REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM
SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 3

For Institutions Seeking Initial Accreditation

To California Institute for Human Science

May 5-6, 2021

TEAM ROSTER

Mac Powell
Senior Vice President, Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities
Chair

Karen McClendon
Vice President for Institutional Research, Quality Improvement, & Assessment, California Northstate University
Assistant Chair

Michael Barr
Associate Vice President for Program Development, Review, and Online Synergy
The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Susan Opp
Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission
Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective judgment 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. Once an institution achieves either candidacy or initial accreditation, the team report and Commission Action Letter associated with the review that resulted in the granting of either candidacy or initial accreditation and the team reports and Commission Action Letters of any subsequent reviews will be made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 3

TEAM REPORT

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

California Institute for Human Science (CIHS) is a small non-profit institution that offers one undergraduate, three masters, and three doctoral degree programs aligned with the teachings of the Institution's founder, Hiroshi Motoyama. Since its founding in 1992, the school has expanded on its vision to create a school in which students could explore the integration of scientific principles and spirituality. CIHS offers Bachelors, Masters, and Ph.D. degree programs in Psychology (California Licensure track or Integral), Integral Studies, Integral Health (including Life Physics concentration), and Comparative Religion & Philosophy (including Yoga Studies Concentration) through onsite and hybrid instruction methods to facilitate degree completion and educational engagement. CIHS is located on a leased campus with ample classrooms and public spaces and enjoys a unique relationship with a Japanese Foundation that provides for generous leasing terms, ongoing financial support, and a passive income stream from additional properties on the CIHS campus.

With the passing of the founder in 2015, and in support of creating an engaged and independent governing board, CIHS continues to advance its mission, which consists of eight principles:

- To Promote a Society which Enhances the Integration of Science and Religion

- To Understand Human Existence from the Total Perspective of Body, Mind and Spirit

- To Establish Guiding Principles for the Citizens of the Global Society

- To Establish Energy Medicine, which will Prevent Diseases and Promote Health

- To Elucidate the Mechanism of the Correlation Between Mind and Body, and to Actualize Mental Control over Body and Matter with a Resulting Better Life

- To Systematize Scientific and Objective Meditational Practices, which will Promote Spiritual Growth

- To Establish a Society which Satisfies both the Individuality (Freedom and Rights) and Sociality (Morality and Coexistence) of Human Existence

- To Establish a Creative Science which Researches the Mind and Soul as well as Matter.

CIHS currently operates under the oversight of the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE). The Eligibility Review Committee (ERC) acted to grant eligibility to CIHS and outlined recommendations for further attention in its letter of November 16, 2016. Since that time, the institution hosted an SAV1 visit in May 2018 and achieved Candidacy for initial WSCUC accreditation on July 20, 2018. An SAV2 visit in March 2020 identified significant progress and areas of opportunity to come into compliance with specific WSCUC CFRs.

Dr. Thomas Brophy continues to serve in the role of President since a leadership transition between SAV1 and SAV2, and the institution has added staff to expand its academic and operational capacity, including a full time chief financial officer, a half-time Dean of Academic Affairs, a Dean of Admissions and Enrollment Planning, a half-time Director of Continuing Education, a part-time Director of Assessment and Institutional Research, a part-time Dean for Student Life, a half-time Director of Psychology Programs, a part-time Director of the

MA in Integral Health--Concentration in IAYT Yoga Therapy Program, and a part-time Comparative Religion and Philosophy Program Director.

The visit was conducted virtually on May 5-6 and included in-person interviews with the Board of Trustees, administration, faculty, staff, students, donors, and alumni.

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit 3 Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

The visiting team found the Seeking Accreditation Visit 3 Report to directly address the CFRs referenced in the Commission action letter and the SAV2 Team Evaluation Report. CIHS made efforts to address each of the CFRs outlined by the WSCUC visiting team in prior Commission action letters, which found CIHS to have met all of the WSCUC Standards "at a level sufficient to grant Candidacy." Section 3 of the institution's Seeking Accreditation Institutional Report outlined steps taken to address these issues since the last visit.

The team found the institution's report to include descriptions of actions taken by the institution to address areas requiring attention noted in the Commission Action Letter (CAL). All of the action plans identified in prior visits continued, and the team found an institution that remained committed to quickly achieving the outcomes it established for itself as it pursued accreditation.

