Tuition and Fee revenue and a significantly lower discount rate. It remains to be seen if these projections are accurate.

It should also be noted that, while tuition is heavily discounted at CST, this is a common practice in schools of theology. According to the ATS, based on an informal estimate, discounts in mainline (non-evangelical) schools may average 50%, although some do go well above this figure.

## *Enrollment Challenges*

Enrollment decline in traditional schools of theology has been a national trend. CST's decline (40% between 2005 and 2009), parallels the national trend. But the importance of direct enrollments is an obviously critical element of the long term fiscal viability of the CST. The senior leadership of CST understands that fact clearly. Final figures for fall, 2013 enrollments were not yet available at the time of the visit, but preliminary data indicated an increase in new enrollments over the previous year. Members of the CST Enrollment Team attribute the stronger showing in part to the attraction of inter-religious coursework. On-line offerings also seem to be creating interest, particularly among prospective students who want to continue their employment. The enrollment team has made projections for the next five years that assume annual growth averaging 14%, the rate that has been experienced by the combined CST and CLU over the past five years, lifting new enrollments from the 50 of fall, 2012 to over 100 by fall, 2018. The enrollment team assumes growth will come from improved access and delivery of current programs, more than from the addition of new degree programs. By "improved access and delivery" they mean delivery on-line, in hybrid programs and the recently approved masters programs requiring fewer credit hours than in the past.

The recruiting strategies envisioned for the next five years include greater attention to attracting Methodist students, including through stronger ties with the UMC, greater attention to building partnerships with other denominations, and much more aggressive recruiting of international students, particularly from the Asian Pacific Rim. Some of the optimism of the enrollment team is based on the new President's strong connections to the Methodist Church in the U.S. and to the church in Asia. The recruiting strategies are consistent with the enrollment projections, but the projections necessarily contain considerable hope and guess-work.

The current uncertainty about the eventual home, CLU or CST, of the Ph.D. programs may add to the challenge of student recruiting, particularly if students who enrolled with the understanding that their doctorate would be from CLU find that it will be from CST instead.

Senior leadership of CST recognizes that enrollment growth by itself will not be sufficient to right CST's fiscal ship. Both successful fund-raising and cost control will be essential to over-all success.

CST's confidence that masters' enrollments will rebound is based on several factors, but a significant element of this confidence relates to the creation of CLU with its mission of interfaith learning and to the partnerships which will grow from the consortium of institutions associated with CLU. The impact of CLU on this fall's enrollment is an encouraging sign. New CST degree programs, some which will be attractive online programs, may also strengthen enrollment

numbers. However, if enrollment does not rebound by the expected additional students, tuition will not rebound and the institution's already questionable fiscal stability will be further eroded.

### *UMC Contributions*

With respect to the UMC contribution, CST has seen an overall decline in UMC contributions since 2007-08 (although there have been fluctuations). In 2007-08, the contribution from UMC was \$951,319. In 2011-12, the contribution was \$662,794, or 7.5% of the total revenues of CST.

In addition to this annual funding contribution, CST has relied on its certification as a ministerial educator by the UMC, to attract students to CST and thus, additional tuition revenues. The stability of the UMC contribution, as well as the pattern of students enrolling at CST because of its certification by the UMC, came into question in 2010 due to the objections of some UMC Faculty Senate members to the CST's new planning direction. The concern was that CST might be moving away from Methodist ministerial education in favor of inter-faith programs. While that situation was resolved within a matter of months, the question of CST's continued ability to rely on the UMC contributions is at least, a question from the perspective of this IRT. President Kuan's close ties to the Methodist community may augur well for the future relationship with the UMC. However the UMC has recently revised its funding formula which serves as the basis of those contributions and it is unclear how those formulas will actually affect future UMC contributions. CST does not expect increases.

### *Endowment*

Third, CST's use of endowment is another area for very major concern. The 2012 Financial Statements show a total endowment of \$24.6 million for June 30, 2011 and \$22.9 million for 2012. Not only is the value of the endowment declining, the endowment is "under water," that is, the current value is less than the value of contributions to it. In June, 2011, it was underwater by \$9.2 million and in June of 2012 by \$11.1 million, considering only donor-restricted endowment funds. Currently the spending rate against the endowment is 6.5% (+/-). This is a higher level than most experts would agree is wise given the present investment realities. In order to assure the preservation of principle, a spending level of between 4 and 4.5% is widely considered advisable. CST is well aware of this issue, as is demonstrated in their Report, but was compelled to continue to draw at the 6.5% level in order to cover expenses this year and last. At the present time, there is no specific plan for reducing this rate, nor is there a plan for the restoration of the endowment's corpus. The IRT recommends that CST develop a multi-year plan for reducing the spending rate to an appropriate level and for restoration of the corpus. Without such a plan, there is a possibility that eventually the corpus of this endowment will diminish to levels which provide little income.

