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SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of the Institution

Claremont Graduate University (CGU) is a private, non-profit, free standing graduate-only educational institution that began operating in 1925. Its mission is to “prepare a diverse group of outstanding individuals to assume leadership roles in the worldwide community through research, teaching, and practice in selected fields” (Criteria for Review: CFR:1.6). The university has a history of educational effectiveness that is rooted in student learning and success, program assessment and review, and institutional commitment and learning. (CFR 1.1)

The university has an operating budget of $52.4 million and currently employs more than 220 staff and 137 core faculty, and enrolls 2,205 students in five schools, one institute, one center and one independent department. The university offers 38 master’s and 22 doctoral programs in the following schools, institutes, and departments: Arts and Humanities, Community and Global Health, Drucker School of Management, Educational Studies, Information Systems and Technology, Mathematical Sciences, Social Science, Policy and Evaluation, and the Department of Botany. No online, distance education or off-campus programs were reported.

The student body is approximately 53% female and 47% male; with the following racial and ethnic diversity: 44% White, 7% black, 10% Asian, 13% Latino, 16% international, and 10% unspecified (Source: WASC Required Summary Data Form, 2012).

CGU is a member of The Claremont Colleges, a unique consortium composed of five undergraduate and two graduate institutions with one central coordinating entity. The colleges and universities within the consortium are Claremont Graduate University, Claremont McKenna College, Harvey Mudd College, the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Science, Pitzer College, Pomona College, Scripps College, and the Claremont University Consortium (CUC). Each institution is an independent legal entity with separate governing bodies, endowment and
other resources, property, and facilities. The CUC is an administrative organization that provides 28 different services and programs for The Claremont Colleges and operates the programs and central facilities on behalf of the member colleges. The CUC will entertain all ideas for operational collaboration of interest to any two or more of the seven colleges.

**Recent Accreditation History**

CGU, originally named Claremont University College, received initial accreditation in 1949, followed by a series of five-year reaccreditation visits and cycles. In 2001, as WASC was transitioning between the *1988 Handbook of Accreditation* and the *2001 Handbook of Accreditation*, CGU elected to conduct its review under the *2001 Standards of Accreditation*. In June 2002, the Commission acted to reaffirm the accreditation of Claremont Graduate University for a period of ten years. The Institutional Proposal for the current reaccreditation was due on October 15, 2009; the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit was scheduled for spring 2012; and the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit was slated for spring 2013. This would be the first and only review to be conducted under the *2008 Standards of Accreditation*. The CPR report was submitted on January 10, 2012, and the visit was conducted on March 21-23, 2012. In the Commission Action Letter dated July 3, 2012, the Commission decided to reschedule the Educational Effectiveness Review from fall 2013 to spring 2014. The institution’s self-study report was received on January 18, 2014.

**Description of the Visit**

The purpose of this visit was to consider the evidence for Claremont Graduate University’s fulfillment of the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness. The visit was conducted on March 24-26, 2014, by a team of five evaluators. The visit was successful; CGU facilitated the team’s work and was responsive to requests for additional information and changes in the schedule.

**The Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal, Capacity and Review, and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report**

The team commended CGU for its work in preparing for its reaffirmation of accreditation. The university embraced the WASC review process as a way to achieve its mission and to maintain
rigorous standards in its academic and university processes. The Institutional Report pledged a systematic approach to addressing the expectations identified in the Commission’s action letter and subsequent issues raised during institution’s strategic planning and other reflective activities. This included continued work on realignment, assessment and continuous improvement, diversity, and the definitions and implementation on university themes (Research that Matters and Transdisciplinarity).

Although the themes and issues identified in the CPR continue to represent CGU’s priorities, the university’s context has changed significantly in the past two years. First, CGU has undergone a thorough restructuring, combining smaller units into larger schools. This realignment increased efficiency and collaboration between academic programs and researchers and reduced administrative overhead. The team learned that approximately $500,000 has been saved as a result of realignment.

Second, President Freund, who was a new president at the time of the CPR, has completed building her senior leadership team, although some administrative posts in other areas of the campus remain open.

Third, the Board of Trustees adopted a new academic plan that leverages CGU’s educational strengths for short-term revenue gains by increasing enrollment, expanding research funding, and bolstering executive education.

Fourth, the university purchased a new learning management system that is responsive to the needs of students and faculty in the current educational marketplace. CGU can offer hybrid learning models, online models of collaboration, and social media tools that have the potential to improve student learning.

Fifth, shortly after the CPR visit, CGU conducted a major program review of the Transdisciplinary Studies program and is making substantial changes that are described later in this report.
Lastly, CGU assumed the role of ‘lead college’ for the library, which historically had reported to the Claremont University Consortium. Because of the challenges in managing a library from a central office, the Council of Presidents decided to move the library closer to academic leadership and the presidents of CUC institutions.

Response to Previous Commission Issues
The Commission’s 2012 Action Letter highlighted the following five areas for further exploration:

1. Strengthening diversity (CFR 1.5, 2.8, 2.10, 2.3, 3.2);
2. Advancing student learning outcomes and assessment (CFR 1.2, 2.10, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7);
3. Developing metrics for the realignment initiative (CFR 3.5, 4.2);
4. Enhancing Transdisciplinary Studies (CFR 2.1-2.6, 2.12, 4.6-8); and
5. Rebalancing master’s and doctoral enrollments (CFR 2.1, 2.12).

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

This section of the report evaluates institutional educational effectiveness according to the themes selected by CGU. It also highlights areas or criteria in the Standards that were not addressed in the theme essays.

Reflective Essay: Transdisciplinary Studies

Introduction and Description of the Theme
Transdisciplinary Studies continued to be a key element of the CGU brand that is presented to prospective students and the world at large, and was featured as one of five tabs on the homepage of the university’s website: www.cgu.edu. It took only one click to reach the main page of “CGU Transdisciplinary Studies.” The university lived up to this brand by requiring every PhD student to take at least one transdisciplinary course. (CFR 1.1) That being said, the concept of transdisciplinary studies continued to be difficult to define for people outside the rarified field named “transdisciplinarity,” and the organization of the program, while stronger than it was at
the time of the WASC site visit in 2012, was still fragile. At the time of the visit, the program
was dependent on a small critical mass of faculty and two co-chairs, who would both be on leave
in 2014-15. (CFR 2.1, 3.2) Because the program was still in a formative stage, the WASC team
was able to judge its educational effectiveness only in limited terms, and the discussion focuses
partly on continuing issues of capacity.

The WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2012 noted that the definition of
transdisciplinarity was unclear and that the program itself was in need of clarification, new
thinking, and possible structural adjustments. As of March 27, 2014, the Transdisciplinary
Studies website stated:

At CGU, transdisciplinarity is an approach to problem-centered research and
teaching that draws upon the ideas and methods of multiple disciplines and
extends our knowledge beyond any single discipline-specific domain to create
new, integrative, and transformative solutions.

Transdisciplinarity is a way of thinking and doing. Researchers must be free to
follow a problem across disciplinary boundaries; they must be open to
collaboration and innovation, drawing on the concepts and methods of other
disciplines and creating new approaches to problems; and they must always ask
how their creation of knowledge impacts our understanding of humanity's most
thorny problems.

Beyond the written definition, the enthusiasm of faculty was best expressed when, during a
discussion, transdisciplinarity was referred to as an “institutional muse.” It is a tribute to CGU’s
inherent transdisciplinarity that the statement about the muse came from a faculty member who
was not from the arts and humanities. The ongoing discussions of this broadly-based intellectual
quest further the mission of the whole university. (CFR 1.1) The team considered the issue of
definition to be a positive source for ongoing institutional discussion.
Findings

It is clear that the university has done considerable work, and still has more work to do, to firm up the curricular and practical support for this compelling vision. After the WASC visit in 2012, the university conducted a program review of Transdisciplinary Studies based on its guidelines for decennial program reviews. Certain adaptations were necessary because the program is not a degree-granting entity and does not serve as a home for faculty appointments. The provost, Academic Standards Committee chair, and Transdisciplinary Studies Faculty Advisory Committee oversaw the review process. The self-study included the following elements (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.7):

1. Course data, including syllabi, faculty teaching patterns, enrollment trends, data from rubrics on student performance, course evaluations, and samples of student work
2. Forward-looking qualitative data garnered from surveys, focus groups, and interviews
3. Archival data review involving the history of the program and transdisciplinary work based outside the program

The team found the recommendations in the Transdisciplinary Studies program’s own self-study most useful. A series of five themes emerged from the study:

Theme 1: Define transdisciplinarity. The 2014 WASC team believes that the university has spent enough time trying to refine the definition and is ready for healthy conversations at a “global” or “macro” level. Lack of a clear definition is not a major hindrance for a potentially vibrant academic endeavor.

Theme 2: Develop a clear pedagogy and application. The 2014 WASC team agreed that efforts to do so will enhance the effectiveness of the program, especially if such efforts are linked to the assessments (discussed below). (CFR 2.1, 2.3)

Theme 3: Expand the transdisciplinary program scope. The team supports the efforts to engage the CGU community more broadly including the incorporation of ideas outside the program
itself with one caveat: the program should not become so broad as to lose a sense of focus. Transdisciplinarity cannot be and should not be all things to all people.

Theme 4: Enhance CGU support for transdisciplinarity. The team agrees with this premise contingent on the establishment of strong, coherent leadership, and the demonstration of rigorous standards in all areas, including use of data to analyze and improve the program. (CFR 3.2)

Theme 5: Advance systematic assessment and link to employment. The team agrees that assessments, the gathering and use of outcomes measures for programmatic improvement are essential to programmatic success. (CFR 2.6) It should be determined if transdisciplinary curricula contribute to the graduates’ success, including employment after graduation. Further, the team stresses the importance of considering employment beyond the first job when the real value of a person’s education may be more evident than during the early post-graduate career.

The university views the five major findings of the Transdisciplinary Studies self-study consistent with the findings of the WASC CPR team in 2012, although the WASC team of 2014 believes that the program may be better served by moving beyond some of these concerns.

Based on the self-study, two external scholars of transdisciplinarity, conducted a site visit in January 2013. (CFR 4.1, 4.3) Their findings included eight key points and a number of subheadings. The WASC team agreed with a number of them, such as engaging in national and international discussions, enhancing faculty governance of the program, and highlighting accomplishments.

One of the external reviewers was subsequently hired as a consultant for the program’s transition year. During this period, the program revised the website, drafted a job description for a new director, and held development workshops for faculty. The goal of obtaining a new grant remains, but an affiliated faculty member received an NSF grant to study team science, including a provision to arrange training for faculty on how to develop effective teams. Perhaps because of this, the 2014 CGU EER self-study notes that “a new working definition of transdisciplinary studies has led to a focus on the science of team science.” The WASC team found this meta-
definition potentially useful as one aspect of the larger discussion, but overall believes that such a definition is constraining and runs counter to the breadth and vibrancy of the program suggested elsewhere. The 2014 CGU EER self-study further notes that the process of the program review brought transdisciplinary studies students and faculty together in meaningful ways, and prompted the review of all syllabi and a rubric for transdisciplinary student learning. (CFR 4.8)

The Transdisciplinary Studies Advisory Committee prepared a report dated February 2014 that outlined the next steps for the program. The team agreed with most of the basic premises of the interim report, which included more support, more activities including an annual conference, and an enhanced governance structure. The report also proposed the creation of a Certificate in Transdisciplinary Studies available to any CGU student, involving one core course and two upper level transdisciplinary courses, plus a portfolio evaluated by a faculty committee. While the WASC team found the idea of a certificate compelling, the team had some concerns about the distribution of faculty resources between the Transdisciplinary Studies program and home programs. (CFR 3.2)

In sum, the WASC team found that CGU had made substantial progress since the last WASC visit. It provided a more compelling argument that Transdisciplinary Studies has the potential to serve as a powerful intellectual engine for key aspects of the university’s mission. The success of the program is contingent upon the active involvement of a critical mass of faculty marked not only by a commitment to the “muse” of transdisciplinarity, but also by the energy and practical and administrative skills required for everyday operations. The team recommends that the University take measures to support this momentum. This includes identifying strong leadership and supplementing the small critical mass of faculty that currently give the endeavor its intellectual vitality. (CFR 2.1)

Reflective Essay: Research That Matters

Introduction and Description of the Theme
CGU is classified as a research-extensive institution. In fact, it states that it is the “only graduate-only, research-extensive university” in the country and that is a major differentiating factor. Research that Matters is an organizing theme related to the university’s goal: “CGU’s ultimate goal is to advance knowledge and contribute to a better world.” (CFR 2.8)

In addition, Research that Matters is a theme inextricably interwoven into the university’s mission and vision statements (CFR 1.1):

- CGU is an intimate, student-focused center of graduate education that emphasizes a transdisciplinary learning environment and a focus on both applied learning and research in its selected academic fields.
- CGU prepares diverse students for critical, creative leadership responsibilities in an ever-changing world that requires broad experience and sound judgment.
- CGU fulfills its mission through leadership in graduate-level education and innovative research on some of the world’s most pressing problems.