The report was thoroughly evidenced, clearly-written, and extremely well-organized. The visiting team found faculty, staff, students, alumni, and board members to be fully engaged in the work of accreditation. Furthermore, all constituencies demonstrated a strong commitment to the institution and its mission and values, as well as a budding commitment to embracing the WSCUC standards and to building a culture of institutional improvement.

Due to COVID-19, the institution transitioned all courses to an online modality, and shared that because nearly all of their existing courses were taught in a synchronous-hybrid environment, the transition was smooth, and it instituted new training for on-line teaching and upgraded its learning platform. Because most courses were already being taught via a synchronous-hybrid of online and on-campus, the transition to all-online was not difficult. All CIHS staff and administrators worked remotely, except for a limited presence in the front office, and the enrollment increased year over year in each academic quarter during the Pandemic.

The institution reports that Fall 2020 was the largest enrollment in the institution's history and though revenue did not show significant declines in tuition, there was an offsetting reduction in revenue from the subleasing of its facilities of $37,000. CIHS was able to receive two PPP loans, in the amounts of $68,000 and $103,640, which have helped to maintain the positive operating balances and net asset levels referenced as consistent in prior reporting.

C. Response to Issues Raised in Past Commission Letters

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) acted to grant Candidacy to CIHS and outlined the following commendations, as well as recommendations for further attention in its letter of July 8, 2020.

The Commission commended CIHS in particular for the following:

1. Strong and widely shared sense of identity and institutional purpose around the principles of body, mind, and spirit.

2. Expanded allocation of resources to support fulfillment of its mission, particularly the additional personnel to support academic quality, institutional research, and assessment.

3. Establishment of a Faculty Senate and Student Senate and the institutional commitment to the principles of shared governance.

4. Founder's commitment, and the continued commitment and support of his son, and the generous contributions of Tamamitsu Jinja to support the evolution of the institution.

5. Successful fundraising efforts, particularly the engagement and support of the board.

6. Financial management and the institution's ability to operate without debt, and with a small but growing financial reserve.

The Commission required the institution to respond to the issues identified in the related CFRs below and the language from the Commission action letter is cited for each CFR. The team's general findings regarding the institution's responsiveness to these issues will be outlined in this section of the report with more depth provided in the next section, particularly for CFRs needing further attention.

CFRs 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4: *Develop a faculty-driven process for establishing appropriate standards for student performance and curriculum development and oversight to include establishment of appropriate summative assignments, creation of well-developed assessment methods, and alignment of course- and program-level learning outcomes.*

Since the time of the last visit, CIHS has invested in an enhanced organizational structure to support the assessment of student learning, program review, and curricular and educational effectiveness planning. The institution created several new positions to provide support for teaching and learning: Director of Outcomes Assessment, Dean of Academic Affairs, and program directors. Further, the institution's Faculty Senate took ownership of the assessment process via the work of a curriculum subcommittee that worked with key administrators to create

assessment tools needed to assess student learning. (Please refer to Section II for additional

detailed information regarding CFR 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4.)

CFR 2.6: *Assess student learning at or near graduation in order to establish the extent to which graduates achieve the expected student learning outcomes at expected levels of proficiency.*

After building out its assessment infrastructure, the institution implemented its plan to

assess student learning at or near graduation to determine the extent to which graduates achieve

expected student learning outcomes at expected levels of proficiency for all of its programs.

(Please refer to Section II for additional detailed information regarding CFR 2.6.)

CFR 2.7: *Fully implement the program review process and have completed the program review process by the time of the next accreditation visit. Ensure that program review includes the assessment of student achievement of all program learning outcomes for that program as well as retention, graduation rates, board pass rates and licensure, and an external review component.*

Since the time of the last accreditation team visit, CIHS has developed its program

review process. This process includes a self-study, assessment data trends to report on student

success, an assessment of program resources, and an external review component. (Please refer to

Section II for additional information regarding CFR 2.7.)