### *Donations and Gifts*

Fourth, the IRT reviewed the status of Donations and Gifts in the overall CST budget forecast. Most significantly, the Lincoln family has provided large gifts (\$10M initially) to CST over the last few years to develop and incubate the new CLU. As such, the Lincoln funds have been used to expand CST staff or assign existing staff to related work as necessary to accomplish that goal, which has relieved some of the pressure on other CST revenue sources. It is very apparent that without the Lincoln gifts, CST would have been sorely challenged to continue its own mission over the last three years. With CLU becoming a separate entity, CST must balance its finances without those gifts.

Aside from the Lincoln gifts, the College has sought to improve its fundraising capabilities, but there have been challenges, especially in relation to estates and bequests, and total giving has declined. Personnel changes have occurred to redress this situation, but the campus is in need of an overall plan for fundraising. The IRT learned during its visit that the new President is contemplating a comprehensive campaign (possibly \$50m). This is a most necessary step for the campus as other revenue sources are deeply challenged. A further complication is that CST and CLU expect to coordinate fundraising. It is not clear what the actual practices will be as yet. But clarity in the scope of prospective donors for each institution is desirable.

### *Structural Deficit*

All of the circumstances described above contribute to the financial challenges of the CST. And as a result, CST has had operating deficits and cash flow crises for at least the past three years (2009-10 to 2011-12). While the budget has technically been balanced for the last few years due to the Lincoln gifts, it is doubtful that CST operations, standing alone, have been balanced--as noted in the WASC financial report of November 2012. CST self-defines the situation as a "structural deficit."

To complicate this picture, in the last three years, the substantial Lincoln gifts were made to CST with the intention that they would support the new interfaith mission produced by CST's planning process and in particular, the development of CLU as a separate institution. CST explains the operating deficits in the context of its current expanded activities, implying that without those activities, the operating expenses of CST would be considerably lower. Operating expenses in the last three years have involved not only the support of CST per se, but the creation of the new institution, CLU, and the costs associated with that effort, including support operations as well as faculty costs.

In FY 2012-13 and the current year, summary budgets constructed by the CFO show the CST budget minus CLU revenues and expenses. The CFO's CST revenue budget total for 2012-13 is

\$6 million, which is approximately \$2.7m lower than the previous year (the latter presumably representing the CLU revenues from all sources). For the current year the CFO's summary shows a \$1.3m increase in CST revenue. This is presumably based on the expectation of much increased tuition and fee revenue and lower discounts for tuition.

CST presents data in the Institutional Report that details expenses attributable to the CLU's development. A significant portion of costs for key officers of the school (65%) plus other staff, and presumably faculty, are attributed to CLU.<sup>1</sup> Still it is difficult to fully understand from this material what in fact is CST activity vs. CLU related activity. During the visit, the IRT learned more about the particulars of these expenses and about current shared services, although not to a comprehensive level of detail. What is clear is that CST operations will be difficult to fully and clearly separate from CLU, although an initial cost allocation has occurred. An initial cost allocation methodology has been agreed upon; but less clear is whether both institutions agree on how it will be utilized going forward.

The issue of "balanced operations" was raised as a concern by the Financial Review Committee of November 2012. The observation of the IRT is that it is very difficult to know to what degree CST, apart from CLU, has balanced operations given the extent to which operations for CST and CLU have been mixed during the past four years. One important note is that the new President is of the view that cost containment at CST must be a high priority even with a renewed student enrollment effort and a renewed fundraising effort. The President's concern also likely relates to the intentions of CLU to purchase services from CST in the future. The "balanced operations" topic is complicated by the fact that there is to be a continuing financial relationship which is based on a cost allocation and reimbursement plan.

