

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Saybrook University

Date of Visit
March 13-16, 2018

Team Roster

Katrina Rogers, Team Chair, President, Fielding Graduate University
Maryann Jones, Team Assistant Chair, Dean Emerita Western State College of Law
Katherine Davis, Director, Program Review & Assessment, School of Allied Health Professions,
Loma Linda University
David Ely, Associate Dean, Fowler College of Business Administration, San Diego State
University
Patricia Easton, Executive Vice President and Provost, Claremont Graduate University
Barbara Gross Davis, Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History	3
B. Description of Team’s Review Process.....	4
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence.....	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS.....	6
A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions	6
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators	8
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degrees.....	20
D. Component 4: Educational Quality, Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation	23
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation	26
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence.....	31
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment.....	34
H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement	41
SECTION III –COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	43
APPENDICES	45
A. FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS	45
1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review	45
2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review	48
3 – Student Complaints Review.....	50
4 – Transfer Credit Review.....	52
B. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION REVIEW	53

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Saybrook University, now an affiliate of The Community Solution Education System (hereinafter referred to as TCS), is a not-for-profit institution providing graduate education in psychology, clinical psychology, counseling, organizational leadership and management, transformative social change, mind-body medicine, coaching and integrative health and nutrition. Founded in 1970, the institution has a humanistic vision with a focus on the potential of its graduates to live full and meaningful lives as individuals and creative community members. Its mission is to provide a graduate education that inspires transformational change in individuals, organizations, and communities toward a just, humane, and sustainable world. All degrees, with the exception of one at the Bellevue campus, are offered on-line, with at least one annual residential conference. One degree is all virtual with no residential requirement.

Saybrook University is organized into two colleges, the College of Social Sciences and the College of Integrative Medicine and Health Sciences and currently has 682 students. In 2014, its headquarters were relocated from San Francisco to Oakland, California. There is also a campus in Bellevue, Washington. The institution provides a hybrid form of education, to include distance education and residential gatherings. The institution offers the following 13 degrees: MA Counseling, MA Integrative Wellness Coaching, MA Management, MA Psychology, MA Transformative Social Change, MS Integrative and Functional Nutrition, MS Mind-Body Medicine, PhD Applied Psychophysiology, PhD Clinical Psychology, PhD Managing Organizational Systems, PhD Mind-Body Medicine, PhD Psychology, and PhD Transformative

Social Change. An MS Psychophysiology will be offered commencing fall 2018. The institution also has a variety of non-degree certificate programs.

Since receiving WSCUC accreditation in 1984, the institution has been required to submit regular interim reports and has been subject to a number of special visits. The institution was last reaffirmed for seven years in 2008. In 2014, WSCUC approved the affiliation of Saybrook University with TCS, and moved the next reaccreditation visit to 2018. The recurring concerns for WSCUC have been financial sustainability, strategic planning, enrollment management, leadership stability, and the existence of academic silos that have impaired the creation of a collaborative, cohesive university.

The team identified seven lines of inquiry identified during the off-site review: financial sustainability and enrollment management; assessment and program review; creating a collaborative, cohesive university; the affiliation with TCS; faculty workload and morale; strategic planning; and retention and graduation rates. These lines of inquiry guided the team's conduct of the site visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team reviewed past Commission letters, the institutional report, and all appendices. Additionally, the institution was responsive to the team's request that certain additional information and documents be provided prior to the site visit as well as in the team room. The team visited the institution from March 13 – 16, 2018. During the course of the site visit the team met with the leadership of Saybrook University and TCS, the Saybrook Board of Trustees, college deans, core and adjunct faculty, the WSCUC Steering Committee, faculty senate,

students, staff, and the teams in charge of student enrollment, finance, academic support, student retention, assessment and program review, financial aid, IT, institutional research and institutional research board, human resources, finance, and advancement. The team held a conference call with the auditor. Additionally, one member of the team conducted a site visit to the Bellevue campus.

The team reviewed the confidential email account, which contained several messages from faculty and students. Those messages helped inform the questions that were posed to students, staff, faculty, and administrators in meetings during the visit.

As the institution did not address the optional additional theme section, this report does not contain an examination of component 8. The Credit Hour and Program Length Review, Marketing and Recruitment Review, Student Complaints Review, Transfer Credit Review, and Off-Campus Location Review forms are appended at the end of this report. Additionally, as 12 of Saybrook's 13 degree programs are classified as on-line, the team did not complete the Distance Education Review form.

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

The institution's report was well-written and accurately portrayed the institution's strengths and weaknesses and dealt openly and honestly with previous Commission concerns. Appendices were well-organized and easily accessible. The evidence provided supported claims in the report. There was broad-based input in the drafting of the institutional report, to include faculty involvement. The institution used the reaccreditation process to engage in reflection and self-inquiry. The institution provided additional information and documents that the team

requested both before and during the site visit. Meetings held during the site visit generally yielded candid and thoughtful responses and the team found significant institutional engagement with the process at all levels.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The institution, initially accredited in 1984, was reaffirmed by the Commission for seven years in 2008. Because of the Structural Change in 2014 (Saybrook's affiliation with TCS), the Offsite Review was rescheduled to fall 2017 and the Accreditation Visit was rescheduled to spring 2018. The institution has had numerous interactions with WSCUC since initial accreditation, to include special visits and interim reports. There was a Special Visit in 2014 and an interim report in 2016. The recurring issues have been financial sustainability, strategic planning, enrollment management, leadership stability and the creation of a cohesive university.

While several of the initiatives are still very much a work in progress, the institution has made significant progress since the 2014 Special Visit. The institution had an operating surplus for FY 2017 and is making progress towards financial stability following years of operating deficits. There is a budgeted operating surplus of approximately \$.7 million for FY2018.

Leadership has stabilized with hiring in key academic and administrative positions, to include the hiring of a new president in 2014. Steps to streamline processes and standardize procedures have been taken to reduce silos and create a more cohesive university, to include standardized faculty hiring practices and salaries and fewer tuition models across the institution. Institutional and program learning outcomes are in place. There is a schedule for program review, and three

programs have completed the cycle. The affiliation with TCS has resulted in many operational efficiencies and improvements.

Enrollments have stabilized and steadily increased and there is now in place a Strategic Enrollment Management Plan. There were improved enrollments in spring 2018. The admissions department has added staff. With the assistance of TCS, the marketing and enrollment functions have markedly improved. In terms of strategic planning, the majority of the strategic initiatives in the current strategic plan, Vision 2020, have been accomplished and plans are in place to begin preparing a new strategic plan this summer. The new plan will span three years and will include a vision for two additional years.

However, as fully explored in the sections that follow, the team found that assessment, program review, and routinized collection, dissemination, and usage of data are still at the emerging level. There is not yet a culture of faculty-led assessment. Many programs have yet to complete a program review and there is lack of consistency across the institution. Furthermore, the many differences in the policies, practices, and processes of the two colleges indicate that more needs to be done in terms of eliminating silos and creating a cohesive university. The team found the enrollment goal, to have 1,000 students by 2021, to be ambitious. The institution has not yet achieved three years of operating without a deficit and is in the nascent stages of developing plans to diversify revenue in order to be less reliant on tuition.

Finally, the many changes have impacted students, faculty, and staff, with the institution acknowledging that faculty morale and workload need to be addressed. Reductions in faculty and staff, increased faculty workload, larger class sizes, and the necessity of offering summer

classes, while necessary to achieve fiscal stability, have affected faculty, and to a lesser extent, student morale.