Indeed, during the 2013 two-day retreat of university leaders and trustees, two of the four main presidential priorities were related to this theme:

1. To become a more practice-based research university
2. To become a more research-intensive university

President Freund’s new initiatives in the Inland Empire – the communities adjacent to CGU – will open new avenues for Research that Matters.

During the CPR visit the team made the following suggestions related to this research theme:

1. The team encouraged the institution to continue to develop a common definition, language and metrics, which will indicate success at achieving excellence in “Research That Matters.”
2. The team suggested that [research-related] assessments and scorecards be actively monitored. How the data are used, and explicit examples of improvement processes put in place as a result of the analyses of these data, need to be provided in the EER.
3. The team recommended that CGU reexamine its research culture, most particularly the flow of research-related funds, including indirect cost recoveries, so that strategic investments can be made by the central administration.

Findings
Progress toward each of these suggestions will be considered in order.

I. Developing a definition of Research that Matters
As stated in the CGU EER self-study, the faculty did engage in an active discussion in order to define “Research that Matters.” Working from a basic definition as follows: “practice-based work that contributes to solutions for real-world problems” the faculty tackled defining Research that Matters. The resulting definition: “Research with applications to social processes relevant to contemporary life” was further refined to include “and transforms current understandings and appreciation of historic issues, iconic writings, and art.” In that way, the faculty were able to encompass all of the major research areas of emphasis on campus. During the site visit, some faculty expressed the opinion that Research that Matters relates more to brand identity for CGU (especially useful for student recruitment and for philanthropy) than anything that defines the direction their research should take. Other faculty noted that perhaps applied research, not scholarly activity in the humanities and art, were held in higher esteem. However, full academic freedom to do whatever scholarship they like was confirmed. (CFR 1.4)

While the adopted broadened definition may seem counterproductive to having a somewhat more focused definition for planning purposes, the team concluded that Research that Matters has offered an effective lens through which investments are made, including new hires. A review of currently active grants reaffirmed that practice-based and real-world topics are the focus of much of the funded scholarly activity at CGU.

II. Assessments related to Research that Matters
During the CPR, it was noted that there was resistance, especially among PhD advising faculty, to developing a common methodology to assess progress in doctoral work. During the EER visit, this seemed to have been overcome. Efforts related to the assessment of student research
progress have made great strides in the intervening two years. The definition of institution-wide learning outcomes was a big step, as was the rubrics for dissertation work implemented by every school.

In particular, the second university-wide learning outcome: “Students will engage in and or conduct research and critical inquiry in the context of their discipline” is related to the Research that Matters theme. (CFR2.9) Metrics were being developed to ascertain whether students’ “contribution to the field or extension to existing scholarship/practice is explicit, innovative, and significant, addressing an important problem.” Dissertations and theses will be evaluated based in part on whether the problem that is addressed is significant.

III. Research culture and infrastructure
Success in the university research agenda related to the university’s focus on Research that Matters was well documented. For example, during the review of the psychology programs, it was noted that funding requests focused on prevention and solution of societal issues. Their departmental research “provides practitioners with the means to influence the direction of institutions for the betterment of society.” The Department of Behavioral and Organizational Sciences is known for the applied nature of its research. Similar findings emerged in reviews in the School of Educational Studies in which research focused on “educational challenges, practices and settings.”

Research efforts at CGU were robust. The team noted that intramural funding in support of faculty and student research was available, as were fundraising efforts for new funds. University central budgets supported both intramural and extramurally-funded research. Research expenditures based on audited financials showed a steady increase from just over $6M in 2010 to almost $10M in 2011. In 2013, extramural awards reached $10.8M with 20 new grants amounting to almost $5M already awarded as of March 2014, the time of the site visit. Such external indicators of approval supported the contention that the university faculty were engaged in “Research That Matters,” at least with respect to funding agencies.
The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs was in need of expansion at the time of the CPR in 2012 and a suggestion was made to change the distribution of indirect costs, which were then provided 100% to the department in which the PI resided. This change had been implemented and at the time of the visit the distribution was 25% central and 75% school-directed, which provided central administration resources for cross-unit strategic research investments. In addition, the university had recently negotiated a higher indirect cost rate with the federal government (38.6%). In particular these new sources of funds had allowed the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to expand by 30% in the two years between site visits. The university had also proposed the creation of a new university research center. As part of the short-term strategic plan, CGU had targeted the recruitment of two highly-funded researchers, who would bring in new resources.

Student research in areas “that matter” was encouraged. Even master’s programs that are course-and didactic-based (rather than thesis-based) had curricula that required students to incorporate active research into their work. The new Student Success Center provided a central resource to support students in developing expertise with research methodology and data analysis.

Intramural support of research was determined to be appropriate with modest funds available for pilot and related initiatives ($100k) and five $10,000 awards available to assist doctoral students to complete their research. A new Trustee gift had provided an additional $50,000 per year to support research efforts.

In sum, while Research that Matters remained a somewhat loosely-developed concept, it had provided useful guidance for the university.

**Reflective Essay: Realignment**

**Findings**
CGU demonstrated significant progress on the realignment initiatives. Three major initiatives had been completed at the time of the visit: 1) reorganization of academic schools, 2) definition of a performance accountability infrastructure and 3) improvement of the fundraising
infrastructure. The institution moved from nine to five schools through reorganization, achieved $500,000 savings per year, and created a strategic initiatives investment fund. While the process of reorganization was a serious undertaking for all constituencies on the campus, there was general agreement that the institution had created a more efficient and robust organizational structure as a result. The team commended CGU for completing the academic reorganization realignment initiative resulting in a more efficient operational model and organizational structure. Further, the team saluted all levels of leadership for the skill and sensitivity with which the university has managed the transformational change that academic reorganization represents. While additional work on reorganization needs to be done, the team acknowledged the tremendous scope and magnitude of the initiative and the expediency and thoughtfulness with which the university carried it out.