As mentioned above, the Institution Report shows allocations of time of individual CST employees devoted to CLU for 2010-11 and 2011-12. It is unclear whether this delineation is reasonable, or whether it can in fact really be determined. But if this allocation of time is correct, a further question arises. Is that portion of CST staff time not used for CLU over the past three to four years what will be needed for CST alone when and if the separation from CLU actually occurs?

CST has displayed roughly \$3m in expenses (CFO Display) for CLU as well as \$1m in annual revenues (presumably residual of the Lincoln gifts). CST also stated in its report that while the initial split in overall costs between CST and CLU would be roughly 80% to 20%, ultimately it expected that CLU would carry as much as 70% while CST carried 30% of the costs within

---

<sup>1</sup>In the notes to the 2012 Financial Statements it is stated that CST expenses were supporting 30 degree seeking students in CLU in 2012. Hence we conclude that there were faculty expenses. It is not clear from the data on Pages 845-847 whether the faculty expenses were recorded as such.

approximately seven years. This implied that there would be a rapid paced growth of revenue from CLU in the direction of CST. In other words, it implied there would be a significant level of purchased services by CLU from CST. The question, of course, is if there is growth in demand for services from CLU , but no commensurate revenue flow, CST will be on the losing end of the situation and would need to downsize its expenses very significantly or rapidly grow enrollments.

While the report framed the plan as described above, during the IRT visit, it became very clear that plans for purchase of services by CLU from CST had modified considerably. Both CST leadership and CLU leadership stated or implied this change in interviews with the IRT. CLU leadership and Board members in particular, clearly reserved the right to purchase services from CST only if they were cost effective and the right to go to other sources if necessary.

This raises concerns about the level of support which CST can rely on in the future from CLU and it leads to the question of the governance relationships between the institutions.

### *Governance Issues*

In looking at the governance issues raised by the development of CLU as a separate institution, the IRT commended CST, the board, its former president and its overall leadership for their extraordinary effort to find a critical path to viability in the future. The whole CST campus community has demonstrated again, an extraordinary devotion to this task and has shown enormous creativity and determination in pursuing it. But, the IRT also noted that the spin-off of CLU raises questions of ensuring the governance of each institution complies with the spirit of the *WASC Policy on Independent Governing Boards*.

There are at least two dimensions to the governance topic of concern to the IRT. The first involves the current and future relationships of the two separate institutions, CST and CLU. The second is the future relationship between CST and other partners in the consortium, which revolves around CLU.

The future CST/CLU relationship, by all evidence, appears to be a critical relationship for CST's future viability. The very founding of the CLU was prompted by a desire to find a way to assure the viability of CST. CST, a theological educational institution, is owned by two conferences of the UMC, but it has a separate governing board as an incorporated 501(C)3. CLU, currently seeking status as an incorporated 501(C)3 organization and WASC accreditation, is scheduled to become an independent operation upon approval from the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education, IRS, and WASC. A separate board with the normal powers and responsibilities of a board governs CLU.

The actions undertaken by CST in developing the plan for CLU (with partners) and “incubating” CLU within CST over the past roughly three years, have posed a complex analytical task. As discussed above, the financial life of CST over these past three years is difficult to entirely sort out. Further, it is difficult to know whether the future financial life of CST will be sufficient to maintain CST, because so much depends on the willingness of CLU’s present and future Board to enter into agreements concerning cost assumption by CLU. Many parts of the Institutional Report mention the hiring of this or that staff person who it is intended will be shared; new programs which will involve faculty sharing; sharing of online educational technology; and so forth. The assumption, again in the original Institutional Report, was that CLU would utilize significant current capacity, especially the faculty, administration, and physical plant of CST. But as mentioned above during the on-site visit interviews it became clear to the IRT that there are doubts about this extensive of an operational relationship between CST and CLU. And yet WASC, as mentioned earlier in the report, approved an expedited review process for CLU based on the assumption that the new interfaith institution would bolster CST’s finances to assure long term financial sustainability.

As noted above, the expectation was that up to 70% of operational activities undertaken by CST could become attributable to CLU and subject to cost reimbursement over the long term. This assumption has softened considerably based on the IRT on-site interviews. But even if the expectation is now 40%, 30% or less, it is an extraordinary level of reliance by CLU on CST for operations; and by CST on CLU for revenue. One can imagine the complexities, which could arise, including who ultimately controls decisions concerning operational matters. Control of operational matters is fundamental to mission accomplishment. There is no doubt that the missions (and programs) of CST and CLU are likely to have great complementarity. But these programs may also be somewhat competitive as a whole. The point here is two independent boards and administrations entering contracts, which, at the magnitude of resources involved, are critical to mission control, may well have conflict over control. This leads to the overall question of inter-institutional agreements.