CFR 2.10: *Collect and analyze both aggregated and disaggregated data related to student achievement in order to determine the extent to which students are successful and programs are meeting student support needs.*

CIHS has adopted a student information system (Populi) that should allow the institution

to more easily disaggregate student data. CIHS has begun to create individualized student reports

and academic plans. CIHS's Dean of Student Life has made improvements in the institution's

ability to obtain student feedback regarding their support needs through a student advisory group

although this information is made available in aggregate. While the numbers of students remain

small, and this poses challenges in terms of being able to protect student identity or make

generalizations, there are some untapped sources of data, including course evaluations and

alumni surveys, which could be disaggregated to provide additional information pertaining to

students' experiences in different programs and cohorts. (Please refer

to Section II for additional information regarding CFR 2.10.)

CFR 4.1. *Continue implementation of the academic program review process, further outline the process for new program development, and develop and implement a process for non-academic (co-curricular) assessment.*

CIHS has implemented a process for academic quality assurance that includes emerging

processes for new program development and non-academic program review. With regard to new

program development, CIHS requires that a sub-committee of the Institutional Effectiveness

Committee (IEC) support its development, which then follows an institutional review process

that includes the Faculty Senate, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. It may be

beneficial for CIHS to develop a clear set of guidelines and processes to establish the criteria for

approval of new programs, which would ideally include financial feasibility/sustainability and

mission relevance. With regard to non-academic program review, CIHS has included this area of

responsibility within the charter of IEC; however, there is not a formal assessment plan or

benchmarks for the services specified in the institution's program review process.

CFR 4.2. *Establish a position responsible for the function of collecting, organizing, and presenting institutional research for the purpose of planning and decision making.*

The institution has hired a Director of Research and Assessment, who has begun the

migration from a manual registrar function to an electronic student information system (Populi).

Progress has been made on loading records into the system. At this point, the institution is not

yet capable of providing student success reports consistent with industry standards for retention,

time to completion, satisfactory academic progress, and graduation. When available, these data

will be reported to the IEC. (Additional details are provided under CFR 4.2 addressed in Section II.)

CFR 4.3. *Collect and analyze data reflecting the systematic assessment of teaching and learning, and the campus environment, and use the data to support improvements.*

The institution began implementing a systematic assessment of institutional effectiveness in August 2019 and is currently piloting the process. Initial data for some programs are available; however, the cycle of assessment for no single program has yet been completed to allow the feedback loop to close by using data to support decision making around programmatic or support service improvements. Co-curricular activities have only recently been identified, and measures are being developed to assess their effectiveness. There remains a strong reliance on student course evaluations and grades as evidence of program and institutional effectiveness. (Additional details are provided under CFR 4.3 addressed in Section II.)

CFR 4.4. *Develop support for faculty inquiry and training around the scholarship of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on pedagogy, and curriculum development.*

Since the last visit CIHS has focused faculty professional development on the process of assessment of student learning and the development of metrics and rubrics at the CLO and PLO level. The institution would benefit from the systematic evaluation of the pedagogical methods used by faculty in the classroom to plan and deliver instruction and to respond to opportunities for improvement with targeted institutional support for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning designed to support faculty classroom skills in person and in a distance learning environment.

CFR 4.5. *Formally include appropriate stakeholders such as board members, staff, faculty, students, and community members in the process of assessment of institutional effectiveness.*

Within the written Institutional Progress Report, the response to this recommendation included an overview of the public continuing education presentations and the initiation of the process of board self-evaluation. From the site visit, the team has assessed progress based on interviews and evidence provided elsewhere in the report.

Although the recently implemented program review process involving the IEC, the Faculty Senate, the Student Advisory Senate, and stakeholders offers input from multiple stakeholders, the institution has not yet completed a complete cycle of quality assurance review, with a pilot program in progress that has some initial data. (Additional details are provided under CFR 4.5 addressed in Section II.)

CFR 4.6. *Integrate the outcome of academic and non-academic program review into the institution's strategic planning.* [MB3]

Since the last visit, CIHS has made considerable progress on the development and implementation of the academic program review process. The institution should continue this work, with the accompanying development and implementation of more detailed quality assurance plans for non-academic units, and formally integrate the process into the institution's strategic planning process.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT

General Statement

Following SAV1, the WSCUC Commission granted Candidacy finding all four Standards at a Candidacy level. In SAV2, the WSCUC Commission deemed Standard One and Standard Three at the initial accreditation level. Based on team findings, the Commission identified CFRs within the Standards requiring further attention to achieve Initial Accreditation (IA), recognizing

that the Commission makes a holistic determination for an entire Standard. Not all CFRs need to

be at an IA level of sufficiency to find a Standard at a sufficient level for IA. If the institution is

found to be at an IA level, recommendations will be made. If the institution is continuing

Candidacy for another visit, Standards still at a Candidacy level will have CFRs identified in the

CAL needing further work. Standards found to be at an IA level will not have recommendations

but the team may make improvement suggestions that will only appear in the team report and not

the CAL.