In addition, CGU enhanced collaboration between the academic deans and the central administration by institutionalizing a decision-making structure with representation from the reorganized schools and divisions under the leadership of the president and the executive vice president/provost. While there is often a disconnect between academics and operations in university decision making, the team also commended leadership for the wisdom it showed when the Executive Committee was formed. This Committee, comprised of both deans and vice presidents, meets often and effectively coordinates broad-based and balanced university decisions.

CGU has a well-developed committee structure and the decision-making process appeared to be transparent and inclusive. The team commended the CGU leadership team for its inclusiveness, reaching from the president and provost through deans, chairs and the Faculty Executive Committee, as well as for their vision, conviction, and cooperative spirit in working with the consortial library, faculty, staff, and students to implement academic policies and practices that serve CGU well in terms of both reputation and academic substance.

However, the team noted that two relatively small units have not been incorporated into the school structure and did not feel included into the decision-making process.
As a part of the realignment initiatives, CGU has made a commitment to evidence-based decision-making, has built up its data capacities, and developed the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The team encouraged CGU to expand the use of integrated institutional and financial data in application to major institutional decisions including pricing, marketing and branding, strategic enrollment management, and financial planning.

The institution had undertaken significant steps in enhancing its fundraising capacities including hiring a new Vice President of Advancement, centralizing fundraising goals and strategies, while locating fundraising staff that operate within academic schools. The current fundraising efforts have exceeded those for the corresponding period last year in terms of activity and funds. The team encouraged CGU to expand its fundraising initiatives, leading to a comprehensive fundraising campaign with goals across academic programs, scholarship, and facility needs. The team also encouraged CGU to complete an institutional master plan addressing current and future facility needs. (CFR 3.5) The plan was completed and submitted to the City of Claremont in 2012.

Two important realignment initiatives – a new institutional budget model and revised institutional marketing and branding efforts – remain to be implemented. Both initiatives are essential to ensuring CGU’s future financial sustainability. The institution is tuition and fee dependent, with tuition and fees comprising more than 80% of the operating revenues. CGU has had an annual operating deficit starting in FY12 and has projected operating deficits through FY18 if no changes in enrollments and revenue diversification take place. The administration has developed a pro-forma of additional short-term revenues with low and high estimates starting in FY15 and the Board has created ways to allow for strategic investment, covering an operating deficit and generating a modest operating margin for FY15-18. The pro-forma was based on realistic budgeting, diversification of revenues, and enrollment management. It projected a modest positive operating margin based on a projected enrollment growth (55 FTEs) and a three percent annual tuition escalation. It also incorporates additional expense allocations including additional faculty lines (1 faculty FTE for every 8 new student FTEs).
In addition, CGU continued to seek additional cost savings through greater operating efficiencies and reduced redundancy. In a case of unforeseen events leading to enrollment shortfall, the Board of Trustees agreed to release quasi-endowed reserves to cover operating deficits. To enhance and diversify its revenue streams, the institution had agreed upon a methodology to identify its areas of strength and it received support from the Board of Trustees to invest quasi-endowed funds into the areas of academic strength for future growth. The institution intended to complete the Academic Program Strength Analysis that would identify the academic areas of strength and future potential growth in relation to the research, business and workforce needs of the Inland Empire and the region.

The team agreed that the institution would benefit from improved financial reporting allowing for systematic and granular analyses of revenues and expenses by functional and academic areas (CFR 3.5) and CGU was in the midst of revising its budgeting model. The centralization and decentralization of revenue and expense allocation and reporting and analysis was in flux.

The team encourages CGU to complete its analysis and finalize its budgeting model so that unit-based responsibilities are clarified. In addition, the team applauds the beginning efforts and encourages CGU to further incorporate the findings from the Academic Program Strength Analysis into the new budgeting model, making investments into areas of strength. The team also recommends an increased investment into strategic enrollment management, marketing, recruiting, and branding initiatives. This is essential in order to address some of CGU’s enrollment challenges and to further diversify its revenue streams. (CFR 3.5, 4.2) The team believes that an investment into marketing and branding will help to address some enrollment challenges.

**Reflective Essay: Consortial Library**

**Introduction and Description of the Theme**

In the June 2011 WASC Commission Action letter, CGU was asked to incorporate the review of the Claremont Colleges Library for which CGU took responsibility as the lead college for five years. The four areas of focus for the library’s review were:
1. Governance and leadership, including an assessment of the new governance structure and an update on the new Dean of the library, including a description of the procedures for evaluating his or her performance;

2. Strategic planning and fundraising, providing evidence of funding efforts and funds raised by the colleges and illustrating a transition from key strategic directions to a fully constituted strategic plan;

3. Sustaining a top-tier library, reflecting the new dean’s efforts to articulate the library’s identity and establishes criteria for top-tier quality; and

4. Assessment and educational effectiveness, including evidence of assessments completed and ways that results are used towards improvement of student learning.

Prior to the EER visit, the Claremont Colleges Library prepared two substantial reports documenting the library’s progress: a November 2012 WASC Interim Report and a November 2013 Interim Report, included in CGU’s self-study appendix. The library’s documented approach was methodical, multi-pronged, and meaningful, with data gathered for deeper insight and used for ongoing improvement. (CFR 3.6)

Findings

Governance and Leadership

The Council of Presidents decided in 2011 to more clearly align the library with the academic leaders of the CUC institutions, with the lead chief academic officer (currently the CGU provost) and lead president providing the executive oversight of the library dean and library operations. Outlines of the relationships between the library director and key decision makers have been documented, especially those between the Joint Governance Committee, Academic Deans Council, lead provost, and lead president. These relationships are critical to ensuring well-informed strategic planning, appropriate funding, and curricular support, and the team observed that these are functioning well.