During the on-site visit, this IRT received a draft of what is to be the basic memorandum of understanding for CLU; that is, the principles, responsibilities and rights of members of the CLU consortium. This MOU, which is an expansion of an original much more limited statement, has not yet been approved by either Board. The IRT considers it critical that this work be completed.

President Kuan and the CST Board of Trustees need to ensure that an appropriate overall governance agreement (MOU) is in place so that the future process for the development of the CST/CLU relationship is clear and based on mutually adopted principles and processes for approval of sub-elements of the relationship.

CST and CLU have made some progress on the cost allocation process and have adopted a methodology which is now being applied in the current budget year. Less clear is what the future intentions of CLU are with regard to purchase of services from CST will be. For the long term, the cost allocation and reimbursement agreement between CST and CLU needs to be robust. The agreement itself will likely need to be modified over time as circumstances change.

At the time of the visit, the CLU board was not yet fully populated, so there was little hard information about what the relationship of the two institutions boards, especially board memberships, will be. Given the extreme importance of independence in governing board decision making in this instance, it is important to ascertain whether the majority of these two boards are adequately independent per the WASC policy.

A second similar concern, although not at the level of CST/CLU relationship involves the other religious education institutions that are now (or will be in the future) participating in the consortium. It is unclear what the inter-institutional relationships are to involve in terms of resource sharing and mechanisms for cost reimbursement if needed.

In summary, the capacity and long term effectiveness of CST to achieve its mission is very much dependent on meeting the enormous financial challenges and the governance challenges described above.

CST has improved its overall administrative structure, especially in the financial management area since WASC's last visit to the campus. This capacity, however, is severely challenged with the additional burdens involved with the incubation of CLU at this time. But financial reports are reliable and informative. Overall the institutional needs to continue towards decision making that is evidence based and that is focused for the long term.

The new leadership has a very good grasp of the challenges facing CST, especially recognition of the financial sustainability challenges; and it has a very good grasp of the CST/CLU relationship as it currently stands. The new president already roughed out a "go forward" plan for CST which is not as heavily reliant on CLU as originally anticipated.

There is also recognition of the need for a Plan B that involves a much downsized operating budget through cost containment; a less top heavy administration; and a significant growth in enrollments; a focus on rebuilding the endowment through a realistic level of comprehensive campaign, especially within and through the Methodist community. A Plan B is in the earliest stages of articulation and needs to be further developed.

## **Essay 5: Planning for the Changing Environment for Seminary Education in America**

This section of the report concerns the topics covered in Essay 5 of the Claremont School of Theology report, “Planning for the Changing Environment for Seminary Education in America.” The essay takes a broad view of the future, expanding the institutional capacity and effectiveness analysis offered in Essay 4 to include a general examination of the problems of theological education. CFR 4.1 is of primary importance in regard to this essay with the Institutional Purposes CFRs (1.1, 1.2, and 1.3) also playing a role.

The historic decline of denominational seminaries is accounted for. Increased costs, declining enrollment, problems with the economy of scale and the advent of online education are identified as key contributors to the problem. The analysis presented connects these concerns and CST’s plans to 1) expand the multi-religious aspects of their programs 2) offer a “hybrid” version of the M.Div. 3) become a multi-denominational seminary and 4) add a focus on “emerging Christianity” to the programs and ethos of the school.

The essay presents a cogent assessment of the changing patterns of being religious in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century and offers clear, creative initiatives aimed at appropriate change. At the same time it acknowledges the major uncertainties involved in CST’s predicament. Like other institutions of theological education, CST is living in “interesting times”. A rapidly-changing environment makes predicting difficult indeed. Though the projections offered necessarily involve speculation, in its conversations with campus leaders the IRT heard thoughtful realism as well as optimism and hope.