B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institution Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes

The institution has a clearly defined mission and institutional values that drive decision-making. There is broad-based support for the mission, as was evidenced during the visit in meetings with all constituencies, to include the Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, and students. The institution is committed to helping students achieve their full potential and is deeply rooted in the humanistic tradition of the social sciences. (CFR 1.1)

Saybrook publishes educational objectives at both the course and program levels. A review of a variety of syllabi revealed the existence of course learning outcomes, but the quality varied significantly. Comments from students during the open meeting revealed that the degree of familiarity with both the course and program learning requirements also varied significantly by program. The institution publishes retention rates and completion/average time to completion rates on its website and now has the capacity to track graduation rates. In its Review under the Standards, the institution acknowledges that educational objectives could be better communicated, that it could improve the availability of student achievement data, and that data needs to be well-documented and incorporated in the planning processes. (CFR 1.2)

Integrity and Transparency

The institution has published academic freedom policies. The academic freedom statement appears in Section 21 of the Faculty Handbook. It guarantees the right to academic freedom in research, publication, and in the classroom, to include on-line courses as well as speech engaged in as a private citizen. (CF R 1.3)

In terms of the diversity of the student body, African Americans represent 12 %, Hispanics represent 10 %, and Asians represent 4%. The Faculty Handbook contains a statement of Commitment to Diversity and Equal Opportunity and the faculty has a committee dedicated to diversity and inclusion. However, of the core faculty, only 10% are African American and there are no Hispanic or Asian faculty members. As for the adjunct faculty, 5% are African American, 18% are Asian, and 3% are Hispanic. Among the staff, 8% are African American, 16% are Hispanic, and 12% are Asian. (CFR 1.4)

While part of the TCS system, Saybrook University has its own Board of Trustees separate and distinct from that of TCS. The majority of the Saybrook trustees are independent and have no affiliation with TCS. The team meeting with the Saybrook Board revealed a highly engaged and energetic board with a strong commitment to the institution and its students. (CFR 1.5)

Saybrook has published policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, the definition of the different types of academic credit, as well as grading. These policies can be found on the website, the catalog, and the handbooks. The institution has no history of violations in this regard. (CFR 1.6)

The institution has had two years of clean audits. Policies governing faculty, staff, and students are in place and generally widely disseminated. There are handbooks for faculty, staff, and students. (CFR 1.7) The institution has been open and honest in its many interactions with WSUCU. The institution used the accreditation process to candidly assess strengths and weaknesses and was forthcoming with all requests from the team for information. (CFR 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning

Saybrook's graduate program learning outcomes align with the university's mission to "provide a rigorous graduate education that inspires transformational change in individuals, organizations and communities toward a just, humane and sustainable world." (CFR 2.3, 2.4) Measurable student learning outcomes have been established for a limited number of programs and expectations for achieving those outcomes are established and communicated to students in a variety of ways. (CFR 2.1, 2.2b, 2.4) An assessment schedule has been established and the institution is in the initial stages of using direct assessment measures to ensure successful completion of program learning outcomes. (CFR 2.4, 2.7) The team noted that the expectations for some programs lack the rigor appropriate to the degree. (CFR 2.1) The institution provides an adequate number of internships that afford students the opportunity to practice and apply theory. (CFR 2.5) While an assessment infrastructure is emerging, the institution has not yet embarked on a thorough analysis of student learning. (CFR 2.6)

Teaching and Learning Environment

The educational experience at Saybrook is enhanced through academic advisement and the creation of the peer- mentoring program where newly enrolled students are offered encouragement and navigation assistance through their programs. Disability accommodations are currently available for approximately 10% of the student population. The institution identifies at-risk students during the admissions process and provides assistance and mentoring support from peers, faculty and staff. (CFR 2.11, CFR 2.13) Residential conferences provide opportunities for students to connect face to face with their peers and faculty. These conferences afford students the ability to obtain specific information regarding student support services, student learning outcomes, and program expectations. Faculty surveys indicated an increasing number of students were challenged by the writing expectations in graduate programs. In an effort to address these concerns, the institution recently established a writing center to assist students with scholarship writing across the curriculum. (CFR 2.1)

Organizational Learning

Key performance indicators are established in some programs and co-curricular areas. Dissemination of the results is emerging; however, data are only available since 2014, rendering it premature to reference comparative data. Currently, the institution has an emerging program review process, but it lacks consistency and formalization. (CFR 2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity

The institution's commitment to scholarship and creative activity is evident in the recently restructured sequence of research courses and the creation of a research department, which is responsible for developing the research sequence for both colleges (CFR 2.8, 2.9) In

December 2016, the institution evaluated the number and types of research conducted by both faculty and students. As a result of this review, several changes are proposed, including simplifying the application process by creating a “smart” application and inviting department chairs to attend IRB meetings. Global research opportunities are available through the affiliation with TCS. The new IRB director’s vision is to expand the role of the office beyond the approval process and toward an educational function through webinar offerings regarding the ethical principles of research. Time and support for scholarship were brought up by the faculty.

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

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

Faculty and Staff

To appraise Saybrook’s policies, practices, and planning pertaining to faculty and staff, the team reviewed employment patterns, the institution’s organizational chart, and CVs of faculty. The team also discussed a range of issues relative to Standard 3 in meetings with administrators, faculty, and staff.

At the time of the writing of its institutional report, Saybrook employed 21 administrators, 10 staff members, 26 core full-time faculty, and 10 core part-time faculty. In fall 2017, FTE was 30.9 and 7.2 for core faculty and adjunct faculty, respectively. The CVs made available for the team to review show academic and professional activities for 29 faculty, 26 of whom hold doctorates. Since almost all of the institution’s programs are online, faculty reside nationwide with the greatest concentration of core full-time faculty in California and Washington. Adjunct faculty are more disbursed across the country. For fall 2017, the faculty-

to-student ratio was 1:12.9 for the College of Integrated Medicine and Health Sciences and 1:9.3 for the College of Social Sciences. The average class size was 6.3 and 5.8 in fall 2017 and spring 2018, respectively. The average size for general classes was 8.7 and 7.5 in fall 2017 and spring 2018, respectively. The institution recently increased class sizes from an average of three students. (CFR3.1)

As noted elsewhere in this report, Saybrook's affiliation with TCS has boosted the level and quality of academic and student services. The institution has recently filled two positions: director for the newly created Center for Writing and Dissertation Excellence and director of research and IRB. A search for an On-line Learning Specialist is expected to be completed in spring 2018. (CFR 3.1)

Policies regarding faculty and staff are documented. The Saybrook Faculty Handbook covers policies on governance, academic freedom, professional conduct, ethical conduct, outside involvement and conflicts of interest, recruitment (including a Commitment to Diversity and Equal Employment Opportunity statement), evaluation, professional development, workload and teaching assignments, and grievances. The handbook has been updated since the affiliation with TCS. The previous document, dated 2001, was revised by the faculty in 2015 and approved by the Board of Trustees in 2016. Detailed faculty workload policies are provided in a separate document, which notes that scholarship and clinical work are now a functional part of faculty workloads. The institution has policy documents pertaining to performance evaluation and asks students to evaluate their instructors. (CFR 3.2, 3.3, 3.10)

The institution has recently taken steps to engage adjunct faculty in university activities. For example, one position was created for an adjunct representative on the faculty senate and

plans are in place to include adjuncts on the IRB Committee and in faculty meetings. The current Faculty Handbook includes sections on professional development and articulate the expectation that faculty will participate in professional associations and engage in research. Salaried faculty are allocated \$3,000 per year for professional development and can apply for additional funding, contingent upon the financial health of the institution. (CFR 3.2, 3.3)

Based on the results of a recent faculty senate survey and the team's conversation with faculty, significant segments of the faculty believe that the workload policy document is unclear, are dissatisfied with current workload expectations, and think that workload practices provide insufficient time for faculty research. The recent increase in average class size is one source of this dissatisfaction. Fifty percent of the respondents to the senate survey indicated that they disagree, or strongly disagree, with the statement: "I am satisfied with Saybrook's support of faculty research." The team recommends engaging in conversations about the proper level of faculty research activities to support quality instruction and professional development subject to institutional budget constraints. (CFR 3.2, 3.3, 3.10)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

Fiscal stability and enrollment management are addressed in detail under Component 7. (CFR 3.4) Information systems services are provided by TCS to Saybrook, including: internet services; Microsoft 365 online services including email, cloud storage, and online applications; the course learning system (Canvas); the student management system (CampusVue); and a web-based human resources application (Workday). These TCS-based platforms support the following reports and services: program review data reports, student experience surveys and reports, new student surveys and reports, alumni surveys and reports, ad hoc custom surveys and

reports, ad hoc data requests, accreditation support, administration of course evaluation surveys, production of the official student census, IPEDS, gainful employment, and other mandated reporting. (CFR 3.4, 3.5)