In the last two years, the Claremont Colleges Library has made significant strides with personnel changes, occasionally through national recruitment (such as for the library dean and an associate dean) and often providing internal advancement opportunities within the organization (such as in
the case of the communications and program specialist, assessment officer, and director of collection services and scholarly communications). The reconstituted library leadership team was designed to better align the current staff with current strategic priorities and with their enhanced outreach approaches; these changes seemed effective for accomplishing their goals.

The Claremont Colleges Library is scheduled to transition its reporting line to a new lead college every five years. Since this arrangement was new at the time of the site visit, the viability of this approach was yet unknown and it will be wise to closely monitor the challenges and opportunities that arise. There is an inherent dynamism in the model and a clear opportunity for the Claremont Colleges Library to develop more substantial connections and deeper understandings of the mission, goals, and specific needs of each college, ideally continuing to build on those ties even after the reporting lines change. The team recognized CGU’s leadership in taking responsibility as the first lead institution for the Claremont Colleges Library. During the initial term of the lead college model, it will be important for CGU to engage the Council of Presidents in more fully clarifying the ongoing governance issues as well as elements of the transition plan.

**Strategic Planning and Fundraising**

With the support of consultants, the library undertook an extensive strategic planning process that appears to have engaged the user communities and library staff in an open and transparent process. Implementation of the plan will take several years and seems to be on a wise path. Accomplishing some of the envisioned goals will require an influx or redirection of resources. Examples of such investments, made with the approval of the library dean and the provost, demonstrate a shared commitment. It is likely that some aspirational goals will require a more direct approach to identifying new revenue streams such as through fundraising.

The 2012 WASC Interim Report suggested plans for collaboration between the library and college Advancement Officers. In all environments, it is challenging to create the right conditions for advancement growth, including building and sustaining a base of library donors and communicating a well-articulated message about the library’s aspirations. This initiative
will be critical for the library dean, Joint Governance Committee, Academic Dean Committee, and Council of Presidents to undertake collaboratively.

**Top-Tier Library**
The methodology outlined for articulating the Claremont Colleges Library’s identity and defining a top-tier library appropriate for the CUC environment was articulated with clarity and nuance. That the CUC environment is complex was evident, but the identification of various key characteristics and the benchmarking was explained well. On a practical level, students and faculty reported satisfaction with the library in terms of information resources (including easy access to interlibrary borrowing), physical access (especially the renovated spaces encouraging collaboration and cross-institutional conversations), virtual access (including a design and services that allowed them to be self-sufficient and productive), and expertise (especially noting training and consultations by the librarians associated with specific fields and schools).

The library seems to have developed an effective model that balanced the use of their in-house expertise and the centrally-provided services of CUC to continue to experiment and innovate in ways that will allow their library to develop and adapt to changing research, teaching and learning needs. Consortium-related investments should continue to take into account the impact on the library’s ability to provide seamless, coherent services (such as enterprise systems and curricular choices), while also allowing the specialization that distinguishes various programs, schools, and colleges.

**Assessment and Educational Effectiveness**
The library’s connections to research, teaching, and learning initiatives – such as through the research methodology courses, first year programs, senior capstones, and information literacy assessment approaches -- were notable for their range and collaborative development with the relevant faculty, program coordinators, and students. The team applauded the library in taking the initiative to identify important assessment questions, gathering relevant quantitative and qualitative data, and sharing that data with the colleges to inform a wide range of quality-improvement related initiatives from course content to new services. Simultaneously, the library
served as an academic bridge across the colleges, nurturing a community of students and faculty engaged in data sharing across disciplines.

Similarly, the embedded librarian approach -- pairing a librarian to contribute in formal ways with each member college -- was credited with aiding the library in making more substantive connections to the individual colleges. These connections ensured an appropriate level of resources are available before a school undertakes a new program or degree, as well as enabled richer experiences for the students and faculty overall. The team was encouraged when it learned of the expectation that all colleges include the librarian as a member of their faculty committees and curriculum committees, and that several colleges have developed this idea further to include the librarian in other formalized ways such as with teaching and learning committees, steering committees, and student government groups. The team concluded that the library is well positioned for the desirable next steps to further integrate the library services and resources into the students’ research and learning experiences.

One promising example was the proposed intercollegiate program called the Claremont Center for Engagement with Primary Sources (CCEPS). Hosted physically and programmatically by the library, CCEPS amplifies the research orientation of the CUC member institutions, providing professional archival training for both graduate students and undergraduate students. The library provided the genesis of the idea, which was facilitated by CUC and supported by the lead provost including approval for redirection of library reserves. As such, this Center and its related program demonstrated the potential for creative partnerships between the library and the colleges, and provides a valuable model for similar future initiatives.

Other Issues Arising from the Review of the Standards and Criteria for Review

Student Success

While methodology for calculating retention and graduation rates among graduate-level programs has not been standardized, and the WASC standard that “makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning outcomes” (2013 CFR 1.2) was not contained in the 2008 guidelines used for the CGU self-study, public disclosure of these metrics will be a requirement in the near future. Despite the
lack of a requirement, CGU has conscientiously and diligently tracked their student success rates in order to improve their programs. An analysis of retention from year to year and completion rates for CGU graduates by discipline indicated that CGU’s median years to degree at the time of the site visit were similar to those reported nationally.

For example, their analyses stated that for master’s degree students, the rates are slightly better than average with the completion rate at 87%. For doctoral students, the completion rates are slightly below the national average (55% vs. 57%). CGU takes these analyses a step further and compares the retention and completion rates for under-represented minority students to majority students. These comparisons reveal poorer results for minorities, however the team applauded the fact that CGU is taking those extra analytical steps. Goals for diversity initiatives will arise from these efforts.

On a different topic related to students, currently CGU has a disaggregated model for receiving and addressing student complaints. Students can initiate a complaint to the chair, dean, or dean of students. The student grievance process and form is very thorough, covering many areas in a flexible manner. Greater promotion of the appropriate channels and processes would be clarifying for many students. In addition to better awareness, with an eye toward improving the institution’s ability to identify patterns of student issues and concerns, the team encourages CGU to implement a more streamlined and integrated approach for gathering, storing and analyzing this information as well as for relaying issues to the appropriate departments or committees for action or review of related policies and processes. (CFR 1.7)

**Diversity**

As CGU noted in its EER self-study, the challenges of achieving diversity are deep-rooted, national issues. The data for underrepresented students who finish college are startling, which puts CGU and other graduate programs in a real bind. Too few underrepresented students are advancing to graduate programs, postdoctoral fellowships, and faculty positions.