The team found Standards 2 and 4 have been addressed at the level of Initial

Accreditation, though additional work remains as identified in the team's recommendations.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes & Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes the educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of the essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.

The Commission has previously found that CIHS has demonstrated evidence of

compliance with Standard 1 at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates

that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of

learning and by supporting the success of every student.

CFRs 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 *Develop a faculty-driven process for establishing appropriate standards for student performance and curriculum development and oversight to include establishment of appropriate summative assignments, creation of well-developed rubrics, and alignment of course- and program-level learning outcomes.*

In order to assess CIHS's compliance with this standard, the team looked for evidence of sustained, informed, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively CIHS accomplishes its institutional purposes and achieves its educational objectives. The team looked at evidence of compliance with the standard as well as evidence that the institutional learning outcomes and educational effectiveness practices guide institutional planning. The team also reviewed evidence of the institution's assessment activities and outcomes and discussed processes in place as well as those that are planned for the future.

Since the time of the last visit, CIHS established and implemented a faculty-driven assessment of student learning process. After first adding key positions to support educational effectiveness, CIHS's Faculty Senate worked with CIHS leadership, including the new Director of Outcomes Assessment, the Dean of Academic Affairs, and the program directors, to establish a short- and long-range, faculty-driven assessment process with a committee-supported structure. Through the work of the curriculum sub-committee, faculty developed and refined curricular maps to ensure alignment of course- and program-level learning outcomes. Particular attention was paid to the alignment of CLOs and PLOs across all curricula; this was evident in the syllabi and described by faculty. Further, faculty created assessment tools including analytic assessment rubrics for assessing the PLO and ILO achievement via summative assignments embedded

within the curriculum as well as assessment tools for assessing the quality of student theses and dissertations.

The institution has clearly defined what it means to be a graduate of CIHS in terms of institutional learning outcomes and what it means to be a graduate of various programs though clear articulation of the PLOs. The institution is encouraged to distinctly articulate the meaning of each specific degree level (master's versus doctoral). Additionally, the institution needs to ensure documentation of student learning in distance learning courses.

CFR 2.6: *Assess student learning at or near graduation in order to establish the extent to which graduates achieve the expected student learning outcomes at expected levels of proficiency.*

Since the time of the last visit, each CIHS program has created an educational program assessment plan that articulates a multi-year plan for assessing achievement of the program learning outcomes (PLOs), including the assignments and assessment method, and specific targets for student performance. CIHS focused the development of the assessment plans on summative data, clearly targeting assessment of dissertations and theses. Standards for student achievement were set by faculty and action plans were developed for those PLOs that indicated a need for improvement. It was unclear from the report whether faculty or an administrator completed the PLO assessments, but the CIHS team clarified the role of faculty in assessing student learning, individually and collectively.

In following these assessment plans, the institution conducted assessments of student learning near graduation to determine the extent to which graduates achieve expected student learning outcomes at expected levels of proficiency for all of its programs. Now that the institution has compiled baseline data for student achievement of the PLOs, it has learned that students have not achieved all PLOs at desired performance levels. Time is needed for the

institution to mature the assessment process, identify trends and gaps in learning, and make meaningful changes to positively impact student learning and close the assessment loop.

CFR 2.7. *Develop a comprehensive and systematic program review process that includes the assessment of student achievement of program learning outcomes, retention, and graduation rates, board pass rates and licensure, and an external review component.*

Since the time of the last seeking accreditation team visit, CIHS has completed program reviews for each of its programs. Each review has included the assessment of PLOs. CIHS's program review process for each program includes a self-study, assessment data trends to report on student success, an assessment of program resources, and an external review component. Information on licensure pass rates was mentioned as a metric but not reported in the Psychology program.

CIHS established a robust quality assurance process, which has taken root with the collaboration of faculty, staff, and board members. Some of the processes are still in development. The institution will need to implement its action plans, ensure alignment of its planning processes including connection of programmatic planning to budgeting processes, and work to close the assessment loop.