The implementations of these systems were completed within 12-18 months of the affiliation. Based on discussions with administrators and staff during the visit, the systems are functioning well, and the level of support is excellent. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

Saybrook's organizational chart shows clear lines of responsibilities and reporting. The Board of Trustees (BOT) retains the final authority in all matters pertaining to Saybrook University. Its specific responsibilities include oversight for all administrative and educational policy changes, selecting and reviewing the president who serves as the chief executive and administrative officer, approving the president's faculty appointments, approving the annual budget, and formulating short-term and long-range plans for the university. Saybrook's BOT consists of eleven members with professional credentials. Eight of the members are independent and three have an association with TCS. The BOT operates with governance, audit, and finance committees, each with a majority of independent trustees. The BOT is engaged, knowledgeable about the institution and trends in higher education, and supportive of Saybrook's mission. The institution has a full-time CEO/president and a full-time director for business development and operations who serves as the CFO. The responsibilities and reporting lines for the vice president for academic and student affairs, deans of the colleges, and program directors are stated in the Faculty Handbook. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9)

Through an active faculty senate, faculty participate in shared governance. Faculty have primary responsibility for curriculum, degree requirements, grading, methods of instruction, admissions, and other academic policies and practices. One faculty member and one student also attend BOT meetings. Based on the recent survey, the senate concluded that faculty are interested in participating in governance but receive insufficient institutional support for their efforts. The faculty senate has recommended that shared governance be more clearly defined, that governance activities be included in the workload formula, and that participation by both salaried and adjunct faculty be appropriately compensated. During the visit, some faculty members expressed the view that leadership should do more to solicit faculty input, that rationales for decisions should be better communicated, and that there should be greater clarity on who makes what decisions. The institutional report also acknowledges that areas for improvement include communication, workload, and morale. (CFR 3.7, 3.10) The team recommends that the institution address faculty morale through the adoption of a faculty workload and evaluation plan, and clarify decision-making roles in a shared governance model. (3.2, 3.3, 3.7, 3.10)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that Saybrook has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 3.

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

Quality Assurance Processes

With the TCS affiliation and appointment of a new president and provost in 2014, Saybrook has made commendable progress in its engagement in quality assurance processes for institutional learning and improvement. The review team found that Saybrook completed its review under WSCUC standards in a self-reflective, critical, constructive, and analytical manner. Saybrook is mission-driven and steadfast in its commitment to its tradition of holistic humanistic education and is showing a sense of urgency about the changing higher educational environment and for its need to re-make itself while staying true to its mission. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) centralized at TCS, produces a comprehensive set of data and a range of reports to Saybrook faculty and staff. However, institutional research norms and practices are not yet internalized. The team concurs with areas identified for growth in the institutional report which include “publication of student data, clarity in faculty workload, faculty morale, the institutionalization of ongoing and consistent assessment and program review, use of data to inform future strategic planning, and co-curricular activities and student services including writing support.” Despite recent improvements in its institutional research capacity, further attention to the gathering, use and dissemination of data is needed. There is not a consistent approach to assessment processes as is evident in the differing summary reports provided by the programs completing program review. For example, two of the three programs completing the review process provide Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) assessment data for each course in the programs but lack a cohesive and comprehensive evaluation of the assessment

data and educational effectiveness. A formal multi-year assessment plan for PLO assessment exists but it remains unclear how successful the institution has integrated program review into planning and budgeting.

Institutional Learning and Improvement

Saybrook has recently adopted a clear institutional commitment to assessment, mobilizing a relatively new administrative organization and staff, and employing new procedures and policies. Although in early stages, Saybrook shows a commitment to improvement based on data and evidence and the systematic assessment of teaching, learning, campus environment, and the utilization of results.

Saybrook conducted a survey using WSCUC Review Under the Standards, which is informative in identifying areas for actionable improvement. Survey results, and Saybrook's response thereto, show awareness of the need to improve through input and engagement of appropriate stakeholders in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness—especially students, faculty, and alumni. Low results from faculty on transparency and governance questions have led to increased transparency on financial progress and inclusion of deans in the budget process. It has also led to the identification of the need to break down “silos” across campus and for broadened inclusion of academic leadership to include students, staff, and faculty in meetings. One regular adjunct faculty member has been added to the faculty senate. However, based on the faculty senate's recommendations, workload, commitment to humanistic foundations, research, shared governance, and compensation are ongoing concerns among faculty.

Progress has been made since 2015 with the implementation of Vision 2020, and the support from TCS has led to rapid, although very recent, improvement in quality assurance

processes. Given the degree of change the organization has undergone since 2008, and the significant financial challenges and uncertainty of future enrollments, it is clear that Saybrook 2020 provides an important framework for working towards long-term sustainability. The team commends the recognition of the Board of Trustees, the president, and the president's cabinet that a new strategic planning process is needed and that plans have been laid to begin the process in April 2018. (CFRs 4.3-4.7)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that Saybrook has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

The IEEI identifies all degree programs, learning outcomes, assessments, and program reviews. The IEEI and institutional report show evidence of an organization with an emergent but active commitment to quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement. Twenty percent of the degree programs have clear Student Learning Outcomes and clear assessment methods of collecting data. The other 80% of the degree programs have improved their student learning outcomes as can be seen in the sample syllabi and are scheduled for review over the next two years to address the assessment methods, collection of data and connection of the course, program, and institutional outcomes. The recently established revised schedule of program review is as follows: three of the fifteen programs (20%) completed a program review during the 2016-2017 academic year and two programs are currently in the review process (2017-18). The recently established revised schedule of program review is as follows: three of the fifteen programs (20%) completed a program review during the 2016-2017 academic year and two programs are currently in the review process (2017-18). In addition, four programs are

scheduled to complete program reviews in 2018-2019, six in 2019-20, two in 2020-21, and three in 2021-22.

Overall Summary of Component 2

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that Saybrook has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standards and federal requirements. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission. The team identified areas where further attention and development is needed, as noted in the recommendations section of this report.

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

Meaning of the degrees

At a general level, Saybrook articulates its philosophy and has deep roots in a tradition of holistic and humanistic psychology. Its instructional values and curricula embody that philosophy. For example, its course template includes a statement of the Saybrook mission, and while on the site visit, faculty, students, and staff consistently expressed a clear sense of institutional values, the meaning of Saybrook degrees, and the goal of translating those meanings into coursework, internships, volunteer work, practicum sites, and employment. (CFR 1.1) Graduate (MS and PhD) degree requirements, credit hour policy, are clearly defined and accessible. (CFR 2.2) However, Saybrook is emergent and variable in its expression of the meaning of its degrees in terms of the outcomes for students and the institutional mechanisms that support those outcomes. (CFR 2.3-2.4, 2.6) The formation of the university-wide Degree Review Committee in early 2016 has led to the revision of learning outcomes in some courses and programs, and for the institution. For example, a recent move towards behaviorally defined

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) is a positive step, although a review of the sample syllabi shows that it has not been consistently or successfully applied across the university. The team suggests that the institution continue to improve both the quality and rigor of its course syllabi. Revision of PLOs is also underway, although not systematically, and the use of external reviewers has proven to be a valuable means of advancing PLO assessment. Counselling and clinical psychology programs seeking specialty or holding accreditation from CACREP and APA are developed in their learning outcomes and the program review process in these programs and should be used as models for all other programs. (CFR 2.3-2.4) The PhD Clinical Psychology degree program is not seeking APA accreditation. There is now a process in place for program review and all programs will have undergone review by 2022. (CFR 2.7)

Quality and integrity of degrees

The institution has made strides in this area, creating necessary structure and process around continual improvement. The Degree Review Committee (DRC) has been instrumental in improvements to the quality of individual courses, as well as strengthening the selection and sequencing of program content. The DRC has evaluated learning outcomes at the weekly/module, course, degree program and institutional level; they invited external reviewers to assess revised PLOs; and they have asked these reviewers to remain on an advisory committee for future reviews of learning outcomes. (CFR 2.3-2.4) A faculty workshop held in January 2017 on Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees (MQID), marked a significant improvement in the way that the Saybrook community works together as a collaborative, cohesive university.

With the enhanced support of TCS, Saybrook has improved its Learning Management Platform by moving to Canvas, which has increased functionality and a user-friendly interface.

Although faculty are not yet fully comfortable with the platform, the recent hiring of an Online Learning Specialist, will support faculty in the transition and enable better course design. (CFR 4.7) TCS also provides a team of experts to support institutional research and assessment, and have assisted faculty and staff with gathering and analyzing critical data for making improvements.

The team noted that the leadership at all levels, including staff, faculty, administration, and the board, is committed to improvement and were clear about the critical role of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Policies and practices for the gathering and use of information is emerging at a rapid pace. (CFR 4.3) The team suggests that Saybrook develop a plan to assess the changes underway with respect to the meaning and quality of the Saybrook degree. As Saybrook grows and offers new programs, there may be the need to expand their understanding of how to apply that philosophy while remaining sustainable. The institution has yet to answer questions about the relevance or adaptation of the traditional humanistic mission in relation to sustainability, which is a challenging set of questions around vision, mission, goals, and objectives. For example, there are important questions concerning what the shift to larger class sizes and from written assignments and comments to “interactive dialogue” mean for assessment. Questions also arose around what this means for how it may change the student learning experience, and how rigor and quality is maintained. These are critical questions to keep in view for reflection, data collection, and interpretation to continually honor the institution’s mission while sustaining and maintaining its meaning and quality.

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

Saybrook strives to ensure educational quality and excellence in all aspects of student learning. The institution predominantly relies on indirect measures for the assessment of the current co-curricular activities. Several new co-curricular programs are in the initial stage of development and a systematic plan for assessment of these programs is currently under discussion with TCS. Through the self-reflection process, the university acknowledged there was a need to strengthen program learning outcomes, improve program evaluation, and embark on a campus-wide culture of assessment. “Faculty from both colleges were provided training opportunities with community experts, consultants, and the WSCUC liaison and trainers” (*institutional report, p. 44*). As a result of these dialogues, the site team noted that assessment processes are in the emerging stages and are beginning the integration process within the two colleges. Institutional learning outcomes are not specifically mentioned on Saybrook’s website or in the institution’s report. Student learning outcomes are assessed through the degree programs as part of the program review process. The MA in Counseling program reports that greater than 80% of the students are exceeding or meeting expectations for the program learning outcomes. In addition, an assessment sub-committee established a schedule for syllabi and course review. A formal multi-year assessment schedule is published. The plan includes PLO assessment and allows for programmatic differences while maintaining focus on the institution’s mission. (CFR 2.4, 2.7) The three programs completing the program review process collected program learning outcomes assessment data in several individual courses. Currently, the OIR does not provide comprehensive assessment data reports to faculty. Therefore, the percentage of

students meeting the program learning outcomes is currently unknown for the MS in Mind and Body Medicine and PhD Psychology programs. Program summary reports address findings from syllabi and course reviews with no mention of PLO assessment results beyond the MA in Counseling program data. Annual assessment data summarizing the overall quality of student learning and student achievement of program learning outcomes are not evident in the program summary reports, making it difficult to determine whether data driven decisions are used to effectuate change to pedagogy and program improvement. Currently, it is unclear how assessment data significantly impact overall changes made at the programmatic or institutional level. The affiliation with TCS offers Saybrook assistance, through their OIR, by providing programs with student survey results and statistical student data central to the assessment and program review processes. (CFR4.2)

The faculty-driven process for revising PLOs outlined by the programs completing the program review process demonstrate a robust, rigorous, and collaborative effort with emphasis on aligning PLOs with programmatic professional standards and the institution's mission. Committees across both colleges collaborate and evaluate curricular alignment of program and course learning outcomes, develop rubrics to assess student learning, establish a protocol to develop and revise syllabi in a limited number of programs. External reviewers at institutions with similar subject matter programs vetted the revised PLOs. The team observed the final versions of the learning outcomes clearly require higher cognitive level thinking and are appropriate for the graduate level. (CFR 2.2b) In addition, the outcomes adequately describe how students will demonstrate their learning in a curriculum that provides opportunities for students to develop increasing proficiency with respect to each outcome. (CFR 2.1) The team

noted the grading and assessment rubrics are limited to a few programs and clearly illustrate the level of competency students are expected to achieve. (CFR 2.3)

It appears that faculty, clinical faculty, and on-site preceptors have clear instruction when assessing student assignments. (CFR 2.4) Experiential learning appears adequate for the number of students with assignments assessed using the program learning outcome elements. (CFR 2.13) A limited number of these data have been compiled by TCS. The standards of performance at graduation are communicated to students on the institution's website and sporadically at the residential conferences. Faculty surveys appear to indicate they are satisfied with current student performance and recognized the need for a writing center to improve the students' scholarly writing. The curriculum is aligned with the institution's mission of "providing a rigorous graduate education that inspires transformational change in individuals, organizations and communities toward a just, humane and sustainable world." Each academic degree is clearly defined and reflects the humanistic values upon which the institution was founded. (CFR 2.2)

Curriculum mapping for three programs illustrate alignment with the PLOs and to further ensure PLOs are achievable, "subject matter experts work closely with the instructional design team to ensure course content and course learning outcomes align with the PLOs" (*Institutional Report, p. 46*). Program learning outcomes are assessable and faculty are in the emerging stages using both direct and indirect measures of assessment to determine the level of outcome achievement. While this approach incorporates assessment best practices, it appears that the institution heavily relies on indirect assessment measures to make curricular and pedagogical changes. The team recommends the institution diversify data collection to include more direct assessment measures across the university. Faculty assessments of student work included in the

institutional report were limited to the required courses in the Mind Body Medicine program. These reports indicate the institution's efforts are in progress to assess student achievement of expected outcomes. (CFR 2.6). While these efforts are commendable, there was little evidence indicating students receive feedback from the assessments. (CFR 2.5) In addition, where students did not meet the outcome it is unclear whether faculty use these data to impact program improvement. (CFR 4.3) The institutional report states the degree program committee is charged with "calculating an average rating of PLO achievement across students. This evaluation process will be utilized to make decisions regarding curricular or pedagogical adjustments." (*Institutional Report, p. 47*). The data were not available to the team for evaluation.

A recent development in the institution with the guidance of the IRB director is the creation of a department of research. The team noted the vision and plan for this department is heavily focused on improving the academic support and the quality of student research. Competency based assessment practices are incorporated into the newly developed sequence of courses.

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

Definition of Student Success

Student success is evidenced as a clear priority in the strategic plan, with graduation and retention rates included as part of their Key Strategic Indicators (KSIs). (CFR 2.1) The institution has chosen to embed student success within its strategic enrollment management plan. As stated in the institutional report, "this enrollment management plan signaled a strategic shift from a focus on only new student recruitment to an emphasis on both recruitment and retention (p. 50)." Although a specific definition of student success is not evident, many actions taken

towards improving student learning, retention, and persistence indicate a growing awareness of and attention being paid to this area. For example, at the program level, faculty members in at least one program discuss individual student progress on a regular basis. The admissions staff also identifies new students who may need additional support. The registrar's office now has the capability to conduct degree audits, which improves student awareness of their own progress as well as ensures more efficient tracking by that unit. Overall, the team found that while certain measures are in place, they are not systemically embedded across the institution nor widely used among various academic units.

Student Learning

During a time of significant institutional change, which included changes in senior leadership and affiliation with TCS, Saybrook approached improvements in student learning by focusing on structural and strategic changes. Structurally, the institution hired a vice president for enrollment management and re-focused the director for student affairs into a student success position. Saybrook also created several governance bodies to track student achievement and timely progress, important efforts aligned to track student achievement and for providing robust student support services. (CFR2.10, 2.13) Strategically, the institution established action steps for providing more support directly, such as with the peer mentoring program (*Institutional Report*, p. 54).

The institution also recognizes that consistent curricular design and explicit program learning outcomes are critical for student learning. In these areas, there is wide variation in syllabi across the institution with some evidence of program learning outcomes. Institutional learning outcomes are not widely disseminated nor prominently displayed. (CFR 1.2)

Retention Rates

Saybrook created the Student Retention Task Force in 2015-2016 (since re-named committee) to address student success and ongoing issues with retention. The Student Retention Committee is led by the dean of students and includes department chairs, students, and administrative support from the registrar's office. This action demonstrates the commitment that institutional leaders have towards retention and persistence. The committee has three sub-committees: academic writing, advising and mentoring, and student engagement, which includes work with student groups.

The Task Force identified the following priorities (from Attachment V.A) consonant with CFR 2.10:

Priority one. Significantly increase YoY enrollment growth leading to 950+ by 2020

Priority two. Attract strong and prepared students who will persist

Priority three. Show steady and significant enrollment growth in new programs

Priority four. Develop and execute comprehensive and robust outreach plan (particular focus on Bay Area and Seattle)

Priority five. Leverage new and existing partnerships to increase brand awareness and enrollment

Priority six. Retention, progression and graduation. Implement institution wide retention initiative, focused on increasing meaningful engagement, high quality learning experiences and timely interventions. This priority includes steady improvement of retention and graduation rates.

Priority seven. Institutionalize Student Success

Overall, the institution has made progress in improving enrollment (noted elsewhere in this report). A structure and strategies for attracting students that can persist is still in its infancy. Marketing metrics are in development to help make progress on the priorities identified for the Student Retention Committee.

Year over year, retention has not notably changed according to the data cited in the institutional report over the long term, although Saybrook recovered from a dip in 2012-2013. This dip may be related to the Special Visit, and the passing of three key faculty members. For the masters' programs, fall 2014-2015 retention was 75.5%; in 2015-2016 retention was 77.6%. In the doctoral programs, retention was 81.8% and 82.3% respectively. As Saybrook continues to work on retention issues, it will be important to focus on priority seven, institutionalizing student success. Given the increased attention paid to student success, tracking results over time and using comparative data is a critical component of the quality-assurance processes. (CFR 4.1)

The institution does have a data set of retention rates, which will now be used to set benchmarks at the program level. This is still a work in progress but is an area of work that is led by the Student Retention Committee.

In the institutional report, the vice president for enrollment management was noted as calling out financial hardship as a major factor in student withdrawals (p. 52). During the site visit, financial hardship was also noted by other program and school leaders at the institution. First term is when students are most likely to drop out, which is typical of the industry. The peer mentoring program for first year retention was developed for the clinical psychology program. Programs have various models depending on numbers of students and are often organized as virtual communities with a loose cohort structure. There is also a high risk of drop-out at the

dissertation level. The schools are evaluating the development of a research program that helps to address withdrawals at the dissertation level. Tuition at Saybrook ranges from \$1,000-\$1,470 per credit for 32-35 (master's programs) and 105-108 credits (doctoral programs), with an estimated total price ranging from \$35,000 to \$158,760 (not including residencies, student fees, and other ancillary costs). Given the competition, this seems to be a fundamental business question that has not been adequately addressed.

Graduation Rates

Saybrook's average time to completion is 2.2 to 2.3 years for master's programs and 5.1 and 7.7 years for doctoral programs. As the time to completion was not reported with a comparative time frame nor interpreted, it is difficult to know what to make of these data in terms of Saybrook's current strategies for retention. (CRF 4.1) This reporting may reflect the lack of available data for previous years; a lack that has been since addressed by new leadership and data system in place. According to members of the Student Retention Committee, a data set for graduation rates is underway.

Saybrook has made progress in creating a new structure to support student success, student learning, and to improve retention, namely the creation of robust academic and student support services, and the development of the Student Retention Committee. In addition, a high level position for a dean of student affairs was created and hired in February 2018. While a work in progress, the structure is very much in place. Progress has also been made in the development of strategy to improve student success, all of which is commendable.

Additional work is underway or about to be undertaken in formulating a robust data set for graduation rates, evaluation as it relates for first year retention strategies such as the peer

mentoring program and virtual communities, and intervention strategies when students reach the dissertation level.

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence

The university's Assessment Committee recently initiated a four-year program review schedule and process. The deans from the College of Integrative Medicine and Health Sciences and from the College of Social Sciences collaborated with the faculty to establish the essential components of the program review process. Three of the fifteen programs (20%) completed a program review during the 2016-2017 academic year and two programs are currently in the review process. In addition, five programs are scheduled to complete program reviews in 2019 and three in 2020.

The institutional report provided a list of essential elements for program review that included a schedule for accomplishing the review of documents, faculty instructions for evaluating student assignments, and a rating scale used by faculty indicating how well the students achieved the program learning outcomes. (CFR 4.1) The faculty rating results showing how well students achieved PLOs were not provided to the team. A review site was established in Canvas, the university's learning management system, to facilitate document sharing among the faculty. While these steps illustrate the collaborative efforts Saybrook is taking for program review, integration of the evidence collected, the feedback and recommendations from external reviewers, and closing the loop appear to be in the emerging category. Summary reports from the three programs completing the program review process indicate results are being used to improve overall program effectiveness. (CFR 4.2) It is unclear how successful the programs are

in closing the loop or if the institution has integrated program review into planning and budgeting. The institution has not yet developed a process to provide annual feedback on assessment results. It is important to note that TCS is piloting an assessment management system and it will become available to Saybrook pending results of the pilot.

Based on the program reviews submitted to the team, several changes were implemented including: syllabi template and program learning outcome revisions and the creation of a writing resource center. (CFR 4.3) The institution also recognized the need to involve students in the program review process. Student involvement is emerging with a student advisory council participating in the academic affairs committee and town hall meetings where conversations regarding syllabi revision and sequencing of curriculum is discussed.

The institution submitted one annual assessment report from the MA in counseling program, which is seeking accreditation by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, (CACREP). It details results from direct and indirect assessment measures. (CFR 2.4) The required elements of this program's self-study are highly developed. Each PLO and key performance indicators associated with CACREP standards, and the results from student surveys, are included in the program's report. Internal and external reviewers provided evaluative feedback and the program used this feedback to develop action plans when results fell below the acceptable threshold as set by the program. (CFR 4.6)

The two remaining program review summary reports were more global, focusing on faculty challenges and the need for syllabi and program learning outcomes revision with rare mention of direct or indirect assessment results. Direct assessment data regarding program-learning outcomes are collected; however, the findings were not integrated into the summary

reports making it difficult to determine how the information is used to effectuate change and impact improvements in pedagogy. The institution is considering using the MA in counseling annual report as a model for annual assessment reports across the entire university.

OIR provides programs with program related metrics, i.e. student retention and completion rates, student satisfaction ratings, grade point averages, and alumni rating. (CFR 2.7) While these elements are important to the program review process, it is unclear how the results of these elements have impacted quality assurance and student learning. (CFR 4.7)

The institution appears committed to the improvement of online instruction and the development of new faculty by providing multiple training opportunities. (CFR 4.4) These include training guides and tutorials housed in Canvas and the creation of the Faculty Resource Center. Invitations to attend videoconference-training sessions are sent to faculty at the beginning of each semester. These sessions are recorded and placed in the Faculty Resource Center for easy retrieval. Faculty are provided a list of best practices used for online education and tips for conducting student engagement activities in their courses.

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

Financial position

Along with a narrative on its financial situation in the institutional report, the team reviewed (1) audited financial reports showing Saybrook’s financial position as of May 31, 2017 and May 31, 2016, (2) an income statement for the eight months ending January 31, 2018, (3) a summary balance sheet as of January 31, 2018, (4) a detailed Board-approved budget for FY 2018, and (5) the Saybrook 2020 Strategic Plan. Two team members conducted a telephone conversation with Saybrook’s independent auditor during the site visit. Table 7.1 summarizes the institution’s revenues and expenses since 2015. (CFR 3.4)

Table 7.1

Revenues, Expenses, and Assets: Years ended May 31, 2015 – 2018 Amounts in \$ thousands	Actual		Budget	Actual	Budget
	2015	2016	2017	2017	2018
Operating revenues	10,647	11,064	12,895	12,865	15,091
Operating expenses	12,134	11,384	12,660	12,554	14,372
Operating surplus (Deficit)	-1,487	-320	235	311	719
Other Income (Expense)	46	1	0	138	0
Total Surplus	-1,441	-320	235	449	719
Net assets – end of year	6,328	6,008		6,458	

Concerns over financial sustainability have been noted in communication following the Educational Effectiveness Review in 2008, the Interim Report in 2012, and the Special Visit in 2014. In its letter, dated May 2, 2016, following an Interim Report, the Interim Report Committee noted that, since its affiliation with TCS, Saybrook had “strengthened its financial

position: reviewed and implemented cost containment strategies; invested in a philanthropic infrastructure that could lead to larger reserves; improved faculty productivity; put in place small increases in tuition; phased out some academic programs; set realistic enrollment projections; and realigned existing resources by maximizing the TCS affiliation.” While commending these steps, the panel of the Interim Report Committee recommended that “Saybrook continue to be vigilant in monitoring its financial status.”