The team was pleased to read the efforts initiated by CGU after the CPR visit which included the creation of a President’s Diversity Council, utilization of existing and new data, completion of a
university-wide plan, creation of the new Student Success Center, hiring of an associate dean, and a special task force charged with creating a formal statement of specific recommendations to better support underrepresented students. Evidence of these efforts was presented in the council’s meeting minutes. The documented results include:

- Increase in the underrepresented faculty hires
- Improved persistence, time-to-degree, and completion rates for underrepresented students in master’s and doctoral programs
- Enhanced campus climate and sense of inclusion
- Increased support for training and development around diversity issues

The Board was very supportive and saw their role as helping CGU achieve its diversity and inclusion goals, which included the creation of a President’s Diversity Council. The council will review hiring processes and policies and completion and retention data, and recommend changes.

The team reviewed the diversity plans of various schools and noted that while data had been collected, analyzed and distributed, specific goals had not been established. This was true even in the cases where interventions had been designed and implemented. Without specific goals or benchmarks the team wondered how progress would be judged? How would CGU know that the intervention had been effective?

The team recognizes CGU’s efforts in engaging the community in the challenging work of diversity and inclusion; however, there is still a significant amount of work still be done. While the school’s diversity plans were created under the umbrella of the CGU plan, the team recommends that the university widely communicate the goals of the Diversity Plan, set an agenda for translating the value of diversity into action, and provide the resources that would help realize these goals. (CFR 1.5)

Assessment and Student Learning Outcomes
CGU’s documentation provided evidence of significant commitment to close faculty-student engagement, the apprenticeship model, and regular feedback. While the implementation of educational objectives across graduate academic programs is difficult to develop and apply in a
standardized way, CGU has worked diligently to define learning outcomes and incorporate them into course syllabi, assignments, and practices in ways that are appropriate for each discipline and program. In all cases, faculty members have taken a lead role in exploring approaches to assessment and continuous improvement. The assessment plans are well articulated, engage faculty members and staff together in the process, and aim for a broad view across the institution. Several examples of new models have been implemented – such as student review days, partnership with Esri, dissertation pilot and the pro-seminar – which speaks well to the issues identified from student surveys. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.4- 2.9)

CGU had made good progress toward addressing educational objectives and assessment, though concerns remained about the progress and the consistency and depth of acceptance across the institution. At the time of the site visit, the assessment of learning outcomes was uneven across the schools and had been developed in isolated ways that may not lend themselves to holistically tracking a student’s performance, especially if a student is taking courses across schools such as is fundamental to the transdisciplinary approach. Several schools were working closely with their faculty to develop a model that most appeals to them, though it is critical that the faculty also work across programs to seek broad adoption of best practices that have the greatest benefits to the students. Campus-wide learning outcomes had been defined, but progress toward assessment of these was projected to be prolonged. The team noted CGU’s significant progress in identifying appropriate assessment measures and developing assessment instruments. While data were being used by some units to determine if improvement efforts are successful, the team recommended that the university place an increased emphasis on the consistent analysis and use of the data gathered for continuous quality improvement by all units to guide their academic and administrative operations. (CFR 2.6, 4.4)

Faculty and Staff

The site visit team noted that CGU employed personnel in sufficient numbers and of appropriate professional qualifications to support academic programs. The institution had made significant investments into full-time faculty. Full-time faculty members comprised 95.2% of total faculty FTE. However, there has been some decay of salaries below competitive benchmark levels and this might be an issue for future hiring and retention, especially for highly marketable
disciplines. While modest future faculty increases were built into a five-year institutional financial pro-forma, the team encouraged CGU to seek additional way to create retention initiatives and opportunities for faculty and staff. (CFR 3.3) For example, various opportunities for professional development were made available to staff including on-job training, peer mentoring, faculty-staff collaboration, and professional conferences. The team encouraged CGU to continue this practice to sustain professional qualifications and morale of the staff. The team recommended that CGU reinstate formal faculty evaluation processes. Both constructive feedback and recognition of faculty excellence are essential for continuing engagement and improvement. (CFR 3.3)

Financial Aid Awards
The team strongly encouraged CGU to bring more clarity into its communication to admitted and continuing students related to financial aid awards. Greater detail and clarity including specific amounts, types (grants and awards should be listed separately from loans), the total annual award, and whether subsequent year’s awards are automatic or contingent, should be provided. (CFR 2.13)

Program Review
The 2014 CGU EER self-study report and appendices made it clear that the university aims to achieve evidence-based program review that “closes the loop” for innovation and improvement. The formal guidelines for program review were instituted in 1995 and modified for clarity and focus thereafter. Program reviews are normally conducted every ten years including CGU-initiated reviews and external reviews associated with specialty accreditation from agencies such as the AACS, CCTC, and CEPH. Program reviews focus on assessment of student learning outcomes at the program level, and the findings are used for strategic purposes in planning the program’s future and, when rolled up, the university’s future. (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7) Faculty participation in program review, including analysis of program data in considerable depth, enhances faculty understanding of the functioning of the university and builds an informed base for better faculty governance. (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)
The process of program review was summarized in the 2014 CGU EER self-study, and the guidelines were spelled out in detail in the institutional handbook, section IV.B. The guidelines parallel those at many institutions. The reviews depend on interactions among the provost, the Academic Standards Committee (ASC), and the program under review, and the external reviewers. The process involves an initial Memorandum of Understanding; a forward-looking statement of mission, resources, needs, predictions, and plans for the next ten years; a self-study based on data supplied by the school, Office of the Provost, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness; an external review team chosen by the provost from at least six names supplied by the program and approved and forwarded by the ASC; and a site visit. The site visit is followed by a report from the external review team; an assessment or the report by the ASC and a report by the ASC to the program; a response by the program; and an MOU including recommendations. This report is forwarded to CGU faculty and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees by the ASC. The Office of the Provost then requires follow-up reports for two years to document appropriate responses to the recommendations and to suggest further steps for improvement.

