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COMPONENT 1:
INTRODUCTION, RESPONSE TO COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS, & TEAM PROCESS

**Institutional Context:** The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (TCSPP) was founded in 1979 by a group of psychologists and educators committed to advancing the field and providing professional training in a nonprofit setting. From a modest beginning with classes serving a small number of students in temporary headquarters, the program has expanded dramatically. TCSPP currently serves over 4,200 students in Chicago, Los Angeles, Irvine, Washington, D.C., [and New Orleans, in partnership with Xavier University], and through its online programs. The institution currently offers twelve doctoral programs, one educational specialist program, eleven master’s degree programs, a Bachelor of Arts in Psychology, and four certificate programs at its various campuses and online. The student body is 80% female and over 37% students of color.

TCSPP is a part of TCS Education System, a collaborative collection of educational institutions. In addition to TCSPP, the Educational System includes Pacific Oaks College, the Santa Barbara and Ventura Colleges of Law, the Dallas Nursing Institute, and Saybrook University.

**Mission and Purpose:** The Chicago School of Professional Psychology embraces a mission of integrating theory, professional practice, and innovation in order to provide an education for careers in psychology and related behavioral and health sciences. Further, TCSPP is committed to service and support of diverse communities. This mission is facilitated by the institutional values of education, innovation, service, and community and directed toward the accomplishment of the institutional learning goals of scholarship,
diversity, professional practice, and professional behavior. As indicated in its latest strategic plan: “TCSPP is advancing its long-held intention to be, and be recognized as, the preeminent institution of professional psychology in the world.”

A unique aspect of TSCPP’s approach to fulfilling its purpose, honoring its values, and facilitating achievement of student learning goals is the intentional combination of student learning with mission-driven work in the community in diverse practice centers. Most centers are located in the cities where TCSPP has campuses, but some extend to international settings including Peru and Rwanda.

**Accreditation History:** From 1984 to 2011, TCSPP was accredited by the Higher Learning Commission in the North Central region of the United States. As a result of the move of the main campus and base of operations and TCSPP’s incorporation in California in 2011, the institution sought and securedWSCUC Initial Accreditation for a period of five years. Upon initial accreditation, the Senior Commission asked TCSPP to address four issues:

- Clarify its relationship with the TCS Education System and the role of faculty in institutional decision-making processes;
- Reflect on the appropriate rate and pace of change in introducing new programs, procedures, structures, and processes;
- Provide definitions of research and scholarship, most especially for the students and faculty in the institution’s doctoral programs; and
- Describe its preparedness to address all components of the revised WSCUC accreditation process.
Response to Commission Recommendations: Following review of a 2013 Interim Report from the campus, the WSCUC review committee determined that TCSPP had appropriately addressed all four issues. However, since this visit would be TCSPP’s first comprehensive review since initial accreditation, the 2017 visiting team incorporated the four issues into the Lines of Inquiry it developed for the institution. These Lines of Inquiry covered the following six areas: mission and strategic plan, governance and decision-making, evaluation of faculty, institutional diversity, curricular quality and student success, and sustainability.

Team Process: The visiting team structured its visit to incorporate all of the institution’s physical campuses as well as its online programs. Before the main visit to Los Angeles, one team member visited the Irvine campus, two team members visited the Chicago campus, one team member visited the Washington, D.C. campus, and a final team member began a review of online programs. All five team members visited the Los Angeles campus and spent two full days reviewing documents and interacting with numerous constituent groups—from students, to staff, to faculty, to administrators, to Board members. The Los Angeles visit was organized according to the six Lines of Inquiry delineated in the paragraph above. The team members were ably assisted in their work by the WSCUC staff liaison.

The narrative which follows provides evidence and support for all of the various commendations and recommendations that appear in the final section of this report. The team was impressed with the quality and level of communication among various stakeholders at the institution and across its campuses. It was abundantly apparent to team members that, in spite of the complexities involved in communicating across a set of
camptuses spanning the continental United States, TCSPP has found a way to utilize the technology to facilitate the communication of information, the substantive discussion of important issues, and the implementation of a meaningful process of collaborative institutional governance.

**COMPONENT 2:**

**COMPLIANCE WITH THE STANDARDS AND WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS**

**Standard 1:** TCSPP's mission is published and widely available, and its purposes fall within recognized academic areas and disciplines. The School offers professional degrees in psychology and the behavioral and health sciences. Its educational objectives, as described by its Engaged Practitioner Model of Education, seek to transform students into professional change agents by a hands-on, practitioner-oriented, and evidence-based education that emphasizes community service and lasting positive community impact. The model is widely recognized throughout the institution and is consistent with stated purposes. TCSPP's publicly-stated core values of education, innovation, service, and community underpin and reinforce its mission (CFRs 1.1, 1.2).

The School has a published academic freedom policy and subscribes to the principles of academic freedom formulated by the American Association of University Professors for its teachers and its students. This policy is published in TCSPP’s Catalog under the section entitled “Students Rights and Responsibilities” (CFR 1.3).

TCSPP has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles described in the WSCUC Diversity Policy with its Diversity Statement and notably in its Diversity Institutional Learning Outcome, for which there appears to be strong evidence of student
learning throughout all programs. In terms of composition, the percentage of Underrepresented Minority (URM) students (African American, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Native American) has grown from 19.5% in fall 2009 to 37.5% in fall 2015. The student population is substantially female (80.2%). TCSPP employees (faculty and staff) are diverse. In spring 2016, 37% of employees identified as African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, or Pacific Islander.

TCSPP’s Diversity Plan is not a stand-alone comprehensive plan but a woven theme in the institution’s Strategic Plan, “Leading the Way to a Healthier World.” However, diversity is not one of the three explicit goals of the Strategic Plan, and the eighteen-page plan only uses the word “diversity” a few times. The visiting team recommends that TCSPP develop a comprehensive diversity plan, of which there are many good models, with measurable goals that address issues of composition, inclusion, engagement, and achievement across the university (CFR 1.4).

TCSPP operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy under an independent governing board. In its initial accreditation, the Commission asked for clarification of the relationship between TCSPP and TCS Education System, the consortium in which it is a member. TCSPP did demonstrate appropriate independence both in the documents that it provided and in its conversations with the visiting team. The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and the public at large. TCSPP treats students fairly and equitably through policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid (TCSPP Academic Catalog and Student Handbook) (CFRs 1.5, 1.6). Independent and qualified auditors regularly audit TCSPP’s
finances, with the most recent financial statements audited by McGladrey LLP. The visiting team directly experienced open and honest communication with WSCUC and found respect for WSCUC policies (CFRs 1.7, 1.8).

The team's finding is that The Chicago School of Professional Psychology has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 1.

**Standard 2:** TCSPP’s education programs focus exclusively on psychology and related disciplines. There are sufficient full-time faculty, with adjuncts who bring practical knowledge to their courses (CFR 2.1). There is an Academic Catalog and a Student Handbook with academic policies and procedures (CFR 2.2). There is only one undergraduate program which includes a General Education curriculum and is designed for returning to school adults (CFR 2.2). Graduate programs have clear learning outcomes based on curricular maps, preparing students for advanced professional careers (CFR 2.2b). Each program has learning outcomes and embedded course assignments (CFR 2.3). Faculty and staff from each campus collaborate on national committees to design new programs, learning outcomes, and assessment processes (CFR 2.4). If students need academic support, there are many resources. Students are challenged in the application of their learning in field work (CFR 2.5). All programs collect assessment data on learning outcomes that are considered annually and more comprehensively every three years (CFR 2.6, 2.7).

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology is primarily a teaching institution. There are current conversations among administrators and faculty regarding expectations and support for scholarship (CFR 2.8, 2.9). Data is collected on “time-to-program-completion” disaggregated by populations. Analysis has resulted in identification of
students who need support (CFR 2.10). In this primarily graduate, professional school, co-curricular programs are designed to support student success (CFR 2.11). The advising program has expanded and refocused to offer appropriate and timely intervention and support (CFR 2.12). The School offers a wide array of academic support, especially for dissertation research and writing (CFR 2.13). For undergraduate transfer students there is advising to complete the degree (CFR 2.14).

The team’s finding is that The Chicago School of Professional Psychology has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 2.

**Standard 3:** The review team heard directly from faculty members that they have a meaningful voice in institutional decisions. There has been significant improvement in this regard since the last team visit, most notably the development and successful implementation of the National Faculty Council, the Academic Affairs Leadership Council, and the local Faculty Councils. These three levels of shared governance provide meaningful participation at the programmatic level, the campus level, and the institution level. The team met with faculty members of all ranks, including those who were not elected members of any of these councils. They reported they were welcomed at campus meetings and could voice concerns with their campus council. Leaders of the various campus councils elect one of their own to serve on the National Council, where faculty workload, faculty development, and curricular and co-curricular matters are addressed (CFR 3.1). Each campus council has access to budget information, and the institution has a Budget Advisory Committee where faculty and staff members discuss institution budget priorities. This helps promote meaningful, clear, and collaborative institutional decision-making.
The institution employs a very successful practitioner scholar model, which allows students to learn the latest practices in the profession from part-time faculty members who are themselves practicing in the profession. According to institution leaders, it also means that many adjunct faculty are not interested in serving on institution committees. The chair of the National Faculty Council named two or three adjuncts who do participate in shared governance, but acknowledged that faculty meetings had not been held after hours and had not been designed to make it easy for part-time faculty members to participate. Given that 60 percent of the courses in some programs are taught by part-time faculty (according to the institution CAO), and that there are 161 full-time faculty members and more than 800 who are part-time, the team felt it important that the institution develop a more consistent and accessible way for part-time faculty to participate in shared governance (CFR 3.2, 3.3).