The IRT was impressed by the forward-looking nature of the CST personnel and by their enthusiasm for “the new CST”. Overall CST is an institution that sees major changes in its environment and is willing to make equally major changes in order to remain viable and relevant. During its site visit the IRT found that the people of CST more than stood behind the broad vision described in Essay 5. The first three goals received especially clear support in campus interviews and group meetings. Among CST faculty and administrators there is obvious and strong buy-in for inter-religious education, on line teaching and ecumenism. The IRT did note two areas where campus energy seems to have shifted in the months since the Institutional Report was submitted: 1) interest in the emergent church and 2) plans for implementing ecumenical partnerships. In the dozens of interviews and group meetings held, there was virtually no mention of emergent or emerging church issues. The IRT was also struck by the lack of progress in implementing ecumenical partnerships; it was not clear who holds responsibility for moving them forward. What will become of these two aspects of “the new CST”? How important are they to the plan’s success?

Although overall the IRT affirms the creative work CST has done in regard to assessing the future and planning for it, the IRT has broad concerns in three areas. This section of the report

will describe areas for further inquiry and detail issues the IRT sees as being unclear, unresolved or problematic.

### *1. Process for planning and decision-making*

CST has a well-developed institutional planning system. The Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee and the University Project Institutional Planning Team (now the Institutional Integrated Planning Team) work with the President and administrators to coordinate planning initiatives. However as CST's Self-Review under the Standards acknowledges, "...institutional planning has become more complex and institutional change has accelerated." The IRT concurs with the latter statement and is concerned about the degree to which planning for the four initiatives described in Essay 5 involves the constituent groups represented by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee and the Institutional Integrated Planning Team as well as other stake holders. The IRT is unclear about who led or inspired the initiatives, what groups were involved in their early refinement and what steps were involved in the 2011 vetting process.

Similarly, campus interviews led the IRT to wonder about how the Institutional Integrated Planning Team was currently functioning (how often it was meeting) and about the ongoing role of the Joint Curriculum Committee. Are CST's interests well represented in groups where the leadership and membership rest heavily in CLU hands? And if so, are these groups entrusted with the authority they need to make significant decisions? At the time of the site visit, the IRT noted that PhD programs had been moved from CST to CLU's purview. Yet there was little understanding or explanation of how that decision came to be made. During the visit CLU leadership indicated the programs would be returned to CST, but again it was not clear how the decision would be made from CST's side. Going forward how does CST understand the process for such decisions? And how will it ensure that its needs and interests are accounted for in such a process?

In addition to its concerns about committee structures, the IRT noted issues with the timetable for decision-making. Essay 5 states that buy-in for "the new CST" was achieved between April and September of 2011. This means that both the faculty and the Board of Trustees were persuaded to endorse the proposals during that short period. However given the tendency of initial support to be tested – and even erode – during the implementation of radical change, the team is concerned about the faculty's investment in "the new CST". Will it be sufficient to carry the institution through an intense period of curricular reform? When it comes to the kind of "blue-sky" thinking about the future this essay represents, does the faculty have the kind of time and space they need to implement, assess and re-create? With the departure of the former CST Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, who became the CLU Provost and was seen as one of the key academic spokesperson for the new vision, where will the intellectual capital come from to sustain the vision? Why did two CST faculty members decline

to sign the agreement to also teach at CLU? Were their reasons related to reservations about the changes or something else?

## *2. Christian Identity*

How will CST refine its Christian identity to fulfill its role in the CLU and to be the strongest possible institutional conversation partner with the other world religions represented there? CST's residential faculty includes positions in spirituality, pastoral care and counseling, constructive theology, African-American religion, communication arts, process studies, religious education, inter-religious education, homiletics, evangelism, Hebrew Bible and New Testament. The incumbents in many of these positions teach from a Christian perspective, but, with the exception of New Testament and evangelism, none of these necessarily involves Christian distinctiveness. Full time faculty positions in areas such as the history of Christianity, systematic theology, church music, and liturgical studies -- areas often associated with distinctly-Christian courses -- are not in evidence.

Similarly, the 81 credit version of the M.Div. curriculum currently posted on the website requires 12 units of spirituality, 9 of inter-religious studies, 24 of integrative studies and 15 of free electives but only 21 of Christian theological studies. This means that just one quarter of the current M.Div. curriculum focuses on courses with explicitly Christian content. It would be possible for a student to earn an M.Div. having had 1 course in Church History and 1 in New Testament. Will this change in "the new CST"? In what ways? Given the increased emphasis on world religions in the CST curricula how does the school understand the role of Christianity in the new programs? The M.Div.?