Based on the WASC rubric for program review, the 2014 self-study concluded that CGU operates beyond the emerging category, but has not systematically implemented all elements of the developed category. The report stated that the ASC, deans, and provost are reviewing further recommendations for change in the process of program review based on the university’s increased emphasis on learning outcomes. (CFR 2.7, 4.4) The WASC team concurred with the judgment that CGU is between emerging and developed categories in this area. The team’s conversation with faculty and staff who had participated in program reviews, or provided data or data analysis for programs reviews, confirmed CGU’s increasing emphasis on learning outcomes at multiple levels.

The 2014 self-study included summaries of program reviews for three programs: psychology from a review in 2008, education from a review in 2010, and management from a review in 2012. Binders of materials for these reviews were available in the WASC team room during the site visit, along with materials for the master’s in public health and mid-cycle teacher education specialty accreditations and the 2013 review of Transdisciplinary Studies.
The following appear to be the most significant findings from the program reviews supplied.

Psychology

- The program represents the largest graduate evaluation program in the world.
- Between 2007 and 2013, the core faculty grew from 12 to 13, but the size of the faculty has not kept pace with the growth in student population, resulting in a number of foundational courses with large enrollments, to some degree undercutting the program’s emphasis on individualized attention and close academic relations between faculty and students. (CFR 2.1, 3.2)

Education

- SES enrolled a large number of students from backgrounds underrepresented in higher education. The school found that such students often introduce innovative perspectives. (CFR 1.3)
- The program faces significant challenges caused by specific issues within the California education system, as well as changes caused by the national economic downturn.
- The school is working with the Student Success Center to increase the rate of completion for students in the dissertation phase. (CFR 1.12, 2.13)

Management

- The Drucker School submitted materials to the AACSB in December 2013 for the school’s sixth-year accreditation report. The review followed the CGU program review guidelines discussed above with deference to AACSB’s unique expectations. (CFR 4.1, 4.8)
- In April 2013, the School received a letter from AACSB giving them notification of an additional year of accreditation and a required follow-up. In particular, AACSB would focus on the following:
  1. The required hiring of a new dean. (The dean was named in the summer of 2013.)
  2. The finalization of a strategic plan (The faculty have completed a three-year plan.)
3. Demonstrated improvements in enrollments and finances. (Plans have been put in place, enrollment improvements have already occurred.)

4. Finalization of a re-branding exercise. (This was largely done, with the “Drucker Difference” defined.)

5. Increased resources allocated to student job placement (A new lead and two new direct reports student career advisors have been hired.)

6. Increased school-based authority for student recruitment, advising and fundraising. (This had begun to occur with decentralization of recruitment and fundraising.)

7. Improved coordination between Drucker and central administration.

- This sixth-year review was satisfactorily completed at the time of the EER site visit. The recommendation of the AACSB review team was positive. At the time that the WASC site visit was occurring, the AACSB Commission was meeting, and a full-term, six years of renewed accreditation was anticipated. (CFR 2.2b, 2.3-2.7)

Transdisciplinary Studies Review

- CGU could have let Transdisciplinary Studies continue to drift, leaving the notion as a catchy, but ultimately empty, marketing gimmick. The fact that the university invested the time, money, and brainpower of so many faculty, administrators and staff, including two outside evaluators, speaks volumes about CGU’s commitment to the significance of program review and of transdisciplinary studies. See further discussion under “Transdisciplinary Studies” in this report.

Overall, the WASC team found that CGU appears to be an institution well on its way to turning an important corner. During the WASC team’s visit in 2012, CGU was still set in significant measure in an earlier era. It was a group of graduate programs that were well-intended but not well-connected, not always clear in their goals or rigorous in the use of data to assess and improve themselves. The work of the current leadership team has had notable success in bringing the programs together to function as a graduate university, enhancing meaningful faculty governance, including the clarification of the missions of individual programs and the
university as a whole, and using data-driven processes of program review to analyze the past and set a productive path into the future.

**Continuous Improvement**

In general the statement that CGU is “an organization committed to learning and improvement” is an accurate statement. Much work has been done since the CPR visit in 2012. The team commended the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for its notable progress toward creating an institutional culture of assessment and continuous improvement, representing a transformational change that positively effects all aspects of the university.” (CFR 4.3, 4.5) The best evidence for this was that in the open faculty meeting, uniform support for the collection of data and the value of reviewing data related to learning outcomes was expressed. (CFR 4.1) This is a tremendous change from 2012, and the team believes that the change is sustainable.

At the time of the EER visit, CGU was generating, gathering and disseminating comprehensive data about student learning outcomes. (CFR 4.4) This was consistent across the university and done annually. All schools and programs were required not only to report, but also to ‘publish’ (for internal audiences) its programmatic learning outcomes. Even in areas that the CPR team identified as particularly worrisome (such as some doctoral studies programs) this was now consistently being done.

However, the actual use of the data -- the analysis, planning of improvements and setting of goals for the improvement -- and then reassessment of outcomes to determine if the interventions are effective, was inconsistent across the university. It is evident that in some sectors such as in psychology, education and management, the review process outputs did provide information that fed into program planning improvement plans. For example, in the Drucker School there was evidence that the school had developed a process to “collect, synthesize, report and use assessment findings” to guide curricular change and positively impact learning outcomes. Job placement was a similar area of effort in which the assessment “loop is closed.” In other schools and departments, this was not the case. There were plans for each program to sign an MOU, cosigned by the program and university leadership, which would be the basis for plans for self-improvement.
In addition, the university had just begun to link the allocation of resources to learning outcomes and needs for improvement. (CFR 4.2) For example, the strategy discussions, conclusions and directions set by the university in summer 2013, drew on academic, financial, and market data. The infrastructure was apparent and sustainable, and there was a commitment to go to the next step. That next step is needed.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. The team commends CGU for the candor of its EER report.

2. The team lauds the staff and faculty for their demonstrated commitment to the students’ experience. This dedication is evident across the university.

3. The team commends the leadership team for its inclusiveness, reaching from the president and provost through deans, chairs and the Faculty Executive Committee as well as for their vision, conviction, and cooperative spirit to implement academic policies and practices that serve CGU well.

4. At many institutions, there is a disconnect between academics and operations in university decision-making. The team commends the leadership for the composition of the Executive Committee, comprised of both deans and vice presidents, which meets often and effectively coordinates broad-based and balanced university decisions.