Saybrook has maintained an acceptable Department of Education Composite Score since 2008. It has risen from 2.2 in 2014 and 2015 to 2.5 in 2016. Annual audits are conducted by an outside CPA firm. As of May 31, 2017, Saybrook’s assets equaled \$9.2 million and included \$4.3 million in Cash and Cash Equivalents, \$3.5 million in Investments, and \$0.1 million in Net Property and Equipment. Current Liabilities and Long-term Liabilities stood at \$2.6 million and \$0.1 million, respectively. Unrestricted Net assets were \$5.5 million. The institution currently leases its facilities in both Oakland and Bellevue. The Bellevue lease extends to March 2019; the lease for the Oakland facility extends to December 2019. (CFR 3.4)

In the fiscal year ending May 31, 2017, the institution had operating revenues of \$12.9 million, up from \$11.1 million in 2016. Expenses also rose, from \$11.4 million in 2016 to \$12.6 million in 2017. Saybrook went from an operating deficit of – \$0.320 million in 2016 to an operating surplus of \$0.311 million in 2017. After accounting for investment activities, net assets increased by \$0.449 million in 2017. Saybrook used its reserves to absorb operating losses it experienced prior to 2017. (CFR 3.4)

Its budget for FY 2018 reflects an expectation of strengthening financial results, with projected operating revenues of \$15.1 million (17% above FY 2017), projected operating

expenses of \$14.4 million (14% above FY 2017), yielding an operating surplus of \$0.719 million. Based on unaudited financial reports for the first eight months of FY2018, actual operating revenue and operating expenses had a positive variance against budget of \$0.353 million and \$0.254, respectively. An operating deficit of \$0.812 million was projected for the eight-month period; the actual operating deficit was \$0.206 million. At the time of the visit, the institution’s projected operating surplus for FY 2018 was \$0.500 million. While the FY 2019 budget is still being developed, the institution’s preliminary projection is for an operating surplus at approximately the same level as in FY 2018. Saybrook leadership thinks that they have turned the corner on financial stability and anticipate surpluses moving forward. (CFR 3.4)

Saybrook remains highly dependent on tuition and other student fees. Therefore, financial stability is closely connected to steady enrollment growth. A new position, director of university advancement and outreach, was created in 2018 to conduct outreach to alumni and the local community, support student recruiting efforts, and serve as the marketing liaison with TCS. It is anticipated that additional positions will be created to support this function. (CFR 3.1)

Table 7.2 shows the pattern of fall semester enrollment (headcount) since 2008.

Table 7.2

2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
482	603	607	605	581	604	577	558	622	686

In spring 2018, 682 students were enrolled in 4,684 credit hours. The current strategic plan, Vision 2020, sets target enrollment at 950+ students in 2020. Leadership anticipates enrollments reaching 1,000 students in 2021 or 2022.

Since its affiliation with TCS, Saybrook has taken steps to improve its management enrollment practices and to boost enrollment. Enrollment management is guided by a “Strategic

Enrollment Management Plan”, adopted in 2015, that emphasizes enrollment growth through attracting prepared students, offering new degree programs, improving outreach, leveraging partnerships, strengthening student retention initiatives, and institutionalizing student success. (CFR 3.4)

Saybrook created a division of enrollment management in 2015 with a newly created a vice president position to lead enrollment management. This vice president position was eliminated in early 2018 with the departure of the staff person. A new registrar and assistant registrar were also hired. A task force with broad representation has functioned as a forum to improve enrollment management. This group has evolved into a committee with three sub-committees on academic writing, advising and mentoring, and student engagement. Saybrook has introduced new programs (e.g., masters: Integrative and Functional Nutrition, Management, Counseling, Transformative Social Change and doctorate: Transformative Social Change) while eliminating some low-enrollment programs. (CFR 3.1)

Annually, Saybrook and TCS collaborate on setting admission targets by program by reviewing inquiry data, historical patterns of new enrollments, and departmental goals. Final decisions on program enrollment targets rests with the president. TCS facilitates planning by managing the information system used to organize and analyze data and by serving in an advisory role to the Saybrook admissions team. The team is led by the director of admissions and has recently expanded to include additional admissions counselors. TCS further supports the marketing and recruiting functions by providing a CRM platform, expertise in developing the annual marketing plan, guidance on the allocation of marketing resources, and lead generation. Saybrook has the option of supplementing spending on marketing beyond the allocation in the

TCS service agreement if it wishes to pursue intensive recruiting in specific programs. (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 3.7)

Along with its efforts to recruit new students, enrollment planning includes a data-driven method to forecast the numbers of continuing students. Retention is recognized as an important component of enrollment management. Several initiatives arising from the Retention Task Force designed to boost retention rates have been implemented. These include establishing the Center for Writing and Dissertation Excellence and processes for identifying and initiating interventions for at-risk students. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4)

Allocating Resources in Alignment with Institutional Priorities

The institution has recently transitioned to a university-wide collaborate budgeting process with the goal of better aligning the use of resources to strategic priorities and enhancing transparency. The establishment of the 2020 Strategic Plan was also effective in establishing priorities that are widely supported by the campus community. Most of the items in the 2020 Plan have been completed. Initial steps have been taken to create a three-year successor strategic plan with development efforts intensifying in summer 2018.

The following are examples of steps taken to align resources to priorities. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 3.5)

- Reducing staff in 2014 to better align with enrollment levels and the outsourcing of services to TCS.
- Phasing out of several programs and investing in new programs
- Creating the division of enrollment management and the hiring of additional admissions support staff.
- Hiring a director of community engagement and strategic partnerships to lead advancement activities and complement student recruiting efforts.
- Increasing class sizes to more financially viable levels.
- Directing additional resources toward assessment of learning.

- Restructuring the curriculum so common research courses are used across some programs.
- Consolidating the university into two colleges and improved the use of resources
- Moving from 11 different rates to a standardized per credit tuition and fees structure in Fall 2017
- Moving to annual faculty contracts for financial efficiency reasons

Evolving Higher Education Landscape

Saybrook has a clear mission that is supported throughout the university community and that provides a clear sense of the role it expects to have in higher education. The 2020 Strategic Plan includes numerous steps to grow and become more competitive. However, the institutional report does not discuss its future in the context of the broader directions of higher education.

Saybrook can rightly point to increasing enrollments and expense management as evidence of financial viability. The institution has benefited greatly from the economies of scale and scope efficiencies afforded by its affiliation with TCS. The infrastructure for marketing, student recruitment, admissions, institutional research, instruction delivery, and human resources functions that are provided by TCS far exceed the capabilities Saybrook could acquire and implement on its own. While Saybrook is charged for these services, the expense is significantly less than if the institution independently acquired and managed the systems for itself. Moreover, the range and quality of services through these platforms surpass what would exist without the TCS affiliation. Saybrook administrators and staff frequently interact with TCS colleagues and value the support and guidance they receive on fully utilizing the capabilities of the platforms. Interactions with colleagues at TCS and other affiliated institutions have fostered professional growth and has led Saybrook to become a higher-functioning organization. TCS “partners” often provide “another set of eyes.” The institution employs a budgeting process that strives to allocate resources in an optimal manner. Individual departments and programs contribute to the

development of the institutional budget by submitting funding requests that reflect their unit's priorities. Extensive discussions on priorities and constraints take place prior to the president determining final allocations and the Board's approval. The institution has additional work to do to address the feeling expressed by some faculty that their input is not valued. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

While substantial progress toward financial stability has been made, Saybrook has not functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years (CFR 3.4). Therefore, financial stability remains a concern. Further improvements in financial strength will be driven primarily by their success in recruiting students into existing and new degree programs. The institution's enrollment and budgetary targets are aggressive, but not unrealistic. The institution uses a thoughtful evidence-based approach to projecting enrollments. Through the TCS partnership, the capacity to plan successful marketing and student recruiting campaigns exists. The admissions team has recently expanded, and the recruiters and admissions counselors have the tools and training to be productive. (CFRs 3.1, 3.4, 3.5)

Rising tuition revenue will not automatically lead to large operating surpluses. The institution must balance the goals of growing reserves and investing in academic quality and student services. The expenses of the various systems handled by TCS are allocated across the affiliated institutions using a method based on FTE. An escalation in vendor charges or the expense share allocated to Saybrook will impact the institution's financial results. The leases for office space in Bellevue, WA and Oakland, CA end in March 2019 and December 2019, respectively. Renegotiated leases could be more expensive. However, the expiration of the lease may be an opportunity to relocate to less-expensive office space. Finally, the switch to a credit-

hour tuition model was implemented only this year. More time is needed to fully understand the impact this change will have on enrollments and revenues. This will require the institution to monitor and analyze enrollment patterns over the next several years to quantify the price sensitivity of students and prospective students and perhaps to fine-tune tuition. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

Finally, the institution has taken meaningful steps toward becoming less tuition dependent by initiating outreach to alumni and the local community. An outreach plan has been developed with goals, strategies, and a list of potential partners. Successful regional events have been held to reconnect with alumni and to help the community to become more aware of Saybrook's mission and academic programs. These efforts will continue. However, Saybrook is probably still years from the point when resources generated through advancement activities are substantial. (CFRs 3.4)

H. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

Reflections

Since the pivotal year of 2014, Saybrook has made significant progress in stabilizing finances, enrollment management, and strategic planning. Much of this progress can be attributed to several factors: stabilizing senior leadership, affiliating with TCS in March 2014, reducing costs through restructuring staff and faculty roles, and rebuilding key functions as the partnership between TCS and Saybrook has matured. As the institutional report noted, the affiliation paved the way for the development and implementation of Saybrook 2020, which is an important visioning and strategy document that has led much to their recent progress. Since the 2016 interim report, Saybrook has continued to strengthen ties across the university to create the vision of one cohesive university.

In visiting with the institution, the site team observed pride and excitement regarding several new initiatives, including the creation of the Center for the Writing and Dissertation Excellence, the recent addition of a global engagement program for faculty and staff, the creation of an advancement effort, and improved support for professional development, just to name a few new initiatives. There was also recognition, largely due to the affiliation, that Saybrook is now in a stable place from which to strengthen and grow into their historic mission and vision.

Plans for improvement

Going forward, the team agrees with institutional team members that the institution is on the right path on several fronts and that there is still substantial work to be accomplished. Initiatives that were explored during the site visit included progress being made on faculty workload and evaluation, strengthening of the peer mentoring program, and revisiting new program decision-making models so that the process is more consistent. Regarding student success, institutional leaders are re-thinking the regional conference model to consider whether it could be less expensive for students, to develop earlier intervention measures for student success, and to strengthen management information infrastructure so that data can be used more adroitly for continuous improvement and resource allocation.

This team report has documented the tremendous progress that Saybrook has made in the last few years, and the long road ahead toward sustainability so that the institution can continue to achieve its important vision and mission to build a more just, sustainable, and humane world.

SECTION III –COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations: The team commends Saybrook University for:

1. Significant progress towards financial stability, having achieved an operating surplus in FY 2017 and an anticipated operating surplus in FY 2018 as a result of increased enrollments and management of expenses. The institution has benefited from the efficiencies of economies of scale and scope afforded by the affiliation with TCS.
2. Professionalization of operational functions, including enrollment management, finance and business operations, technology, legal and regulatory affairs, student services, and institutional research.
3. Efforts to improve student success, including the adoption of the strategic enrollment management plan, creation of the Student Retention Committee, the peer mentoring program, and progress toward strengthening student services.
4. A Board of Trustees, faculty, administrators, staff, and students deeply committed to Saybrook’s mission and institutional values.
5. Leadership of the institution, particularly the president and provost, for their stewardship during times of significant change and challenge.

Recommendations: The team recommends that Saybrook University:

1. Continue to strengthen financial viability through further enrollment growth, diversification of revenue sources, and building on initial advancement efforts. (CFR 3.4)

2. Continue to examine its program pricing strategies in light of the changing ecology of higher education. (CFR 4.7)
3. Continue to make progress in the collection and use of graduation and retention data, and that the institution create a plan containing timelines, goals, and ongoing assessment to define and ensure student success. (CFR 2.10)
4. Adopt a consistent model for assessment of student learning and program review, institutionalize the collection and dissemination of data, and use the results for program improvement and allocation of resources. (CFR2.7)
5. Diversify data collection methods to include more direct assessment measures across the university. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6)
6. Address faculty morale through the adoption of a faculty workload and evaluation plan, and clarify decision-making roles in a shared governance model. (CFR 2.8, 2.9, 3.7)
7. Continue to make progress in reducing organizational silos by standardizing academic policies, best practices, and procedures. (CFR 3.7)

APPENDICES

A. FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, where is the policy located? Academic Catalog, Academic and School Policies: http://catalog.saybrook.edu/content.php?catoid=83&navoid=5915#program-policies-and-processes
	Comments: Clearly stated in publicly-accessible academic catalog
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Periodic review of credit hours are included in our program review processes and during new course development.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: The Seattle-based Counseling program is on ground and meets for the prescribed number of hours.

Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 1 per degree level
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online and hybrid
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? MA Counseling and PhD MBM
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 1 per degree level
	What kinds of courses? Clinical Practicum, Research, Evidence-based Coaching
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Counseling and Clinical Psychology
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Comments:	
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? All from academic catalog (catalog.saybrook.edu) and website (www.saybrook.edu)
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? All programs at Saybrook
	What degree level(s)? <input type="checkbox"/> AA/AS <input type="checkbox"/> BA/BS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? All
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable

	length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Patricia Easton
Date: March 15, 2018

2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Saybrook’s marketing department works in close collaboration with legal counsel to ensure they meet the federal (and state) requirements for admissions and recruitment.</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Saybrook publishes credit-hour requirements for degrees in its Academic Catalog. Tuition and fees are published on its website: https://www.saybrook.edu/?s=tuition+and+fees</p> <p>Saybrook is a member of BPPE and as such, students are required to read and sign the School Performance Fact Sheet and the Enrollment Agreement which include this information.</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</p>

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>This information is collected through alumni survey and social media such as LinkedIn and is used in recruiting and marketing materials.</p>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: David Ely

Date: March 20, 2018

3 – Student Complaints Review

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <hr/> <p>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where? Yes. It is outlined in the institution’s Academic Catalog: http://catalog.saybrook.edu/content.php?catoid=83&navoid=5915#grievances</p> <hr/> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Two staff positions are responsible for investigating and responding to student complaints. They are the Director of Student Success and Student Affairs Coordinator.</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: Yes. It is outlined in the institution’s Academic Catalog.: http://catalog.saybrook.edu/content.php?catoid=83&navoid=5915#grievances</p> <hr/> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Yes, the Director of Student Success ensures that the institution’s policies are adhered to.</p> <hr/> <p>Comments:</p>

	<p>The Director of Student Success and Student Affairs Coordinator are directly involved in the student complaint process.</p>
<p>Records</p>	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where? With the Director of Student Success</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly: This would be managed through the Director of Student Success and, depending upon the nature of the complaint, legal counsel.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

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

Review Completed By: David Ely
Date: March 20, 2018

4 – Transfer Credit Review

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publically available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? http://catalog.saybrook.edu/content.php?catoid=83&navoid=5920#trasfer-credit-guidelines
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Policy is stated in the online catalog.