## *3. Contingency Plans*

If the plans to add multi-denominational, multi-religious emphases, hybrid courses and "emerging Church" programs are not successful or do not generate sufficient income to sustain the school, what steps will CST take? If the emerging Church stops emerging, how will CST renew itself? If the eight denominations invited to partner with CST do not accept the invitation, what will happen to CST's plan to be multi-denominational? How important is that piece – or any one piece – of the four-pronged initiative?

Similarly, what plans exist for securing the school's future if the joint venture with CLU fails? What processes will CST use to continue long-range planning? How will those processes change if the financial crisis deepens?

Given the changing ecology of education – unbundling, the emergence of Level 5 leaders, and changing expectations of the Department of Education and the regional accreditors who work

with it – what if CST’s radical plans are not radical enough? Are there “Plan B”s on the books or does Essay 5 represent the farthest view CST can imagine?

### **Section III Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations**

#### *Findings*

CST is a community with an exuberant love of the mission and goals of CST, with high expectations for the quality of its education. There has been substantial progress since the last visit in terms of building a community committed to educational and institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 2.1, 2.2b)

There is strong commitment to students and their education, and the care for student success across denominations, populations and institutions. (CFR 4.6) Whether related to assessment, financial planning, curricular development or student services, the IRT found a strong chorus about the importance of students, demonstrating again the charism and compassion for which CST is known.

CST has thought deeply about the changes that are taking place in the landscape for theological education and in the religious environment of its community and has responded with creativity and courage, a response embodied in Claremont Lincoln University. However, thinking about the relationship of CLU and CST has evolved, and it is no longer clear what degrees will be offered by each institution and the extent to which the new institution will enable fuller utilization of CST resources or be a source of stabilizing revenue. (CFR 1.3)

Since the last visit, CST has greatly strengthened its organizational structure and decision-making processes. It has also made substantial progress in embracing assessment and developing a culture of evidence. The work to develop and align outcomes at the course, program, and institutional level is noteworthy. The institution has completed a university-wide initiative to develop learning outcomes, curriculum maps, and assessment plans, aligning these with institutional outcomes and ATS standards. (CFR 3.11, 4.6)

CST’s long history of financial challenges continues. Without the recent gifts to support the development of CLU, CST would have been sorely challenged. The high endowment spending rate and loss of principal that worried previous WASC teams continue unabated and there is little in the way of concrete plans for addressing the problem. (CFR 3.5)

CST has demonstrated its ability to engage in planning to respond to particular needs or potential crises. However, the IRT did not find evidence of systematic planning with concrete goals,

action steps and timelines. Involvement of campus constituencies has been uneven and there is no up-to-date strategic plan. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

### *Commendations*

1. CST is to be commended for the openness and honesty of its institutional report in describing its history and the challenges it faces. (CFRs 1,3, 1.9)
2. CST is to be commended for aggressively, fearlessly looking for solutions to long-term problem created by a changing environment. (CFRs 3.11, 4.1,)
3. CST is to be commended for the thoughtfulness and creativity it has brought to exploring theological education for the 21st century. The commitment to interreligious education gives CST an important place in the higher education landscape. (CFR 1.1)
4. CST is to be commended for its progress in developing a culture of evidence and strong commitment to being a student-centered learning community. (CFRs 2.4, 2.10, 2.13,4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)
5. CST is to be commended for the clear definition of its mission and the careful alignment of learning objectives at each level. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.3)

### *Recommendations*

1. It is critical that CST complete a memorandum of understanding, service agreements, cost-sharing agreements and other formal documents defining and governing the relationship between it and Claremont Lincoln University as quickly as possible. (CFRs 3.8, 3.9)
2. CST should develop and implement a clear plan for communication to its community and major constituents about significant developments as the relationship with CLU is codified. Lack of information breeds distrust and could weaken commitment to a very important initiative. (CFRs 3.11, 4.1)
3. CST must take steps to achieve fiscal sustainability, including controlling costs and expanding revenues through larger enrollments and other means; it must wean itself from excessive withdrawals from endowment and reduce the draw to a sustainable level. (CFR 3.5)
4. CST should move from episodic planning to systematic, participative planning processes, informed by evidence, to guide continuous improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)
5. CST should continue its efforts to develop and implement systematic academic program review. CST has shown it has a culture of continuous improvement and can readily advance to this next step. (CFRs 2.7, 3.11)

**CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX**

Institution: Claremont School of Theology

Date: September, 2013

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

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments</b> (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.) CST Bulletin and interview with Dr. Kathy Black	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? Where?	Yes, in faculty handbook
	Where is the policy posted?	Taught to all new faculty in their orientation and published in the current CST Bulletin on p. 55
	Comments:	The extensive measures to ensure that all faculty understand the policy are exemplary
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, the Teaching and Learning Committee conducts regular reviews
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes, with a high degree of accountability
	Comments: Both the printed documents and the interview with Dr. Black , who is a member of the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC), indicate that Claremont School of Theology (CST) has taken put in place effective measures to ensure compliance with the published credit hour policy.	
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: There is convincing evidence that the TLC monitors the compliance carefully.	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?	Three syllabi were reviewed thoroughly and others were scanned. There was
	How many syllabi were reviewed? 3	
	What degree level(s)? Primarily the M.Div.	
	What discipline(s)? M.Div.is the degree program for ministry.	

		significant evidence of compliance with policy.
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	Yes.
	Comments: CST has gone to great lengths to ensure that faculty members understand the credit hour policy and that it is implemented in their courses. This is significant strength of CST.	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)	What kinds of courses? Courses in ministerial preparation.	
	How many syllabi were reviewed? Indicated above.	
	What degree level(s)? Primarily M.Div.	
	What discipline(s)? Pastoral Ministry	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	Yes.
	Comments: This is an area of considerable strength for CST.	
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	What kinds of programs? M.A. and M.Div.	
	How many programs were reviewed? 2	
	What degree level(s)? M.A. and M.Div.	
	What discipline(s)? "ethical leadership" and pastoral ministry	
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length?	Yes
	Comments: CST sets a high standard for publishing the requirements for credit, ensuring that this is understood by faculty members, including contract and part-time faculty members, and checking to see that courses comply. CST deserved commendations for this high level of attention to credit hour integrity.	

## STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW - TEAM REPORT APPENDIX

Institution:

Date:

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

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions/Comments</b> (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
<b>Policy on student complaints</b>	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?	Yes
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?	Yes
	Comments: The policy is fully described on pages 147 and 148 of the current Claremont School of Theology (CST) Bulletin.	
<b>Process(es)/ procedure</b>	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: Students are informed about their avenues for students who wish to make or complaint or file a grievance. Non-retaliation is promised to students who do pursue a complaint or grievance. Interviews with eight current students indicate that this process is understood and appreciated by the students.	
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	Yes
	Comments: The published statement in the CST Bulletin is, by all accounts, including interviews with student, faculty members, and alumni and alumnae, the policy is effective and appreciated.	
<b>Records</b>	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where?	Yes, with the Associate Dean for Student Life
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly:	Yes, this is within the purview of the Associate

		Dean for Student Life
	Comments: Students express a high level of confidence that the published channels for their complaints or grievances are effective. The eight students who were interviewed indicated unanimous appreciation for the trustworthiness of CST's provisions for attending to students' complaints.	

Rev 9/2013

**MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW: TEAM REPORT APPENDIX**

Institution: Claremont School of Theology  
 Date: September 27, 2013

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

<b>Material Reviewed</b>	<b>Questions and Comments:</b> Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	<b>Verified Yes/No</b>
*Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: Student Advising Guide for each program gives clear information on tuition and on the credits required for completion of each degree. Institution makes clear that length of time to degree depends on full-time or part-time status. Tuition information is clear, but some students commented that information about Financial Aid is not always clear. Web site also includes specific information about tuition and it has links to financial aid information and resources.	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments: Students interviewed had realistic expectations about employment, based on information from the institution and their own observations. PhD students understood that employment opportunities for them in academe are challenging.	

\*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.

# PILOT 1 COMPLIANCE AUDIT CHECKLIST FOR REACCREDITATION

**Name of Institution:** Claremont School of Theology

**Review Date:** August 13, 2013 (By Richard Osborn, VP, WASC)

**Instructions to institution:**

Please provide a link to each document designated below. Be sure that the reviewer will be able to see where this document is published. If you do not have the exact document that is specified but have some comparable document, please provide a link to that document.

We expect to conduct this initial compliance audit for all accredited institutions once. In subsequent reaccreditation reviews, you will be asked to update the documents if they have been revised.