5. The team commends the Office of Institutional Effectiveness for its notable progress toward creating an institutional culture of assessment and continuous improvement, representing a transformational change that positively effects all aspects of the university.

6. The team commends CGU for completing the academic realignment initiative, resulting in a more efficient operational model and organizational structure. Further, the team
salutes all levels of leadership for the skill and sensitivity with which the university has managed the significant change that academic reorganization represents. While additional work on reorganization needs to be done, the team acknowledges the tremendous scope and magnitude of the initiative and the expediency and thoughtfulness with which the university carried it out.

Recommendations

1. The team recognizes CGU’s efforts in engaging the community in the challenging work of diversity and inclusion. The team recommends that the university widely communicate the goals of the Diversity Plan, set an agenda for translating the value of diversity into action, and provide the resources that would help realize these goals. (CFR 1.5)

2. The team notes CGU’s significant progress in identifying appropriate assessment measures and developing assessment instruments. While data are being used by some units to determine if improvement efforts are successful, the team recommends that the university place an increased emphasis on the consistent analysis and use of the data gathered for continuous quality improvement by all units to guide their academic and administrative operations. (CFR 2.6, 4.4)

3. The team recommends an increased investment into strategic enrollment management, marketing and branding initiatives. This is essential in order to address some of CGU’s enrollment challenges and to further diversify its revenue streams. (CFR 3.5, 4.2)

4. The team recommends CGU reinstate formal faculty evaluation processes. Both constructive feedback and recognition of faculty excellence are essential for continuing engagement and improvement. (CFR 3.3)

5. In the area of Transdisciplinary Studies, CGU has made considerable progress since the 2012 WASC visit. The team recommends that the University take measures to support
this momentum. This includes identifying strong leadership and supplementing the small critical mass of faculty that currently give the endeavor its intellectual vitality. (CFR 2.1)
## Appendix A

### CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where is the policy located? on the public Registrar’s webpage at <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/pages/8227.asp">http://www.cgu.edu/pages/8227.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: They are in compliance with federal guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>periodic audits)? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Each semester a call for courses is distributed to the schools (program coordinators,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>faculty, administration). Both department chairs and school deans are expected to review all course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requests (what the faculty propose to teach) for adherence to the credit hour policy before the classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are submitted to the Registrar’s Office for scheduling. Once the scheduling requests have been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>received, the Assistant Registrar again reviews each course before entering it into the database. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>check is to ensure that credit hour requirements are being met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When it is discovered that a class request does not meet the minimum number of contact hours, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>department’s Program Coordinator is notified and the course is not scheduled until either an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>explanation is given for the expectation of hours provided outside of class activities, or until the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>requested class meeting times have been changed to meet the minimum hours. Further, the Registrar’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>office has a query in place to compare the total minutes of in class instruction to the number of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>units earned to ensure compliance to our credit hour policy. This query is run each term, after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses are scheduled but before the start of the term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Several individual syllabi were spot-checked to confirm that on-ground courses met the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prescribed number of hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? In 2013/14 only 41 students were enrolled in online or hybrid courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>across CGU. Two courses were reviewed that used online resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</em></td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Courses that used some online components (such as exercises where material had to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessed online) or conferencing (chats that were synchronous or asynchronous) and these showed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students were doing work aligned with credit awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that do not meet for the</td>
<td>What kinds of courses? Mostly field experience courses with required assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Master’s and doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)</td>
<td>What discipline(s)? Several: one each from Management, Humanities, Education, Behavioral Sciences and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?  X YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Based on the evidence they are in compliance with federal guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</th>
<th>How many programs were reviewed? 5 additional programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed? 1 in each major discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? Master’s and doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? each major discipline: business, education, psychology, humanities etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length?  X YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: These are quality programs fully in compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Completed By: Laura Schweitzer, PhD, Chair of the WASC site visit team  
Date: Mar 26, 2014
## Appendix B

### TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Credit Policy(s)</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy publicly available? If so, where?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readily available in the application section of materials – <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/pages/8202.asp">http://www.cgu.edu/pages/8202.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The type of institution, documentation required, minimum grade for transfer, when the credits must be requested and required departmental review to determine how the credits will be applied are all clearly outlined in the Credit Transfer Policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Completed By: Laura Schweitzer, Chair of WASC Site Visit Team for Claremont Graduate University
Date: March 24, 2014
### Appendix C

#### STUDENT COMPLAINT REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on student complaints</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? Online and in the Student Handbook: <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/include/handbook/Student%20Grievance.pdf">http://www.cgu.edu/include/handbook/Student%20Grievance.pdf</a>  <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/pages/4850.asp">http://www.cgu.edu/pages/4850.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/procedure</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly: A series of steps have been clearly articulated with responsibilities for specific parties, time periods for actions, brief descriptions, and exceptions: <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/include/handbook/Student%20Grievance.pdf">http://www.cgu.edu/include/handbook/Student%20Grievance.pdf</a></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students bring complaints to their Chair, Dean, or to the Dean of Students. There are three stages to handling a complaint; 1) student meets with administrator to attempt to resolve; 2) If not resolved, student is referred to the Dean of Students; 3) If not resolved, the Dean of Students contacts the Chair of the Grievance Committee to empanel a committee to investigate and evaluate the complaint. In 2007, CGU established the office of the ombudsman <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/pages/4389.asp">http://www.cgu.edu/pages/4389.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? Where? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Dean of Students office. In cases where the complaint is not escalated to the Dean of Students, the record is kept in the student file in the academic unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CGU has historical files of student records and could call up a particular case by student name and retrace the record of complaints. The institution does not keep a running summary of complaints or routinely conduct complaint analyses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal regulations</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Recruiters are employed by CGU and receive compensation for their position regardless of how many students they recruit to the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Time to degree: The institution collects time to degree data, which is shared internally, through its Office of Institutional Effectiveness. This information is not posted on the CGU website. Re: cost of attendance: The website hosts a “Cost of Attendance” calculator that helps students assess the total cost of attendance, including tuition and fees. <a href="http://www.cgu.edu/PDFFiles/FinancialAid/Tuition2013-14.pdf">http://www.cgu.edu/PDFFiles/FinancialAid/Tuition2013-14.pdf</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers and employment</td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
<td>YES, for some schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</td>
<td>YES, for some schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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