The Board of Trustees of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology is comprised of 11 members, including President Michele Nealon-Woods and Michael Horowitz, president of TCS Education System. TCSPP is a member of TCS ES, which is a nonprofit system of five colleges and nearly 7,000 students across 11 separate campus locations. While the non-profit System does not “own” the non-profit TCSPP, it is the “sole statutory member” and retains certain rights in the institution’s bylaws. The team met with 10 of TCSPP’s trustees, either online or in-person. Five of these trustees are also members of TCS ES Board of Trustees. Significant care is taken to insure the independence of TCSPP’s Board and of the institution, including the fact that the president of the institution is reviewed annually by TCSPP’s Board, the budget for TCSPP is developed and approved by TCSPP’s Board, and there are separate finance and audit committees. A Fiduciary Council, which is comprised of a subset of the System Board, endorses specified TCSPP Board
decisions. To date such endorsements have been pro forma, according to both the president of TCSPP and the president of TCS ES (CFR 3.9).

Given the complexity of TCSPP and given its various growth plans, the visiting team believes it would serve the institution well to review its Board of Trustee composition, size, diversity, and expertise to be an even greater asset to the institution. While the Board currently meets three times annually, each of seven committees meets nearly each month. These committee meetings tend to be held electronically, so they do not require travel. But the volunteer, non-compensated role of the trustees appeared to the visiting team to be a demanding one; and the structure did not seem like it was a “scalable” design, should the institution continue to grow as planned.

The team’s finding is that The Chicago School of Professional Psychology has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 3.

**Standard 4:** The visiting team found that TCSPP made good use of the WSCUC accreditation process over time to make significant improvements to its operations and service delivery. During the last review in 2011, the Commission lauded TCSPP leadership for guiding the institution through a “challenging transition into a multi-campus institution” and “for creating a culture of candor, mutual respect, and support for the institution’s mission.” The Commission also pointed to a number of areas for institutional attention: furthering the commitment to diversity, evaluating program review, defining scholarship, providing student services across sites, ensuring the sufficiency of faculty and staff, defining and clarifying organizational structures and governance, promoting faculty academic governance, and monitoring future growth.

It was evident to the visiting team that the institution has taken great strides to
address these areas of critical need as a result of the process of accreditation. A Blue-Ribbon Diversity Task Force established by the president has worked since the last review to establish a campus climate that promotes the value of diversity and that includes a professional development component managed through Human Resources to train diversity officers for each faculty search committee at the institution. Furthermore, there is a strong integration of cultural competency in the curriculum (CFR 1.5, 2.2a, 3.2, 4.5).

While annual assessment and program reviews remain a key feature for evaluating the quality, meaning, and integrity of degree programs at the institution, comprehensive program reviews are now conducted every three years, providing opportunity for reflection and implementation of structured interventions for program improvement (CFR 4.4, 4.7). Conversations with the chief academic officer, deans, department chairs, and the Faculty Development and Promotions Committee, and a meeting with over fifty faculty members from across the campuses, reveal a clear understanding of the institutional considerations for scholarship, which draws from Ernest Boyer’s model of scholarship and a “flex model.” The flex model requires of each faculty member the following: teaching, advising, and committee work, and makes optional two or three of the following: scholarship, administration, and service (to the institution, discipline, or community). While TCSPP has no tenure system, a system exists for both full-time and adjunct faculty to move from the rank of instructor to assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor at the institution (CFR 2.2b, 2.8, 2.9, 3.3).

In addition to the above, TCSPP’s National Center for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) has served as a model of best practices on innovative teaching, learning, and scholarship, provides professional development opportunities to faculty from across all campuses, and
includes a database of faculty scholarship at the institution that dates back from AY 2007-2008 to AY 2015-2016. The Center's Teaching Online Pedagogy and Standards (TOPS) course is an excellent example of a national model for preparing faculty for online teaching. TOPS is an intensive and rigorous eight-week, cutting edge, certificate program on online teaching methods; it is required for all faculty at the institution who teach at TCSPP’s Online Campus or any of its online courses.

The accreditation process has allowed the institution to strengthen support services to students. Drawing from a model of student support counselors for its Online Campus, TCSPP is now extending the same student support and advising model to students in on-ground programs. Altogether, the institution has hired 13 student support counselors serving some 4,200 students, six of them for the Online Campus, two for Los Angeles, four for Chicago, and one for Washington, D.C. The institution is now developing a training manual to guide student support counselors in their work.

In matters involving ensuring adequate faculty for all its campuses, defining and clarifying organizational structures and shared governance, and monitoring future growth, it was evident to the visiting team that the institution has also made great strides. This is also true in regard to putting in place a process through which new programs and new locations are fully vetted by TCSPP faculty, administration, and Board (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). The team found that the institution used the accreditation process as a meaningful, inquiry-based, self-assessment that included broad campus engagement and allowed the institution not only to tell its story but also to reflect on new and existing strategies and processes directed toward continual improvements in institutional quality.
The team’s finding is that The Chicago School of Professional Psychology has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard 4.

**COMPONENT 3: DEGREE PROGRAMS**

The “engaged practitioner model” (EPM) undergirds the meaning, quality, and integrity of all degree programs offered at TCSPPP. Tied to this model are four institutional values, education, innovation, service, and community. EPM is grounded in the following:

- alignment of Mission to Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs)
- alignment of ILOs to specific Program Learning Outcomes, as evidenced through an extensive and robust faculty-led assessment architecture at the institution coordinated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness
- a focus on the application of evidence-based scholarship in the preparation of faculty to teach at the institution, as shown through the work of the National Center for Teaching and Learning
- the periodic evaluation of faculty, evidenced through the institution's promotion and evaluation process, with guidance provided by the Faculty Development and Promotions Committee
- the teaching and training of students, evidenced through rigorous and innovative cultural competency integrated into the curriculum, and excellent support services, including advising and library services
- the delivery of outreach programs to domestic and international communities, as evidenced through clinical services offered at the Los Angeles and Chicago
campuses, and international engagements through faculty-led study abroad programs in such places as Peru and Rwanda (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.1, 2.2).

TCSPP is commended for the quality of its “engaged practitioner model” that so clearly guides curricular decisions, career choices, and future directions. The model assures that the university’s degrees are meaningful and of high quality and reinforces the critical connections that guide the meaning, quality, and integrity of degree programs offered at the institution.

In conversations with administration, members of the Board of Trustees, faculty, staff, and students, it was evident to the visiting team that the EPM core philosophy has guided curricular discourse, the recruitment and hiring of faculty at both the full-time and adjunct levels, and the delivery of support services to enhance student success. It was also clear to the team that the institution has invested resources in ensuring that there is a uniform understanding about a TCSPP degree, what the degree demands, and what it offers. This core philosophy about the interface of psychology and related disciplines with the larger society equally permeates TCSPP’s 2015-2020 Strategic Plan and defines the way the institution perceives its role in educating a new frontier of “engaged” experts and specialists for a changing world and how it communicates this role and its degrees to internal and external stakeholders.

Across TCSPP’s on-ground and online campuses, accountability mechanisms have been established to ensure ongoing assessment about the quality of student learning. Learning outcomes at all levels (institution, program, and general education) have been developed. A rigorous process of annual assessment for each degree program that includes the use of faculty-developed rubrics has also been put in place. Signature assignments and
experiential opportunities, including study abroad, are provided to measure student learning and program effectiveness and inform modifications to curricula. Faculty members collect and use data to inform curricular decisions. Outcomes of the assessments are published and documented in multiple locations, although the institution is making effort to streamline data tracking and documentation through TK20, a comprehensive data management system that allows students to be active online participants throughout their learning, and through a share-point Intranet system which was shown to the visiting team at the Los Angeles campus. However, neither tool has attained a uniform and comprehensive utilization across all campuses.

An Academic Effectiveness Committee also exists to review self-study reports for program reviews, although the use of external reviewers varies across programs. All degree programs are reviewed every three years. The self-study reports are developed to address program strengths and weaknesses and offer recommendations for continual improvement. Degree programs that have external accreditation also go through the program review process, although the expectations may vary depending on what gaps exist between the accreditation reports and the self-study requirements. In those instances, the program is required to provide the additional data for the self-study that may not have been required for the accreditation report.

The visiting team notes that the institution has been improving and streamlining the efficiency of the program review process, with the cooperation and collaboration of faculty, staff, and administration, including extending the timelines for the review to minimize undue burdens, while ensuring that the quality and integrity of degree programs are not compromised. It notes also the depth and breadth of the protocols in place at the
institution to ensure the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees from the institution, a depth and breadth understood, embraced, and appreciated by all campus constituents, including students, who met with the team (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4., 4.6).

**COMPONENT 4: EDUCATIONAL QUALITY**

According to interviews with administrators and faculty, appropriate individuals from each of TCSPP’s campuses participate on national committees to develop curriculum, learning outcomes, and assessment processes for all programs. Because of this collaboration, all programs across locations and modalities have the same curriculum, learning outcomes, and course-embedded assessments. Faculty in interviews were very positive about their experiences on those curriculum development teams that resulted in clear and appropriate standards and a sense of community across all settings. Institutional report appendices show evidence of training faculty and staff receive on program and course design and assessment (CFR 2.4). The institutional report states that learning outcomes for programs with accreditation standards adhere to learning goals of those accrediting organizations.

The School has one baccalaureate degree. According to the Academic Catalog and Student Handbook, students who enter the baccalaureate program in Psychology have a high school diploma, an associate’s degree, or another bachelor’s degree. Although the institutional report states that learning outcomes for this undergraduate program align with the five core competencies, the list of learning outcomes for this degree in the Handbook focus on research, critical thinking, and collaboration. Institutional report appendices give learning outcomes for this degree, but they are not aligned with the five
core competencies. The institutional report states that the core competencies are integrated into the new lower-division courses that began in spring 2016. At this time, the core competencies may be addressed in associate or bachelor’s degrees that students bring into the program, but they are not evident in the School’s learning outcomes. The School does collect data on student performance that are embedded in courses. These data are aggregated and reviewed annually and every three years. The alignment with core competencies is still in the development stages (CFR 2.2a).