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: David Ely
 Date: March 20, 2018

B. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION REVIEW

Institution: Saybrook University – Bellevue Campus

Type of Visit: Off-Campus Location Visit

Name of reviewer/s: Katherine Davis

Date/s of review: January 9, 2018

1. Site Name and Address :
Saybrook University
600 108th Avenue, NE
Suite #150
Bellevue, WA 98072
2. *Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location by WSCUC)*

Saybrook University relocated its branch campus from the outskirts of Kirkland, WA into the downtown corporate region of Bellevue, WA. Currently, two programs are offered at this location, the MA Psychology, Counseling Specialization and the MA Counseling programs. The dean of the college and the chair of the counseling department have thoroughly reviewed the programs and decided to phase-out the 51-credit hour MA, Psychology, Counseling Specialization program that is compliant with current WA licensing standards. Although enrollment numbers in this program averaged between 20 to 40 students per cohort, the decision to phase it out was ethically driven due to students finding it difficult to obtain licensure and employment outside of Washington after graduation. The MA Counseling program (Residential) has been approved and mirrors the curriculum within the current MA Counseling program (Online) based through the Oakland location and continues to work towards national programmatic-level accreditation. This decision allows Saybrook to offer two MA Counseling

degree programs with different delivery methods (online and residential). The Bellevue campus has recently hired two full-time faculty members to administer and teach in the program and also uses a number of adjunct faculty that teach at this location in the residential modality. They have also incorporated the program’s internships in this area into the University’s clinical internship management structure. Over the past two years, Saybrook has worked to establish collaborative relationships with public and private organizations (Leadership Eastside, Sound Transit, Eastside Pathways, and Pierce College District) in an effort to expand its reach into relevant local and regional issues that align with the University’s mission.

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

Saybrook provided a number of documents as requested in the Lines of Inquiry from the Off Site Review. These documents were reviewed prior to the Off Campus Visit. In addition, course syllabi, examples of student work, graduation, retention, and financial information for the Seattle/Bellevue campus were provided.

The visit began with a tour of the facility, including classrooms, and orientation to the team room and technology resources available at this location. Videoconferences were held with all levels of administration and open session group interviews were conducted with faculty, support staff and students.

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission,	Saybrook’s mission is to provide a rigorous graduate education that inspires transformational change in individuals,	

<p>operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>organizations, and communities, toward a just, humane, and sustainable world. This Mission resonates in the faculty, staff and with the students who attend this University. The institution partners with private and public entities who share in their mission and values.</p>	
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>The Bellevue campus is seamlessly integrated into the Oakland campus. Administrators from Oakland rotate visits to the Bellevue campus twice a month, interdepartmental meetings are regularly held with faculty and personnel at both sites and as needed through videoconferences, email and phone conversations. During the interviews at Bellevue, students reported they feel a deep connection to the institution and stated the residential conferences promote face-to-face interaction among students and faculty from both sites.</p>	
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>The physical site partially occupies two floors in the modern Bellevue Corporate Plaza building. Reception, faculty offices, conference room and faculty lounge areas are located on the first floor. The second floor houses five classrooms, a media</p>	

	<p>room, a break-room for students and an office for the community partner, Leadership Eastside. The classrooms are large allowing for formal face-to-face instruction, small group discussion and role-playing of counseling scenarios. All are fully equipped with flat-screen TVs for group work with off-site students and faculty. The director of operations oversees and manages the site.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>Student support services are divided between the Bellevue and Oakland sites. Library services and the assistant director of admissions are located in Bellevue, while the directors of admissions and registration are located in Oakland. During the interviews, the students reported they are adequately supported and the residential conferences thoroughly cover a multitude of topics and are so “well organized,” they leave the conferences fully informed of the processes in place to assist students should issues arise.</p> <p>Saybrook’s technology infrastructure is supported by TCS, which provides internet</p>	

	<p>services, Microsoft 365 applications, administers the learning management system (Canvas), student management system (CampusVue), and web-based human resources application (Workday). HelpDesk support is available every day from 5am to 7pm Pacific Time; a voicemail can be left for afterhours support. Password reset can be done online 24/7. The IT Manager employed by TCS is based at the main campus in Oakland and travels to the Bellevue location several times a year to provide in-person support to faculty, staff, and students as well as for general maintenance or upgrades to systems in the Bellevue office</p> <p>Graduate surveys are administered by TCS and data show students are satisfied with the support services; however, there were low numbers of students returning the survey. The institution anticipates these numbers will increase as enrollment numbers rise.</p>	
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the</p>	<p>The MA Psychology, Counseling Specialization degree program is within the Department of Counseling and is</p>	<p>The role of adjunct faculty beyond instruction needs to be further explored, i.e.</p>

<p>programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>being phased-out and replaced with the new MA Counseling (Bellevue) program.</p> <p>The Counseling Department chair provides oversight, guidance and supervision for both programs, meeting with adjunct and full-time faculty on a consistent basis to address curriculum development, student issues, course delivery, etc. Both program structures are based on a cohort model in which salaried teaching faculty organize, prepare and deliver the curriculum in an intensive campus-based extended weekend model.</p> <p>Two core full-time salaried faculty members were recently hired and teach in the MA Counseling program along with adjunct faculty. It is unclear whether adjunct faculty on this campus are involved in governance.</p>	<p>involvement in governance.</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>As stated above, the dean of the college and the Counseling Department chair provide oversight, guidance and supervision for both programs, meeting with faculty on a consistent basis to address curriculum development, student issues, course delivery, etc.</p> <p>The MA Counseling, (Bellevue)</p>	

program combines face-to-face learning, in a weekend format (Educational Conferences), along with Residential Conferences (in California with the full university). All students participate in two five-day long residential conferences per year. In addition, students attend face-to-face weekend educational conferences in Bellevue, to continue their coursework. This gives the students in the program a total of three long weekends for curriculum delivery. Online instruction is also utilized to maintain connection between conferences. The curriculum mirrors that of the online MA Counseling program, and is aligned with national professional standards, to assist with licensure portability, and ensure current training standards. The MA Psychology, Counseling Specialization degree program is delivered through face-to-face instruction on the Bellevue campus only. The program is designed and delivered by program core faculty who work at the Bellevue campus. As noted above, this program is being phased out.

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Retention and graduation data from the Fall 2014 cohort to Fall 2016 were available for the MA Psychology Counseling Specialization degree program. The retention rate ranged from 90 to 100% for all locations. However, disaggregated data specific for the Bellevue campus was not available and could not be compared to the main campus. Since the MA Counseling program just began in Fall of 2017, retention data were not available.</p>	<p>The institution may want to collect and disaggregate retention and graduation data specific to the Bellevue site for the MA Counseling program as part of the program review process.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Student learning in the MA Psychology, Counseling Specialization degree program is evaluated using faculty assessment of student competencies, student self-assessment of the same competencies, and supervisor feedback from internship site supervisors. Assessment elements include evaluating the family of origin, participation in the learning community, and the development of a growth plan. The new MA Counseling program will adhere to the assessment of student learning practices common across the institution. Rubrics will be used to assess</p>	

	<p>student learning and will include review of data collected each semester and summarized in the program assessment tracker. Faculty and clinical site supervisors also provide assessment of student learning and performance. In addition, the program is assessing and collecting data regarding the key performance indicators as described and required by CACREP standards. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) are available to students in course syllabi and on the website. In addition, the assignments listed in the syllabi are linked to the appropriate PLOs, CACREP standards, and key performance indicators.</p>	
<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>The MA Counseling program is in the process of applying for CACREP accreditation. As part of the approval process the program has identified eight Program Learning Outcomes and key performance indicators. Students will be assessed in a variety of courses addressing these eight outcomes. The data gathered by course faculty, student feedback, site supervisors and alumni will be used to</p>	

	<p>evaluate the degree of student learning and the effectiveness of the program. In addition, the student review process allows students to receive ongoing feedback of their development. The primary means of evaluation are the use of rubrics, which are reviewed each semester, and summarized in the program Assessment Tracker. Course faculty, the director of clinical training and site supervisors discuss the results and develop an action plan to address any discrepancies in the data. Each year, the Bellevue program will publish an Annual Assessment Report, modeled after the online program.</p>	
--	--	--