CFR 2.10: *Collect and analyze both aggregated and disaggregated data related to student achievement in order to determine the extent to which students are successful and programs are meeting student support needs.*

CIHS has utilized its Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) to drive institutional quality assurance and to review and coordinate the use of assessment data from various sources to implement improvements in student outcomes. The institution has created a policy for satisfactory academic progress as well as a tracking system for student academic performance.

CIHS is able to create individual reports and academic plans for students but has yet to make group comparisons (which has to be done manually).

The campus climate is assessed by the Student Advisory Senate (SAS) as well as via alumni surveys and course evaluations although the disaggregation of this information has proven difficult due to the way that this information is provided to the institution. CIHS has conducted a full migration of student records and data into a student information system (Populi). The institution will need to optimize functionality of the new system to assist them with data needs that are currently conducted manually and will need to implement plans to better assess functional areas and student services across the institution.

Summary for Standard 2

The visiting team finds that CIHS has developed an appropriately comprehensive process for the assessment of educational objectives and student learning and is currently in the early final of development and implementation. The team further notes that the institution has made significant progress in the development of its assessment infrastructure and has completed an initial assessment of many of the core functions of teaching and learning and the evaluation of student achievement since the last visit.

In response to recommendations in the last team report, CIHS has developed and implemented a formal academic program review process, engaged appropriate stakeholders through the Institutional Effectiveness Committee, the Faculty Council, and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, and collected and reviewed data on all Program Learning Outcomes as well as effectiveness indicators. Curriculum maps show the introduction, development, and mastery of PLOs across the curricula and identify summative assignments assessed using faculty developed rubrics.

The institution has created a multi-faceted plan for assessment of institutional effectiveness. It was apparent to the team that the faculty have taken ownership of the process of assessing student learning, and institutional administrators demonstrated commitment to providing support for the assessment process as well as for further developing the assessment infrastructure needed across the institution.

The institution is encouraged to continue to extend this development to the inclusion of formative assessments and include detailed assessment plans for non-academic units. It is anticipated that the institution's demonstrated commitment to implementing academic assessment plans and building out its assessment infrastructure will generate the cultivation of a culture of continuous quality improvement that extends to all areas of the institution, allowing CIHS to make data-informed decisions impacting teaching and learning.

The WSCUC team finds that CIHS meets Standard 2 at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the WSCUC Standards.

The team identified improvement suggestions for two CFRs as CIHS continues to develop:

CFR 2.2b. Clearly articulate admission requirements that are differentiated by degree level.

CFR 2.13. Further develop an assessment plan for non-academic units and include this in the institution's quality assurance process.

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

The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.

The Commission has previously found that CIHS has demonstrated evidence of compliance with Standard 3 at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation.

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

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

In reviewing CIHS's compliance with this standard, the team looked for a set of comprehensive processes that provide for the systematic collection and analysis of data indicating students' progressive mastery of learning outcomes across the programs' curricula and the effective performance of the organization on key indicators. The team reviewed evidence of the portions thereof that have been implemented to date as well as the plans for those that remain to be further developed and put into practice.

CFR 4.1. *Complete the implementation of the established process for academic and institutional quality assurance to include use of data to improve student outcomes. Establish a process for new program development.*

Since the last visit, CIHS has formalized and implemented the process for academic program review/quality assurance and demonstrated the use of data to create action plans to address issues uncovered during the review process. The process for new program development has been outlined and followed for the proposal of one new program. As yet the criteria for decision making around the implementation of a new program are not articulated.

CFR 4.2. *Complete the migration of manual records to Populi and develop reports that track satisfactory academic progress, student retention, time to completion, and graduation (both in aggregated and disaggregated formats by student demographics) and integrate them into the quality assurance process.*

Disaggregated student success data has been incorporated into the academic program review/quality assurance process. At this time, graphic reports that compare the outcomes of groups are yet to be developed.

CFR 4.3. *Collect and analyze data reflecting the systematic assessment of teaching and learning, and the campus environment, and integrate this into the quality assurance process.*

CIHS collected data on all PLOs in each program and has committed to a schedule of reviewing one or more PLOs each year to get the programs on a regular, staggered cycle of quality assurance. Data have begun to drive continuous improvement with the engagement of the academic community.

CFR 4.4. Further develop the support for faculty inquiry and training around the scholarship of teaching and learning, with an emphasis on assessment of student learning, pedagogy, and curriculum development.

CIHS has added the position of Dean of Integral Education to advance the scholarship of teaching and learning as well as to improve the effectiveness of the faculty's teaching practices. Faculty have been engaged in contributing papers to scholarly journals and begun to complete a needs assessment for faculty professional development. CIHS has increased stipends to support the scholarship of teaching and learning. In addition, the Dean has implemented a faculty resource course and produced training for faculty teaching online.

CFR 4.5. Ensure that the process of assessment of institutional effectiveness formally includes appropriate stakeholders such as board members, staff, faculty, students, and community members.

CIHS actively engaged all constituents in the assessment of institutional effectiveness with the development of the Institutional Effectiveness Committee and the Student Advisory Senate, and the increased responsibility expected of the Faculty Senate, with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board providing oversight.

CFR 4.6. Include multiple stakeholders in the development of strategic plans based on data and evidence.

Through IEC, Faculty Senate, and the Student Advisory Senate, stakeholders are engaged in the process of strategic planning. The President reports to the Board with a summary of institutional effectiveness activities as they relate to Strategic Planning in each QA cycle.

The WSCUC team finds that CIHS meets Standard 4 at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation, understanding that only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the WSCUC Standards.

The team identified improvement suggestions for two CFRs as CIHS continues to develop:

CFR 4.4. Expand programming for faculty professional development to include curriculum development, which also addresses alignment of syllabi with curriculum maps, learning outcomes, degree level, and faculty review.

CFR 4.6. Integrate academic program review more explicitly into the strategic planning process.

SECTION III. FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The WSCUC visiting team recognizes CIHS as a learning community built on shared values and the pursuit of integrating scientific principles and spirituality to improve health and wellness. The team found that the goals, values, and guiding principles of the institution are widely understood by the community, reflected in academic practices and co-curricular offerings, and key to decision-making by the board of trustees and administrators. Further, the team found faculty, staff, students, and board members to be engaged in the work of accreditation—reflecting a profound commitment to the institution and its mission and vision.

Finally, the team acknowledges the important work of CIHS's founder, Hiroshi Motoyama; the continued support of his son, Kazuhiro Motoyama; and the generous contributions of Tamamitsu Jinja in the evolution of the institution.

Commendations

The team wishes to commend the California Institute for Human Science in the following areas for:

1. Embracing the opportunity for self-reflection and continuous improvement through the process of seeking accreditation, resulting in the establishment of a broad set of supportive processes and a clear student outcome focus.

2. Meaningful engagement and active participation of the Faculty Senate and Student Advisory Senate in shared governance and quality assurance processes.

3. Demonstrating a commitment to and enthusiastic engagement with the process of accreditation, specifically by nurturing a culture of assessment supported by systems and processes to engage stakeholders in decision-making and the assessment of student learning.

Recommendations

The institution has made tremendous progress toward meeting all WSCUC Criteria for Reviews (CFRs), and particularly shown increased efforts in developing and assessing the critical areas of learning and student support. There remain challenges ahead with financial sustainability in a tuition-driven model, with required rapid response to develop and deploy high-quality educational content and deliver it in new educational delivery models, and in maintaining a focus on quality and sustainability as the institution navigates planned growth. The team encourages the institution to retain a focus on continuous quality improvement, and to use accreditation and ongoing assessment activities to continually stretch toward greater levels of institutional effectiveness and mission fulfillment.

The team recommends the California Institute for Human Science continue on their developmental trajectory and take these areas into consideration:

1. Further enhance the institution's scholarly graduate culture through promotion of and support for research. (CFR 2.2b)

2. Complete the academic program review cycle and document how feedback from external reviews is addressed. (CFR 4.5)

3. Ensure that results of quality assurance processes (e.g., program reviews) align with and advise the budget and strategic plan processes at the institution level. (CFR 4.6)

4. Develop and implement a plan for quality assurance in non-academic programs. (CFR 2.13)

5. Continue to address environmental challenges by institutional innovation with a focus on high-quality instruction in a fiscally responsible manner (CFR 3.4 and 4.7).