The university is primarily a graduate school with certificates, master’s degrees, and doctoral degrees. Appendices show charts and tables for each program, with explicit learning outcomes consistent across all graduate programs. The institutional report states, and interviews with department chairs confirm, that there are regular reviews and feedback to faculty members about student performance and the need for adjustment to courses or for support to struggling students (CFR 2.5). Interviews and the institutional report confirm that, if there is variation, this is a function of state or accreditation requirements for each location. Appendix IV.F shows evidence of the director of educational effectiveness tracking alignment of syllabi in each program to ensure consistency across locations and modalities. There is a continual effort to identify areas to strengthen curriculum and support students.

Interviews with faculty and administrators confirmed that faculty collect student-learning outcomes based on the program learning outcomes of each program. In addition, the institutional report and interviews further explained that assessments from fieldwork are also collected. These data are uploaded by a variety of people and reviewed annually and every three years. Appendices show evidence that these reviews of data are used to
develop action plans for continuous improvement. Assessments of student performance result in several different outcomes. Faculty could decide that students’ performance is on target. Alternatively, the evaluations could result in requests for more support for students in specific programs or specific populations of students.

The Engaged Practitioner Model focuses on helping students apply theory to practice. Therefore, students’ knowledge and skills are assessed both in course-embedded assessments and as applied in fieldwork. Learning outcomes are present for both coursework and fieldwork. The institutional report states that, for each of these learning outcomes, there are signature assignments and assessment rubrics that align with the curriculum.

The Student Handbook and Academic Catalog list academic policies such as criteria for admission, credit hours, and graduation. The Handbook includes course requirements for each program. Interviews with administrators, staff, and faculty confirmed the institutional report statements regarding the practice of using multiple committees for input and feedback on academic standards (CFR 2.8, 2.9).

The process of input across all locations about all programs ensures quality through program development, curricular mapping, program review, and graduation auditing. The School collects data on graduation rates by location, gender, and ethnicity. Interviews offered examples of how these data were considered, especially as relating to achievement gaps to develop better support systems such as the new advising model (CFR 2.13). During multiple interviews, administrators and faculty highlighted the infusion of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to prepared graduates with cultural competence (CFR 1.4).
COMPONENT 5: STUDENT SUCCESS

The visiting team received a notebook of tables showing data on students’ time to degree completion and completion rate. Additionally, the data are disaggregated by location, modality, gender, and ethnicity, and also international students. The charts enable administrators and staff to identify programs, locations, or populations that differ in time and completion rate (CFR 2.12). These data are also included in TCSPP’s Annual Fact Book.

Interviews confirmed the institutional report statement that the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides programs with annual and three-year data for program reviews. Additionally, OIR will customize reports when requested. Currently, there are plans to develop a data warehouse.

The institutional report analyzed the patterns of retention for certificates, master’s and doctoral degrees. Graduation rates for master’s programs have remained stable at 67%, and the mean rate for doctoral graduation is 55%. An analysis did reveal that African American students complete at a lower rate than the other populations (master’s 58.1% and doctoral 39.4%). The institutional report states, and interviews confirm, that this observation led to the development of new interventions designed to support academic success (CFR 2.10). Since the institutional report states that students are most likely to leave during their first three semesters, interventions focus on the earliest point in the students’ experience.

TCSPP’s model is the “engaged practitioner.” Therefore, all programs have an applied or clinical component. The various campus deans spoke of their efforts to ensure appropriate training placements for all enrolled students. Students reported that the options regarding and access to local training sites have increased and improved. Data
collected by supervisors are integrated into program reviews. The institutional report states that faculty review training supervisor ratings of students’ proficiency. Also, feedback from students and supervisors has led to faculty improving training for site supervisors.

The institutional report included tables for additional measures of student success. Credential test pass rates are high for all programs. Employers also rate graduates in terms of professional behavior, professional practice, diversity, and scholarship. Ratings from employers were high (CFR 2.7).

Students are prepared for success based on the training model and the values of TCSPP. The School webpage provides a visible statement of mission, vision, and values (CFR 2.1). The Engaged Practitioner Model emphasizes integrating theory into hands-on experiences. The distinct values of the School include learning through community service, innovation, and preparation to be multiculturally and professionally proficient. Interviews confirmed that cultural competence is a key component of all course preparation.

Interviews also highlighted that different locations had very different racial and ethnic populations. This demographic information is being discussed in terms of student support and knowledge and skills for working with different populations. The institutional report highlights that student support is considered and tailored for each location, student population, and community. The report emphasizes a balance between national support and local presence. In addition, support may be proactive intervention. During interviews, faculty and staff shared that systems are in place to report student absences or issues so that advisors or faculty could quickly intervene.
Staff reported that Admissions, working with Student Affairs/Student Success, has also ramped up the advising from the first interaction with a robust orientation process. This orientation includes essential information about time management, technology, financial support, and career services. Further, new students learn how to get the information they need after the orientation. The institutional report states that each location has a student affairs coordinator who serves as the link between national resources and local support. The national support is through the student website “my.theChicagoSchool.edu” and an expanded 800-number dialing system. According to the institutional report, undergraduates work with an academic advisor to develop a “student success plan” and an academic schedule. Then, each semester, the plan and schedule are reviewed.

The institutional report described, and many interviews confirmed, that TCSPP uses online learning communities through the learning management system Canvas. The learning management system provides study resources and course-based materials with discussion boards and assignments. There are course designers that ensure that all models of learning are incorporated to support different learning styles. The ubiquitous GoToMeeting allows students to have “face-to-face” meetings with faculty and staff on their computers or devices. There are discussion facilitators on the learning management system separate from the course instructors to answer questions or offer support (CFR 2.12).

The institutional report shared plans for ongoing improvement. According to interviews, the “best practice” student support model offering enhanced and expanded student success support in TCSPP online programs was already being replicated in on-ground programs. Additionally, new admission procedures are already in place, with more
national support. TCSPP is developing a data warehouse to improve data collection and access. Attachment V.K showed evidence of the impact of increasing student engagement based on the new “student experience survey.” During interviews, several staff and administrators explained the move from satisfaction surveys to engagement surveys.

TCSPP is increasing its international student population and the support for these students. In interviews, faculty members shared their enthusiasm for international students and international programs. Peer groups offer mentoring to international students. Additionally, TCSPP has established a Diversity Advisory Board to consider how to promote success for international students and the increasingly diverse populations in each TCSPP location. The team commends this endeavor and recommends the development of a comprehensive diversity plan with measurable goals (CFR 1.4).

**COMPONENT 6: QUALITY ASSURANCE AND IMPROVEMENT**

Program reviews provide an opportunity for both reflective assessments and evidence-based planning, improvement, and strategic directions. While each program faculty has responsibility for conducting a review of its program, the review itself should, however, be subjected to a set of standards and principles of peer review, with national experts having appropriate professional experience from peer or aspirant institutions invited to serve as external reviewers. This is especially important for degree programs that have no external accreditation.

The preamble of TCSPP Strategic Plan 2015-2020 offers the following three pillars: “Be recognized as the preeminent university of professional psychology in the world;”
“Innovate the education in the profession of psychology for the future;” and “Advance psychology education through technological innovation and streamlined operations.” These three pillars are intended to strengthen the meaning, quality, and integrity of degree programs offered at the institution.

In addition, the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan requires a “state of the discipline” report to accompany each self-study beginning in 2017. These reports are expected to outline disciplinary direction, opportunities, and challenges for program sustainability. A “vital signs” scorecard conceived in 2008, and being updated by the Institutional Effectiveness Review Committee to include criteria for non-academic programs, will accompany each degree program “state of the discipline” report to identify programs needing additional institutional support (CFR 4.6).

The visiting team believes that, if the institution is to advance these pillars of the strategic plan and fully live out their true meaning, it should incorporate external voices with national experts to help it assess and evaluate the quality of its degree programs. External reviewers provide an opportunity for the institution to embrace a quality assurance mechanism that permits it to evaluate its programs against peer and/or aspirant institutions. Therefore, the team recommends that, for TCSPP to maintain and sustain the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degree programs, it should implement a systematic process of external review in its academic program review structure to include reviewers from peer or aspirant institutions. The process should include the use of multiple peer reviewers, who spend a day or two on campus, to do the following:

- Review a program self-study and evaluate the program’s progress in meeting its mission and goals in alignment with institutional mission and goals.
- Meet with faculty, staff, students, and appropriate campus leaders and stakeholders for conversations and analysis related to evidence provided in the self-study
- Evaluate alignment of goals and criteria with actual results and outcomes and offer recommendations through a formal process of continual improvement (CFR 2.7, 4.1).

In regard to overall assessment endeavors, it was evident to the visiting team that TCSPP has a rigorous, faculty-led, administration-supported, nationally-coordinated assessment regime in place that includes three major components: systematic alignment of program learning outcomes with institutional leaning outcomes; formative and summative measures of student progress over the course of their degree program; and annual review of program effectiveness and student learning outcomes to assure continual improvement in quality (CFR 4.1). All campuses, including the online campus, participate in assessment of student learning.

However, it was unclear in the institutional report and during team members’ visits to TCSPP’s multiple campuses how and where assessment data are stored and retrieved, and with what degree of efficiency. While the institution indicated that it had an Intranet system and Tk20, there did not appear to be a uniform understanding about these tools as the centralized assessment planning, management, and reporting system for TCSPP. In conversations with faculty and program chairs in Chicago and Los Angeles, it was evident that documentation of assessment data varied across programs and geographic locations. Some faculty utilized TK20 to collect student data; some stored their assessment data “in an excel file” in their offices; and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness noted that it maintained a share-point Intranet system for archiving some of the assessment data and
reports. The visiting team was unable to retrieve from this last-mentioned system the set of rubrics used by program faculty to assess student learning that should have been housed within the Tk20. The team was informed that those rubrics were kept by program chairs in their departments. In the event that the department chair were to leave the program, the faculty and the institution run the risk of losing valuable information on student learning.

The visiting team acknowledges the existence of commercial assessment planning, management, and reporting systems currently used by many institutions (e.g. Compliance Assist, TracDat, Strategic Planning Online-SPOL, WEAVE, etc.) to efficiently plan, manage, and report assessment information, including information on strategic planning and program reviews. As TCSPP grows in scale and geographic locations, managing student assessment data will become more complex; and a complex institution will require such investment and implementation in order to ensure efficiencies that advance the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degree programs. Therefore, the visiting team recommends that TCSPP implement a centralized online assessment planning, management, and reporting system across all of its programs, modalities, and locations (CFR 4.2).

**COMPONENT 7: SUSTAINABILITY**

TCSPP develops its budget from the operating unit up, thereby capturing the financial resource needs of faculty and staff in each annual plan. This insures that the priorities of the institution are properly aligned with the resources needed, so that student learning and success and educational effectiveness are supported and that other activities
that advance knowledge, develop human capital, and ensure that the institution can learn, adapt, and thrive are properly funded (CFR 3.4).

The annual plan is review by the Faculty Budget Committee and the President’s Cabinet, before it is presented to the Board of Trustees for approval. Actual performance compared to budget is reviewed monthly by campus deans and administrators and is reforecast three times per year in an attempt to ensure compliance and identify any insufficiently resourced project or program in the budget (CFR 3.1).

The institution has successfully met its budget, within small variance percentages, in the last three years and has had an impressive net revenue after expenses or net surplus on its statement of activities the last three years (CFR 3.4). It has substantial unrestricted cash and investments on-hand, primarily from annual surpluses, which gives the institution the highest composite score from the Department of Education and ensures long-term financial viability. The institution is financially stable, despite small declines in tuition revenue over the last three years, and its auditors have provided an unqualified opinion on its financials the last three years.

The financial management of the institution is handled by TCSPPP staff; but TCSPPP’s finance team shares the Financial, Human Resources, and Student Information System software and servers with TCS Education System. Currently, there is a vacancy in the CFO position, but there is a finance director from TCSES who acts as the institution CFO (CFR 3.8). TCSES is an efficient arrangement that allows the expensive software and hardware systems to be shared among the affiliate members of the System. The System helps TCSPPP employ best practices and learn from each of its component institutions (CFR 3.5). Similarly, the System provides marketing services to TCSPPP and its Admissions team. The
expensive marketing work is, therefore, spread across the System and provides a higher quality of marketing services than TCSPP could afford on its own.

Because of the System support, TCSPP is able to keep current with the rapidly changing higher education landscape, both in the academic programs it offers to its communities and in the tracking and effective use of the large amount of data produced by an institution the size of TCSPP. The System marketing team does analyses on the need for various programs in existing and potential communities, which are then provided to TCSPP leadership to consider for program and geographic expansion. This cooperative effort has led to the successful launch of programs in San Diego and program launches and teach-outs in Chicago. This ability to refine program offerings with market insight will help the institution grow and maintain long-term sustainability.

Given the dynamics of the rapidly changing higher education marketplace, the visiting team felt it important that the institution develop and fully implement infrastructures necessary for faculty governance, assessment, student services, and information technology to support anticipated institutional growth in programs, modalities, and locations. Additionally, although the institution has developed an initial advancement plan and hired a leader for this endeavor, the plan is just a start. For the institution to continue to fund the growth it plans, it must diversify its revenue streams (CFR 3.4). The team recommends develop of a comprehensive university advancement plan, with goals that are consistent with its current and future strategic plans, including roles in fund-raising for trustees and roles in grant writing for full and part-time faculty.
COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The visiting team commends The Chicago School of Professional Psychology for:

1. the quality and level of communication among various stakeholders at the institution and across its campuses. During the visit, the team witnessed evidence of effective and consistent communication and socialization of information to staff, faculty, and students, especially with the use of different technology and media platforms. Examples include, but are not limited to, the use of GotoMeeting, the president's monthly newsletter, the quarterly updates on the primary goals of the institution’s strategic plan, and the monthly budget manager meetings.

2. the use of the WSCUC accreditation review process to reflect on key institutional issues and to make significant improvements as necessary and appropriate. TCSPP has demonstrated its continued commitment to institutional learning and proactive forward thinking.

3. the use of an enhanced and expanded student success support architecture to improve student retention and degree completion. Particularly noteworthy is the adoption of best practices in student support from the university’s online programs to its face-to-face programs.

4. the Engaged Practitioner Model that guides curricular decisions, career choices, and future directions. The model assures that the university’s degrees are meaningful and of high quality and makes the critical connections to the WSCUC emphasis on the meaning, quality and integrity of degrees.

5. the significantly improved faculty governance system, including the National Faculty Council, the Academic Affairs Leadership Council, and the local Faculty
Councils, that promotes meaningful, clear, and collaborative institutional decision-making.

6. the increased diversity of TCSPP’s faculty and its student body as well as the successful integration of diversity learning and learning outcomes into its academic programs.

7. the further development and enhancement of the academic and academic support review processes in a collaborative endeavor involving faculty, staff, and administration.

The visiting team recommends that:

1. TCSPP further enhance its academic program review architecture by implementing a systematic process of external review with reviewers from peer or aspirant institutions.

2. the institution develop and implement a plan to integrate adjunct faculty into its governance structure in an appropriate and meaningful way.

3. TCSPP develop and implement a comprehensive university advancement plan with goals that are consistent with its current and future strategic plans.

4. the institution implement a centralized online assessment management system for collecting and documenting assessment information across all of its programs, modalities, and locations.

5. TCSPP develop a comprehensive diversity plan with measurable goals that address issues of composition, inclusion, engagement, and achievement across the university.
6. the university develop the necessary faculty governance, assessment, student services, and information technology infrastructures to support anticipated institutional growth in programs, modalities, and locations.

7. the Board of Trustees review its composition, size, diversity, and expertise to be an even greater asset to the institution as it looks forward to continued growth in an increasingly complex higher education environment.
### APPENDICES

#### A. FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

**1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on credit hour | Is this policy easily accessible? [X] YES [ ] NO  
Where is the policy located? Located in our Academic Catalogue [http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&navoid=4351#Credit_Hour](http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&navoid=4351#Credit_Hour)  
It is also noted and described in the master syllabus template  
[On-Ground Syllabus Template - .docx](On-Ground_Syllabus_Template.docx)  
[Online Syllabus Template.docx](Online_Syllabus_Template.docx)  
Comments: The credit hour is defined by degree level and the expectations for students for both on-ground and online courses. |
| 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)? [X] YES [ ] NO  
Does the institution adhere to this procedure? [X] YES [ ] NO  
Comments: Formal Program Modification process requires Department Chairs to review courses/syllabi and determine the appropriate credit hour assignments of courses as defined by internal credit hour definitions. New programs must also provide a curriculum map which outlines credit hour assignments after formal Program Investment Proposals are approved internally. Institutional review of academic programs occurs annually and then are compiled for the institutional triennial report. |
| Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet | Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? [X] YES [ ] NO  
Comments: Per the syllabus template:  
- **One credit hour** is equivalent to a minimum of 53 minutes of faculty instructional time per week (742 minutes or 12.4 hours in 14 weeks) plus out-of-class student preparation time as defined by degree level.  
- **Three credit hours** are equivalent to a minimum of 160 minutes (2.65 hours) of faculty instruction time per week (2226 minutes or 37 hours in 14 weeks) plus out of class student preparation time as defined by degree level. |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses  
*Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.* | How many syllabi were reviewed? four  
What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? On-ground and on-line  
What degree level(s)? GE, undergrad, masters, and doctoral levels  
What discipline(s)? psychology and research  
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  
Comments: All programs and at all degree levels have a course in Canvas and each program has a
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal regulations** | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  
✓ YES ☐ NO  
Comments:  
http://www.thechicagoschool.edu/consumer-disclosures/
http://www.thechicagoschool.edu/psychology-programs/
http://www.thechicagoschool.edu/admissions/ |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  
✓ YES ☐ NO  
Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  
✓ YES ☐ NO  
Comments:  
Program Finder on website- Search by Location, Degree and Education level  
http://www.thechicagoschool.edu/Home/Program_Finder  
Example program:  
http://www.thechicagoschool.edu/chicago/programs/ma-counseling-psychology-latino-mental-health/  
Program time to Completion is listed below location |
Program Slick:

Program time to completion is listed
https://tcsedsystem.sharepoint.com/sites/tcspp/marketing/Pages/programslicks.aspx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Careers and employment</th>
<th>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? ☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: Employment outcomes from alumni self-reported from July 18, 2016 and closed on August 14, 2016.
https://my.thechicagoschool.edu/community/studentresources/careerservices/Pages/Employment.aspx

Program Slicks:
Career outcomes are listed in the program slicks.
https://tcsedsystem.sharepoint.com/sites/tcspp/marketing/Pages/programslicks.aspx

*§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.

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

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on student complaints</td>
<td>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? ☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is published in the Chicago School of Professional Psychology catalog, URL is <a href="http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&amp;navoid=4353&amp;hl=complaint&amp;returnto=search#student-complaints">http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&amp;navoid=4353&amp;hl=complaint&amp;returnto=search#student-complaints</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The Chicago School of Professional Psychology has internal and external complaints policies for student complaints and a Grievance Procedure.

For Internal Complaint
A complaint is a concern presented by a student whereby the student can show disadvantage or unfair treatment as a result of the action or inaction of a TCSPS faculty or staff member in conjunction with school policy or customary practices. Complaints fall into two categories: formal and informal. Informal complaints are verbal or written concerns directed to a department with which a student is dissatisfied, and the complaint is resolved within that department.

Formal complaints consist of a concern or formal charge of dissatisfaction with a service, facility, or process that requires clarification, investigation, and/or resolution. These complaints must be in writing and must clearly identify and directly involve the student raising the concern or charge. These complaints may not include the following:

- Comments or suggestions on the content or quality of services that do not arise from a specific act or incident and/or where a student cannot show disadvantage or unfair treatment;
- Comments about the general content or provision of a course or program;
- Allegations of misconduct or inappropriate behavior by students; and
- Matters of academic performance.

For External Complaint
A student is expected to follow the internal complaint procedures before complaining to an external agency. A student who utilized the internal procedure and who is not satisfied with the outcome may wish to raise the issue with the relevant state licensing agency under which the institution operates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State*</th>
<th>Agency Name &amp; Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alabama | Alabama Commission on Higher Education  
http://www.ache.alabama.gov/  
Alabama Department of Postsecondary Education  
https://www.accs.cc/index.cfm/school-licensure/complaints/ |
| California | California Bureau of Private Postsecondary Education  
http://www.bppe.ca.gov/enforcement/complaint.shtml |
| Illinois | Illinois Board of Higher Education  
http://www.ibhe.state.il.us/consumerinfo/complaint.htm |
| Kansas | Kansas Board of Regents  
http://www.kansasregents.org/academic_affairs/private_out_of_state/complaint_process |
| Maryland | Maryland Higher Education Commission  
http://mhec.maryland.gov/institutions_training/Pages/career/ps_career.cfm |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Office/Department</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Minnesota Office of Higher Education</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohe.state.mn.us/mPg.cfm?pageID=1078">http://www.ohe.state.mn.us/mPg.cfm?pageID=1078</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>New Mexico Higher Education Department</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hed.state.nm.us/students/complaints.aspx">http://www.hed.state.nm.us/students/complaints.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin Educational Approval Board</td>
<td><a href="http://eab.state.wi.us/resources/complaint.asp">http://eab.state.wi.us/resources/complaint.asp</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The student is advised to find the state of residence. If the state of residence is not listed, the state in which the home campus is located should be selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process(es)/ procedure</th>
<th>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, please describe briefly:

To submit a formal complaint, a student must write to a representative directly associated with the service, facility, or process being questioned. The individual who receives the complaint will work to resolve the complaint or forward the complaint to the appropriate department for resolution. The Campus Student Affairs Officer tracks formal complaints and reports activity to the Campus President or Dean on a monthly basis.

Grievance Procedure
The Chicago School of Professional Psychology is committed to mutual respect and the effective resolution of student problems and complaints through an efficient and fair procedure. The institution seeks to maintain an environment that encourages students, faculty, staff, and administration to work together to understand and address concerns about fair treatment using informal resolution. When that is not possible, TCSPP is committed to a fair and reasonable resolution of issues through a formal grievance process as outlined below.

When Should a Student Grievance Be Pursued?

A student is expected to follow the grievance procedures before seeking an external remedy. This procedure may be used whenever a student believes that rights have been violated by a member of the school community, including when a student believes to have suffered adverse effects caused by decisions or actions that were made by employees or agents of the school, for example:

- Violation of a duly adopted school policy, excluding the outcome of a disciplinary decision or assignment of a letter grade for which the student is seeking an appeal (see Appeal of Disciplinary Decisions and Grade Appeal Process, respectively);
illegal discrimination under any federal, state, local law; or,
• Unethical conduct according to professional standards.

An action or decision is grievable only if it involves a misapplication or misinterpretation of school policy, regulation, or rule, or a violation of state or federal law. This procedure may not be used to challenge policies or procedures of general applicability, including the following:

• The substance of any duly adopted policy or procedure;
• The substance that forms the basis for student performance evaluation or grade for a course or practicum/internship or for independent academic work under the supervision of a school faculty member or in the formation of an Academic Development Plan; or
• A decision regarding a student’s academic status made by a duly designated administrative officer, or by the school committee charged with reviewing student evaluations/grades.

Who May Pursue a Grievance?

The Grievance Procedure may be used by a student who is currently enrolled at the school, or who was participating in a TCSPP-sponsored educational event at the time of the incident being grieved.

The person filing the grievance must be the alleged victim of unfair treatment. A grievance may not be filed on behalf of another person.

Time Limits

A grievance must be received no later than forty-five (45) calendar days after the student first became aware of the facts which gave rise to the grievance. The formal resolution process must be initiated within sixty (60) days of the decision, action, or events giving rise to the grievance. This time limit may be extended by the Dean of Academic Affairs if the individual initiating the Grievance Procedure requests an extension within the 60-day period for good cause shown (e.g. an active effort at informal resolution, death in the family, etc.).

Informal Resolution

Prior to invoking the formal resolution procedures described below, the student is strongly encouraged, but is not required, to make active efforts to resolve matters through professional and direct discussions with the person or persons directly involved. These efforts should take place as soon as the student first becomes aware of the act or condition that is the basis of the grievance. If unsure of how to proceed, a student may enlist the assistance of another member of the school community (advisor, Department Chair/Lead Faculty or designee, Campus Student Affairs Officer) to help identify proper courses of action and/or to mediate problems if necessary. A student has the right to end this informal process at any time and move to the formal stage of the grievance process as desired.

Informal resolution should be considered for all situations excluding sexual harassment or sexual violence. In cases involving allegations of sexual harassment or sexual violence, mediation is not appropriate even on a voluntary basis.

Formal Resolution

Since this procedure is an institutional process, not judicial, the presence of legal counsel, whether in person or virtual, is prohibited for any party of the grievance. This policy is not to be used in substitution for other appeal processes.

A. Initial Review
### Step 1
The submission of the **Grievance Intake Form** and supporting documentation is used to invoke the formal resolution process. A student must submit all documentation to the Dean of Academic Affairs for the student’s home campus. The grievance filing must include a completed intake form and:

- Be in writing;
- State how the decision or action is unfair and harmful to the student and list the school policies or state or federal laws that have been violated, if known;
- Name the person(s) against whom the grievance is filed;
- State how the person(s) against whom the grievance is filed are responsible for the action or decision; and
- State the requested remedy.

### Step 2
Upon receipt of the written grievance, the Dean of Academic Affairs will determine whether the matter is grievable in accordance with the criteria set forth in this policy. If the matter is deemed not grievable per school policy, it will be dismissed and a letter will be submitted to the student initiating the grievance stating the same. If the matter is deemed grievable per school policy, the Dean of Academic Affairs will appoint an ad hoc committee of two faculty members and one student to investigate the situation by gathering additional information from appropriate members of the campus community. The Dean of Academic Affairs will designate one of the faculty members as chairperson of the ad hoc committee. The chairperson will have the right to vote. At any time during the investigation of the grievance, the Dean of Academic Affairs and ad hoc committee may make further attempts to resolve the grievance informally.

The ad hoc committee chair will send a copy of the grievance to the parties listed as having committed an alleged violation (“respondent”) within ten (10) business days of being appointed, giving the respondent(s) ten (10) business days to submit to the chair a written response to the allegations and any exhibits they wish to introduce as evidence. The chair will concurrently inform the student pursuing the grievance of the student’s right to, within ten (10) business days, submit to the chair copies of any exhibits the student wishes to introduce as evidence. The chair may extend the deadlines for submitting a response and for exchanging proposed exhibits upon a showing of good cause.

If the student who has brought the grievance has good cause to believe that a given member of the ad hoc committee is unable to be impartial, the student may request that the Dean of Academic Affairs disqualify that member. Such a disqualification shall be granted only upon the demonstration of sufficient reason. The decision to alter or preserve the composition of the ad hoc committee rests solely with the Dean of Academic Affairs and is final.

### Step 3
In performing its functions, the ad hoc committee will have the right to call any witnesses and to require the introduction of any relevant data or information. The ad hoc committee will be the final judge of what testimony or data is relevant. While the presence of an attorney is prohibited, a student may have a member of the school community present during the hearing to provide advice and support. All deliberations of the ad hoc committee are confidential.

### Step 4
Once all fact finding, questioning, and presentations are complete, the committee will deliberate to evaluate the merits of the grievance and make findings of fact. Such deliberations are restricted to members of the committee. The committee’s decision must be based solely on material presented in the grievance. A majority vote
of the ad hoc committee is required to make an affirmative decision on the grievance.

 Upon reaching a conclusion, the ad hoc committee will communicate its findings in writing to the student bringing the grievance, the respondent(s), the Dean of Academic Affairs, and to the appropriate institutional individual(s) who shall implement the actions, if any, recommended by the ad hoc committee within thirty (30) calendar days after the hearing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The institution does adhere to this procedure by providing an appeal process for the students. Within ten (10) business days of receipt of the committee’s decision, a student who is not satisfied with the decision of the committee may seek further review by submitting the written notice of appeal, together with the committee’s written decision, to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Written notice of appeal must be signed and dated by the student and provide a brief statement of the grounds for appeal, which should contain a list of alleged errors in the decision or decision-making process and indicate what remedy is requested. Appeals received more than ten (10) business days after the committee’s decision was rendered will not be considered.

The action of the Vice President of Academic Affairs will be limited to a review of the basis for the committee’s decision. The Vice President of Academic Affairs will render a decision based on review of the grievance record and the written notice of appeal. There is no right to a hearing or oral presentation in appeals. The Vice President of Academic Affairs may delegate another administrator to act on his/her behalf.

Within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of the request for review, the Vice President of Academic Affairs will submit a decision in writing to the student and to the person alleged to have caused the grievance. The written disposition shall include the reasons for the decision, and it shall direct a remedy for the aggrieved student, if any. The decision on the appeal is final and will not be subject to further review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, where?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chair of the ad hoc committee will compile an official record of the proceeding that includes a copy of all correspondence with the parties, all evidence submitted to the committee, a summary of the committee’s decision, and anything else considered by the committee in reaching its determination. The chair of the committee will be responsible for ensuring that a written report is prepared that addresses and resolves all material factual issues in dispute, that states a conclusion as to whether the student was subjected to misapplication or misinterpretation of school policy or state or federal law, and if so recommends remedies as appropriate. The report and official record will be kept in the student’s record.

All grievance procedures and records are confidential in nature and will be treated accordingly. A copy of the grievance, any decision of the committee, and any decision of the Vice President of Academic Affairs will be retained for seven (7) full calendar years following the year in which the grievance is resolved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, please describe briefly:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Department of Student Affairs maintain a log to track and monitor student complaint information and their decision for the institution to study patterns of complaints to determine where improvements can be made or processes might be appropriate. The Campus Student Affairs Officer tracks formal complaints and reports activity to the Campus President or Dean on a monthly basis.

Comments:

*§602-16(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<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>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? Yes/No  
If so, is the policy publicly available? Yes/No  
If so, where? |
| | Yes, This policy is published in the Chicago School of Profession Psychology catalog. URL is [http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&navoid=4351&hl=transfer+policy&returnto=search#transfer-of-credit-waiver-of-courses](http://catalog.thechicagoschool.edu/content.php?catoid=67&navoid=4351&hl=transfer+policy&returnto=search#transfer-of-credit-waiver-of-courses) |
| | 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? Yes/No  
For Undergraduate Programs: Transfer of credit is subject to the following conditions: |
| | 1. Transferred course credit is restricted to undergraduate-level coursework with direct applicability to courses in the program curriculum. Credit must have been earned at a recognized, regionally accredited degree-granting institution. All credit falling outside these requirements will not be counted toward a degree.  
2. Students who have credit from with multiple institutions considered for transfer must supply TCSPP with an official transcript from each institution. TCSPP does not accept third party evaluations for these purposes.  
3. Only courses for which a student has received a letter grade of a “C” (2.0 on a 4.0 grade scale) or higher will be accepted for transfer. Pass/Fail courses are eligible only if a “Pass” grade can be shown to be a C (2.0) or higher. Credit/No Credit courses will not be reviewed for transfer credit. |
4. All courses are required to be collegiate level, degree applicable and not designated as developmental or remedial in nature. Also, courses that are vocational or technical in nature and/or prepare students for the workforce, including but not limited to areas in welding, machinery, automotive repair, technical writing, typing, and workforce development, will not be considered for transfer credit in any area of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology’s undergraduate degree programs.

5. Course-to-course equivalency matches require an 80% content match and require the student to produce a course syllabus for transfer of credit to be applied.

6. The number of credits earned for the completed course must equal or exceed the number of credit hours for the requested course. For example, a 3 semester hour course equals 4.5 quarter hours of credit.

7. A student entering a BA completion program is required to have a minimum of 48 semester hours of transfer credit posted to the academic record prior to the end of the Add/Drop period. A student who fails to meet this requirement will be administratively withdrawn from the institution. A student who wishes to request additional transfer of credit (up to 30 semester hours) is required to have completing the transfer credit evaluation and posting process by the end of the first academic year with the institution.

8. The Chicago School of Professional Psychology does not recognize other institutions’ credit by exam, proficiency, or challenge exams for credit towards a degree program. Only nationally recognized exams approved by the institution and outlined below are accepted. Students may take these exams only once.

9. When credit through examination is awarded, it is not factored into the grade-point average.

A course that does not meet the specific content requirements of an existing TCSPP course may be accepted for transfer credit as an elective if the course supports the required competencies and learning objectives of the program and meets the following conditions:

1. The course must meet all other requirements for transfer credit.
2. The course must be at the equivalent degree level.
3. The course cannot duplicate other successfully completed requirements.

In order for the transfer request to be processed, the student must submit an official transcript upon acceptance into The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. Unofficial transcripts may be used for review prior to enrollment at TCSPP; however a student who has a financial hold at the transferring institution will not be eligible for a transcript review by TCSPP.

An official transcript is one that has been received directly by The Chicago School of Professional Psychology from the issuing institution, whether on paper or certified electronic copy. A student who submits a hard copy of an official transcript directly to TCSPP for review must provide it in a stamped, sealed envelope from the issuing institution’s Office of the Registrar. All transcripts must include the college seal (embossed or raised for mailed transcripts), date and Registrar’s signature. Any transcripts not meeting the above requirements or not marked official will not be accepted by TCSPP for official review.

For Graduate Programs:
Transfer of credit is subject to the following conditions:

1. Transferred course credit is restricted to graduate-level courses from a recognized, regionally-accredited degree granting institution. All credit falling outside these requirements will not be accepted.
2. Completed course matches 80% of the content of the requested course.
3. Number of credits earned for the completed course matches or exceeds number of
   credit hours for the requested course.
4. Transfer of credit is not granted for practicum or internship.
5. Transfer of credit is granted only for courses in which the grade earned was a “B” or
   higher. Pass/Fail or Credit/No Credit courses are ineligible.
6. No credit will be transferred for coursework that is more than ten (10) years old.
7. All coursework being submitted for transfer credit evaluation must have been
   completed prior to matriculation into TSCPP.
8. Internal transfers do not pay the transfer course fee.

The student will be charged a transfer of credit fee for each credit hour of transfer credit
awarded. Please reference the current schedule of tuition and fees for transfer of credit fee
information.

A course that does not meet the specific content requirements of an existing TCSPP elective
course may be accepted as transfer credit as an elective if the course supports the required
competencies and learning objectives of the program and meets the following conditions:

1. The course must meet all other requirements for transfer credit.
2. The course must be at the equivalent degree level.
3. The course is documented as approved by the Department Chair/Lead Faculty as
   transfer credit and documentation of this approval is required.

Certificate programs typically do not allow waiver or transfer of course credit.

Requests for academic credit transfers or waivers are evaluated by the Department Chair/Lead
Faculty, the departmental admissions committee or an appropriate departmental faculty
member depending upon the subject matter of the transfer course(s) requested for transfer.
The critical factor considered for transfers and waivers is the alignment of the requested course
and the performance in it with the content in the comparable course(s) at TCSPP.

Study abroad courses offered at The Chicago School of Professional Psychology may be used to
satisfy an elective requirement in an academic program. The student must obtain written
certification from the Department Chair/Lead Faculty that a study abroad course will count
 toward the fulfillment of degree requirements prior to their registration in the course. Should
an academic program approve the use of the study abroad course to fulfill an elective
requirement, a student must submit to the Office of the Registrar a signed Transfer/Waiver of
Credit Form bearing the Department Chair/Lead Faculty’s signature to the Office of the
Registrar.

Comments:
Yes, the Chicago School of Professional Psychology has a policy for receiving transfer credit on
undergraduate and graduate programs.

For Undergraduate Programs:
A student wishing to enter an undergraduate program at The Chicago School of Professional
Psychology is required to submit an official transcript to the Office of the Registrar. A student
who is granted transfer of credit after the Add/Drop deadline due to late submission will be
held to the school’s refund schedule and be financially responsible for any charged incurred.

The decision to accept transfer credit resides solely with the school. Approved transfer credit
will be posted to a student’s transcript after the student has registered and remained in
residence through the Add/Drop deadline. Submitted transfer credit paperwork will be held for
processing until the completion of the first week of the semester. All new students register during the same designated period regardless of transfer credit. Transfer credit may affect registration eligibility in subsequent terms.

For Graduate Programs:
A student wishing to petition for transfer of credit for coursework completed at another accredited institution or program offered at TCSP is required to submit a Petition for Transfer/Waiver of Credit to the Office of the Registrar for each course, along with course syllabi and official transcripts documenting the grade received in the course. The student is responsible for ensuring that all required documentation noted on the petition is submitted for courses taken either at TCSP or another institution. A student who is granted transfer of credit after the Add/Drop deadline due to late submittal will be held to the school's refund schedule for any courses dropped due to credits being transferred or waived.

The decision to accept transfer credit rests solely with the school. The school reserves the right to require satisfactory performance on an examination before awarding transfer of credit. Satisfactory completion of a competency examination may be required before transfer of credit is awarded when the course in question has been taken more than five years prior to admission.

Approved transfer credit will be posted to the student’s transcript after the student has registered and remained in residence through the Add/Drop deadline. Submitted transfer credit paperwork will be held for processing until the first week of the semester has been completed. Approved transfer credit will not be factored into a new student’s registration time. All new students register during the same designated period regardless of transfer credit. Transfer credit may affect registration eligibility in subsequent terms.

International Student Transfer Credit Policy

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology accepts academic credit earned at international institutions that are fully accredited by a country’s Ministry of Education or accredited by the United States Department of Education, but only if the courses meet TCSP’s transfer credit policies. International students are subject to all transfer credit policies as well as the following process:

An applicant with a college transcript in a language other than English must submit a certified translation of the transcript and must have the academic grades evaluated for grading equivalency by a certified service. The evaluation should include a course title, credit or semester hours completed, and the letter grade earned for each course. Transcripts submitted without translation or the detailed evaluation will not be reviewed by TCSP.

A prospective international student of TCSP is encouraged to have the international transcript(s) reviewed and evaluated by a service affiliated by the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services, or NACES (http://www.naces.org/members.htm/) or the Association of International Credential Evaluators, Inc., or AICES (http://www.aice-eval.org/).

All services provide evaluation and/or translation of foreign documentation and require a fee. All fees associated with this process are the responsibility of the applicant. It is highly recommended that one of these options be used to ensure proper document evaluation and translation.

---

*§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.

B. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology  
Campus: Irvine  
WASC Team member: Mark Goor  
Site visit: February 23, 2017

1. How does the institution conceive of this off-campus site?

The Irvine Campus is considered a stand-alone site that is part of the TCSPP system. This stand-alone campus is served by many TCSPP system-wide resources such as technology, admissions processes, and policy development. Members of the Irvine Campus serve on national committees and collaborate with colleagues from all campuses to ensure that programs have the same curriculum, assessment and procedures. Administrators are in continuous contact with the main campus. Faculty commented that they have sent suggestions to the main campus and received supportive responses that encouraged new ideas.

2. How visible is the institution at this site?

TCSPP is a “brand” that has meaning to faculty, students and administrators. Faculty and deans talked about how the name has been accepted in the local community as a standard for quality and a way of serving the region. The logo is present on all materials and all signs. Faculty and administrators have both a local and a TCSPP identity.

3. How does the physical environment foster learning?

In 2014, the campus moved to its current 4,500 square-foot space of classrooms and offices on one-floor. This contiguous location has modern classrooms with built-in technology and natural lighting. Faculty and students commented that the desk and chairs allow for multiple configurations that enhance teaching and
learning. This one-floor location allows students to go to class, meet with advisors, and get the help they need to solve problems.

4. How is the site managed?

There is a campus dean and facilities coordinator at this location with key personnel in charge of technology, library services, and other services. The campus dean works closely with the dean of academic services so that facilities and academics inform each other.

5. What student services are available (counseling, computer, library, etc.)?

At this one-floor location, there are offices for admissions, financial aid, and a general service front desk. There is a computer lab and an upgraded Wi-Fi system. The library is primarily online. There are a couple of book cases that hold loaner textbooks and books requested from library loans. Some students find the online resources quite sufficient while others wanted an on-site library. UCI offers TCSPP students access to their library which is a short walk from TCSPP Irvine campus. Writing support is available on line for both courses and dissertations.

6. Who teaches and how does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty contribute to the institution?

The full-time faculty are all included in national meetings and have regular communication with colleagues within disciplines. Faculty stated that they contribute to the development of curriculum and assessment. There is an established on-boarding process for new full-time and part-time faculty. The majority of courses are taught by adjunct faculty. Department chairs stated that most adjuncts have been with TCSPP for years and know the curriculum and have good working relationships with the full-time faculty. There are full-time course “custodians” who share syllabi, assessments, and requirements with new faculty.

7. How is curriculum designed, approved, and evaluated? Are there differences at this site?

The curriculum for each program is developed by representatives of each location in each specific program nationwide. The curriculum is the same no matter where the program is offered. Programs offerings vary by location. There is some variation in California from other locations. LA and Irvine offer similar programs.
such as the MFT and applied clinical psychology programs. However, Irvine does not offer clinical psychology and business psychology.

8. What retention and graduation data are available for the site? How does it compare to other settings?

The ALO shared data that compared year-to-year persistence and graduation rates of 4 campuses and online programs from fall 2011 to fall 2014. The Irvine campus year-to-year persistence rate is highest. Their 5-year graduation rate is 61.9%, equivalent to LA and slightly lower than Chicago.

9. How does the site assess student learning? What are the results?

There is a very thorough annual review process that collects student data for each program. Average scores on each signature assignment are compiled and presented in a notebook. Each program presents recommendations and accomplishments for each year. However, these results are not made visible to the public.

10. What quality assurance processes are in place for the off-campus site?

There are annual program reviews and many satisfaction surveys from students. The campus, in coordination with Human Resources, ensures that HR-required trainings are held, and the dean of academic affairs ensures that new faculty receive sufficient on-boarding.

Institution: The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
Campus: Washington, D.C.
Name of reviewer/s: Richard Giardina
Date/s of review: February 6, 2017

1. Site Name and Address The Chicago School of Professional Psychology
   Washington D.C. Campus

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)

   6 programs; 6 master’s degrees’ 6 doctoral degrees
   Site is in its seventh year
   370 students; 14 FTE faculty
Branch campus standalone location

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

Met with Admissions and Student Affairs staff, Librarian, writing specialists, and Facilities and IT representatives. Also, the chairs of the six programs and the campus and academic dean and staff. Separate meeting with faculty and with students. Examined faculty complement and student enrollments and retention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For a recently approved site. Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>Site is integral to mission and structure of the School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to the Institution. 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)</td>
<td>Presence of the School is deep and visible. Campus programs are integrated with programs nationally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Learning Site. 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)</td>
<td>Outstanding learning site with excellent facilities and support services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Support Services. 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)</td>
<td>Great support services with significant assessment of effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Faculty.** 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 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)

At least one FT faculty per program but not necessarily one FT faculty per degree. Campus faculty are well integrated with faculty nationally.

**Curriculum and Delivery.** 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)

All program curricula and courses are developed by all program faculty nationally, with common syllabi and assessment protocols.

**Retention and Graduation.** 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)

Variable retention rates across programs from the 50s% to the 80s%. D.C. campus beginning to address disparities. Campus too young for much graduation data.

**Student Learning.** 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)

Student learning assessment the same across all campuses of TCSP. Common rubrics and protocols and signature assignments used.

**Quality Assurance Processes:** 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)

Excellent academic program review process. Process for reviewing academic support entities in formative stage.

---

**WASC Site Visit**  
The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (Chicago Campus)  
Thursday, March 2 and Friday, March 3, 2017
Two team members conducted the site visit to Chicago for the purpose of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (TCSPP) reaffirmation of accreditation. Team members were:

- Peter O. Nwosu, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Clark Atlanta University
- Randy Frisch, President, City University of Seattle, an affiliate of the National University System

Team members were guided by the lines of inquiry developed during the planning meeting of the Accrediting Team held in Alameda, California, in November 2016, and the set of questions developed for the off-site visit. The visit to the Chicago campus lasted two days, and included meetings with campus administration, staff, faculty, and students. Among those who participated in these meetings were Deans, Program Chairs, Department Managers, Chief Academic Officer, Chief Operating Officer, Associate Provost, Academic Program Development, Review and Online Synergy; and the Associate Provost for Academic and Dissertation Excellence, Senior Director of Admissions, Director of Community Partnerships, Associate Vice President for IT, Director of Business Operations, Director of Teaching and Learning, Chair, Faculty Development and Promotion Committee, Campus Registrar, Director, Educational Effectiveness, and the ALO. Team members also were taken on a tour of the Chicago campus facility, which included visits to smart classrooms, the Latino/a Mental Health Center, the National Center for Teaching and Learning, the Library, the National Center for Academic and Dissertation Excellence, and the Forensic Center, which also houses the graduate program in Forensic Psychology. All in all, it was a very fruitful and enriching experience.

1. **How does the institution conceive of this off-campus site?**

The campus prides itself as an innovator and one of the largest psychology programs in the area, and boasts of a network of agencies and community-based resources that support graduate education in psychology and behavioral sciences at the masters, doctoral, and certificate level. Faculty members see themselves as active practitioners and leaders, and the concept of the engaged-practitioner is drawn from this faculty of themselves and the role of psychology in human development in a changing and evolving multicultural world. Faculty, administrators, staff, and students see themselves as part of a system, and spoke of ways in which they continuously work together to advance the school’s learning agenda. They also spoke of their affiliation with TCS Education System, which provides common support services to advance this agenda.

2. **How visible is the institution at this site?**

The Chicago campus is the first campus of the TCSP. Founded in 1979, the campus is located in the heart of downtown Chicago, overlooking the Chicago River, and just a few blocks away from the famous Lake Michigan, the Magnificent Mile district, and many popular attractions. There is no question that the campus is a local staple in the Chicago area, and faculty, staff, students, and administration shared a pride in their brand identity and central location, which provides ease of access to potential students in the Chicago area. The two buildings visited by team members had the institution’s logo visibly displayed.
3. How does the physical environment foster learning?

The Chicago campus is housed in a downtown location on 325 N. Wells Street, which the institution has occupied since 2004. The institution had occupied three different locations since 1979. The building houses administrative, faculty, and staff offices, conference rooms, as well as smart classrooms, with moveable desks and chairs. The smart classrooms with built-in technology such as laptops and Go-To-Meeting capability allow faculty, staff, administrators, and students from multiple sites to interact and hold classes and meetings in a clearly efficient manner. Students from different parts of the world and time zones are also able to communicate with faculty and advisors. Academic and student success offices have worked together to host training sessions and activities that support both curricular and co-curricular learning and engagement. We saw evidence of students accessing print resources from the Chicago library and we learned that they can also do so with other TCSPP campus libraries and online resources with the help of the librarian. It was evident that the school had mastered the ability to infuse technology so efficiently to foster and maximize learning. In 2007, the campus expanded to include new space to house the Forensic program. This new space is in the historic Merchandise Mart, across from the 325 N. Wells location.

4. How is the site managed?

We met with the Director of Business Operations (Lee Russell-Brown), and the Lead Facilities Coordinator (Christine Jabczynski), and the Facilities Assistant (Jackie Hudson-Brown), who manage the Chicago campus, in coordination with the Campus Dean (Tiffany Masson), the Dean of Academic Affairs (Luke Mudd), and other key personnel. Support services such as IT are provided through TCS Education System.

5. What student services are available (counseling, computer, library, etc)?

Several services are provided at the Chicago campus: library, admissions, advising, financial aid, writing support through the dissertation center, office of community partnerships, campus life programming office, student abroad office, and an IT help desk. There is also a front office desk that helps guide students to campus resources. In our meeting with students, they did express the need to have a student government association to serve as a voice for students needs on campus. A number of international students did express a need for scholarship/financial aid support to augment their tuition at the institution.

6. Who teaches and how does the institution ensure that the off-campus faculty contribute to the institution?

The campus has made efforts to include all faculty contributions to the institution. National meetings through the use of Go-to-Meeting have taken place to focus on promotion and development, assessment of student learning, and teaching and learning. The institution has spent considerable efforts to improve innovative teaching and scholarship through its National Center for Teaching and Learning (NCTL). The center, housed at the Chicago campus, provides professional development opportunities to faculty from across all campuses, and includes a database of faculty scholarship at the institution that dates back from AY 2007-2008 to AY
2015-2016. The center’s Teaching Online Pedagogy and Standards (TOPS) course serves as an excellent national model for preparing faculty for online teaching. TOPS’ is an intensive and rigorous eight-week, cutting edge, certificate program on online teaching methods; it is required for all faculty members at the institution who teach at TCSPP’s Online Campus or any of its online courses. Another way that faculty contribute to the institution is through a rigorous and innovative cultural competency-based curriculum that is grounded on the engaged-practitioner model that helps strengthen the meaning, quality, and integrity of the campus’ degree programs and certificates.

7. How is curriculum designed, approved, and evaluated? Are there differences at this site?
Curriculum is the purview of faculty at the campus and is managed by program specific-faculty, although each program is subjected through the same rigorous approval process. The campus also engages in an assessment process aimed at measuring the quality of student learning, and all programs go through this process annually. In addition, all degree programs at the campus go through a program review process every three years. Each program is expected to develop a self-study report to address program strengths and weaknesses and offer recommendations for continual improvement. Degree programs that have external accreditation such as the Psy.D., in Clinical Psychology accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA), also go through the program review process, although the expectations may vary depending on what gaps exist between the accreditation reports and the self-study requirements. In those instances, the program is required to provide the additional data for the self-study that may not have been required for the accreditation report. We were informed that this process is the same for all programs in all of TCSPP’s campuses.

8. What retention and graduation data are available for this site? How does it compare to other sites?
Data provided by the ALO Fall 2011 through Fall 2016 showed variations in retention rates for all campuses. For all years, the Chicago campus maintained the highest fall-to-fall retention rate, with 87.2% retention rate in AY 2015-2016, while the Online campus had the lowest retention rate of 62.4% for the same year. In terms of graduation rate for all programs tracked through Fall 2016, the Chicago campus had the highest 5-year graduation rate (72.5%) for the fall 2011 cohort compared to other campuses, with Online being the lowest (50.5%) for the same cohort year.

9. How does the site assess student learning? What are the results?
The institution engages in a rigorous annual assessment process, and uses the results of the assessment to improve student learning. It was however not clear how assessment results are stored and retrieved since multiple sites appeared to be utilized for data storage. A single online assessment management system would enhance efficiency and data management.

10. What quality assurance processes are in place for the off-campus site?
As noted above, the Chicago campus utilizes both an annual assessment of student learning as well as a period program review process to assure the maintenance and improvement of the
meaning, quality, and integrity of its degree programs. To further strengthen this process and its outcomes, the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan now requires a “state of the discipline” report to accompany each self-study. A “vital signs” scorecard conceived in 2008, and being updated by the Institutional Effectiveness Review Committee to include criteria for non-academic programs, will accompany each degree program “state of the discipline” report to identify programs needing additional institutional support.

C. DISTANCE EDUCATION

Institution: The Chicago School of Professional Psychology

Name of Reviewer: Andrew Allen

Date/s of review: March 21-24, 2017

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report."

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Reviewed online courses:
- AB523M Verbal Behavior Spring 2015 (MS Applied Behavior Analysis)
- CM500M Introduction to Counseling Profession and Ethics Spring 2016 (MA Clinical Mental Health Counseling)
- EP732M Integrating Technology on Learning Systems Summer 2016 (EdD Education Psychology and Technology)
- MP553M Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Fall 2016 (MA Organizational Leadership)

Reviewed online discussion boards and grading rubric for:
- BA Program: General Education Capstone 200: Unit 9
- MA in Behavioral Economics: BE510 Brain and Behavior, Unit 3
- MA in Forensic Psychology (Non-Licensure Track): FO622 Mental Health Law, Unit 1

Reviewed online and on-ground programs for:
- MA Industrial and Organizational Psychology (on-ground locations in Chicago, Washington DC, Los Angeles)

---

1 See Protocol for Review of Distance Education to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.
2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

Between May 19, 2013 and February 17, 2017 TCSPP has had 10 distance education successfully go through WSCUC Substantive Change Review.

In total, TCSPP offers 17 distance education programs across 4 degree levels: Bachelors (1), Masters (10), Professional Doctorate (2), and Research Doctorate (4). TCSPP has been offering distance education programs since 2007 beginning with a MA in Forensic Psychology and a MA in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and most recently (2017) an MA in Medical Health Services Administration.

Most online students participate at the graduate level. There were 617 FTE graduate distance education students compared to 25 undergraduate distance education students (Fall 2015). The total number (headcount) of distance education students has grown to 1313 students (Fall 2015) from just over one thousand students in 2011.

The Fall-to-Fall retention rate over all online programs is 62.4% (Fall 2015-Fall 2016), which is similar to the retention rates achieved each year since 2012. The 5-year graduation rate is 50.5% for online students who began in Fall 2011 and is lower than that for some physical campus locations (e.g., the Los Angeles’ rate is 62.3%).

To respond to its growing online campus presence and corresponding demands, TCSPP moved from Pearson’s eCollege LMS platform in 2014 to Instructure’s Canvas. At the same time the learning assessment platform, Tk20 was implemented and is integrated into Canvas. Students go through a secure login process and instructors use a video roll call and other check-in methods to verify student participant identification.

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

- Reviewed WSCUC Institutional Report
- Reviewed Strategic Plan 2015-2020
- Reviewed enrollment and retention information produced by the Office of Institutional Research
- Reviewed information on the TCSPP website and the MyChicagoSchool.edu portal for program requirements, admissions requirements, tuition, students services and other resources
- Reviewed online courses, syllabi, discussion boards and their rubrics listed in 1. above.
- Interviewed Online Deans Breeda McGrath (DAA, Online), Jim Chitwood (Campus Dean, Online) and Tiffany Masson (Campus Dean, Chicago) in person

Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and</td>
<td>Distance Education is fully ingrained with the mission and vision. TCSPP sees itself as “THE Psychology University Leading the Way,” and as such in its Strategic Plan for 2015-202 has in its Goal 3, “advancing psychology education through technological innovation and streamlined operations.” In addition, among its list</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>operationalized?</strong></td>
<td><strong>of Key Investment Areas is to “create contemporary and flexible platforms (e.g., virtual classrooms) that support collaborative and hybrid learning.”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Homepage in MyChicagoSchool.edu portal lists events and activities for students to participate. Campus events, such as speakers, are broadcast for viewing by online students. A student survey reports that 80.2% of online students were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall academic experience at TCSPP (which is higher than that for students at any physical location).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The LMS platform is Canvas and supports robust forms of communication between faculty and students. TCSPP uses GoToMeeting and email for communication with students. Students are introduced to Canvas through a Canvas produced tutorial. I observed active discussion groups in the four courses that I reviewed. Student surveys reveal that students are satisfied with the online environment. Discussions with the Online Deans confirmed that the technology is reliable.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services: What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</strong></td>
<td><strong>The myChicagoSchool.edu student portal reveals an extensive list of student support services and how to contact those offices. The student advising system is strong and has been replicated for the face-to-face students. Library: Online students have their own special page (with a different look and content) in MyChicagoSchool portal. Online students can only request articles and book chapters. To get a print book they have to contact one of the campus libraries. Librarians are available by phone.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</strong></td>
<td><strong>TCSPP reports 262 online faculty (mostly adjunct). Faculty members who are subject matter experts construct the curriculum. The faculty are responsible for developing and executing a programmatic assessment plan. A standing committee of the Faculty Council reviews assessment data. Online courses must follow a template based in part on Quality Matter Standards found in the TCSPP Student Learning Assessment and Program Effectiveness Handbook. TCSPP’s National Center for Teaching and Learning offers free online training for Teaching Online Pedagogy and Strategies (TOPS) as well as on ground trainings for: Canvas, creating videos, as well as trainings for TK20, the assessment system.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program faculty are the authors of program curricula. Programs that are offered both online or on ground have the same required courses, CLOs, PLOs, curricular map and assessment plan. Many programs are governed by professional accreditation requirements (e.g., APA, CACREP, or NASP). Slight differences in curriculum exist to allow for variations in licensure requirements across states. Each program reviewed satisfies credit hour standards.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Retention and Graduation

What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?

The Fall to Fall retention rate over all online programs is 62.4% (Fall 2015-Fall 2016), which is similar to the retention rates achieved each year for the past 5 years. TCSPP has developed a Retention Toolkit that is applied to every program.

Time-to-completion is slower in the online programs primarily due to the additional responsibilities faced by students who chose online programs.

### Student Learning

How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?

The Director of Educational Effectiveness tracks the alignment of each program and their learning. Each campus and online programs Academic Effectiveness Review Committee which meets bi-monthly to oversee student learning assessment process at that location or modality.

Eleven degree programs are offered both on ground and on line. For the MA Industrial and Organizational Psychology, which is offered online and on-ground, students chose an internship or thesis track (on ground students) or an applied research project (online students only). For the Chicago on ground program, internship supervisors evaluate Program Learning Outcomes, while the online program evaluates PLOs through the Applied Research Projects supervised by faculty. Program Reviews of the PLOs shows gains in learning from pre-test to post-tests.

Credentialing pass rates appear similar across modalities.

### Contracts with Vendors

Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?

N/A

### Quality Assurance Processes

How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?

Online programs are reviewed frequently and are modeled to Quality Matters standards (certification by Quality Matters is currently being developed). Most TCSPP programs are subject to and receive external validation from professional accrediting bodies. Graduation rates, licensure pass rates etc., all suggest that TCSPP offers programs that are educationally effective.