**Instructions to team:**

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

**Claremont School of Theology created a website with links to each requested document at:**

<https://sites.google.com/a/cst.edu/cst-accrreditation/Compliance-Audit-Checklist>

CFR	Documents Required	Link to Website or Document Portfolio	WASC Check
1.1	Mission statement		X
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels		X
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention/graduation, student learning)		X
1.3	Organization chart (Also see 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)		X
1.4	Academic freedom policy		X
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; procedures for accommodations re disabilities		X
1.6	Documents setting forth the authority of a corporate, governmental, religious organization or system that is affiliated with the accredited institution	-	-X
1.7	Catalog (online ____, hard copy ____) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)		X
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies		X
1.7.2.1	Grade appeals policy		X
1.7.2.2	Records of student grievances		X
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies		X
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances		X
1.7.4	Staff grievance policy		X
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances		X
1.7.5	Employee handbook, if available		X
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.		X
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files		X
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades		X
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule		X
1.7.6.5	Tuition refund policy		X

1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit; processes for review of assignment of credit; review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses		X
1.7.6.7	Policy on human subjects in research, if applicable		X
1.8	Independent annual audits of finances (also see CFR 3.5)		X
1.9	Policies to ensure that WASC substantive change policies are followed		X
1.9.1	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation;		X
1.9.2	List of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation		X
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (also see CFR 1.7 )		X
2.2	Syllabi for all courses offered		X
2.2.1	For associate and bachelor's degrees: General education requirements (Also see CFR 1.7)		N/A
2.3	Student learning outcomes for every program		X
2.4	Grading standards	-	-X
2.5	Class participation policies if available	-	-X
X2.6	Placement data if available	-	-X
2.7	Program review process/guidelines		X
2.7.1	Schedule of program review (including reviews of non-academic units)		X
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity		X
2.9	-	-	-
2.10	-		
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, overall and disaggregated (link to the standard templates for retention/graduation reports)		X
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate		X
2.10.3	Policy on student evaluation of faculty		X
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students		X
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities		X
2.11.1	Financial aid policy and procedures		X
2.12	Academic calendar (also see CFR 1.7 catalog)		X
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year, including scripts for recruitment		X
2.13.1	Procedures for students to register		X
2.14	Policy on transfer of credit		X
3.1	Staff development policies		X

3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program (link to relevant data exhibit)		X
3.3	Faculty hiring policies if available		X
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policy and procedures (Also see CFR 2.10)		X
3.3.2	Faculty handbook or equivalent		X
3.4	Faculty development policies		X
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures		X
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty		X
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning		X
3.5	Last two years audited financial statements (Also see CFR 1.8)		X
3.5.1	List of financial records maintained		X
3.5.2	Last two years' financial aid audits		X
3.5.3	Last federal composite score if applicable		X
3.5.4	Last report of two- and three-year cohort default rates		X
3.5.5	Campus maps		X
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty		X
3.6.1	If online or hybrid courses, information on delivery method		X
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size		X
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff		X
3.8	Organization chart (Also see CFRs 1.3 and 3.1)		X
3.9	List of governing board members		X
3.9.1	Governing board member biographical information		X
3.9.2	List of governing board committees with members		X
3.9.2.1	Minutes of board meetings for last two years		X
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual		X
3.10	CEO biographical information		X
3.10.1	CFO biographical information		X
3.10.2	Other senior administrators' biographical information (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)		X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO		X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority if applicable		X
3.11.1	Faculty governance organization chart if applicable		X
3.11.2	Minutes of the last year's faculty meetings		X
4.1	Strategic plan		X
4.1.1	Operations plan		X
4.1.2	Academic plan		X
4.1.3	Technology plan		X

4.1.4	Facilities plan		X
4.2	Description of planning process		X
4.2.1	Process for review and monitoring of strategic plan/metrics		X
4.3	-	-	-
4.4	New program approval process		X
4.4.1	Program review process (Also see CFR 2.7)		X
4.5	Description of institutional research function and staffing		X
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (Also see CFR1.2)		X
4.7	-	-	-
4.8	List of major industry or other advisory committees		X

Team Comments:

<b>Accuracy and Availability of Records: Team Only</b>		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	Yes.
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	Yes.
	Records are accurate and up to date	Yes

Team Comments: