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Section I. Overview and Context

Background of The Wright Institute.

The Wright Institute (TWI) is an independent graduate school located in Berkeley, California. The Institute was founded in 1968 by Dr. Nevitt Sanford. The mission is “to educate psychologists to practice at the highest level of professional competence; analyze and evaluate research, theory, and practice; and make appropriate life-long use of the evolving body of psychological knowledge” (The Wright Institute, 2015).

TWI has two programs: a doctoral program in clinical psychology (PsyD) and a Master of Arts (MA) program in counseling psychology. The doctoral program has 340 students enrolled. The program is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA), and in 2010 received a 7-year re-accreditation, the longest time-frame for accreditation extended by APA (TWI Response to WASC visiting team EER report, Dec. 21, 2011). The Master of Arts (MA) program, begun in 2006, is approved by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS) and currently numbers 80 students (Wright Institute, Special Visit Report, p. 1).

Recent accreditation history, and issues to be addressed.

The Wright Institute (TWI) was initially accredited by WASC in 1977. Recent WASC visits included a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) in February, 2010, and an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in October, 2011. Table 1 shows the issues identified at the CPR and EER visits, the Commission’s highlights from the EER visits, and the Commission’s expectations for the Special Visit (Commission letter, March 7, 2012).
Table 1. Summary of WSCUC Highlights and Expectations from Accreditation Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commission’s highlights for special attention following CPR visit of Feb. 2010</th>
<th>Progress noted in Commission letter following EER visit (March 7, 2012)</th>
<th>Commission’s highlights for special attention following EER visit</th>
<th>Commission’s expectations of TWI for Special Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Align student learning outcomes at all levels</td>
<td>Progress made in elaborating LOs and assessment of student learning</td>
<td>Strengthen assessment of student learning and program review (CFRs 2.1, 2.3, 2.7-2.8, 4.2-4.8)</td>
<td>1. Finalize formal program review processes. 2. Use data/findings in systematic planning. 3. Integrate/align institutional, program, and course learning outcomes (map and broadly disseminate). 4. Link program review with planning/budgeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of data to frame improvements to institutional learning</td>
<td>Improvements made in gathering/interpreting data for improvement of dissertation quality</td>
<td>Develop academic стратегический planning (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</td>
<td>1. At faculty level: increase engagement/responsibility to gather and analyze program review data and make planning recommendations from findings. 2. At institutional level: develop a planning model that includes institutional goals, stakeholder engagement, and evidence of alignment of resource allocation with institutional goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify governance organizational structures</td>
<td>Refine and clarify shared governance (CFRs 3.8-3.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Increase faculty engagement by: a. Promoting faculty responsibility for academic planning. b. Clarifying ways faculty organizes for collective responsibility. 2. Academic leadership to work closely with president.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of the Special Visit Report and supporting evidence.

The TWI Special Visit Report was rich with evidence, and many of the team’s questions were answered following a careful search of the exhibits. The team had difficulty finding specific reference to exhibits because there were no hyperlinks between the narrative and appendices, and the pages of the appendices were not numbered consecutively.
Extent of institutional involvement in preparing the Special Visit Report.

Evidence shows broad involvement of faculty and administrators in the preparation of the Special Visit Report. A statement on preparation of the report identifies specific faculty and administrators who prepared the report and others who reviewed the completed report (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 2).

How faculty were included in the discussion and in the action steps.

The report provides details of how faculty were actively involved in the action steps taken since the last visit. For example, doctoral faculty took part in rating dissertations, reviewed data from findings, and made changes informed by findings (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 5). Additionally, faculty from both programs reviewed and approved the program review policy (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 6). Faculty in the master’s program used a draft version of the program review policy as the basis for carrying out a self-study. Findings from the self-study led to significant revisions of the Master’s program including changes to the mission, goals, learning outcomes, and how the outcomes were assessed (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 6).

Faculty in both programs have developed and begun to implement a portfolio requirement in which students include signature assignments completed throughout the program. The portfolio is used as storage for evidence of students’ mastery of expected knowledge and skills. Aggregated data from portfolio assessment are used for year-to-year comparison of student learning.

Both programs prepared a Program Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Report that compares data from the 2013-14 academic year with similar measures from the 2012-13 academic year. In both program reviews, analysis of data is completed by administrators and staff, and then shared with faculty (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 6, 7).
Addressing of each of the identified issues.

The TWI Special Visit Report responded directly to each of the three issues identified by the Commission by citing the issue, then describing the actions taken in response to each issue.

Description of the team review process.

Prior to the visit, individual team members reviewed documents posted by TWI, shared notes about responses to each issue, and discussed findings in a team conference call on March 9, 2015. Specific areas of focus were assigned to team members in preparation for the visit and for subsequent writing of the team report. Additional information was requested of TWI and sent to the team, including the Governance Policy Manual, a summary financial document, outcome data, and course syllabi. The team met on April 13, 2015 for a pre-visit meeting, and the following day met with a broad range of TWI community members (see Appendix A, The Wright Institute Special Visit Schedule).

Section II. Evaluation of Issues Under the Standards

Issue 1: Assessment of student learning and program review.

The team carefully reviewed TWI Special Visit Report and accompanying documents including 35 Exhibits. In addition, the team requested and reviewed syllabi from both programs, and the Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Reports from both programs. The remainder of this section of Issue 1 will report the findings and recommendations for each of the four expectations noted by the Commission for the issue, “Assessment of student learning and program review” (Commission letter, March 7, 2012).
**Finalize formal program review.**

Evidence shows that TWI drafted a program review policy, and that the policy was approved by the MA program faculty and doctoral program faculty. The policy is clear, succinct, and gives precise direction. It requires at least one program review every seven years. The review is to be composed of a self-study as well as an external review by two experts. The policy specifies items that must be included in the self-study including a broad range of evidence that speaks to program quality (TWI Special Visit Report, Appendices, pp. 37-39). Evidence required for the 7-year self-study assumes annual data gathering of direct and indirect measures of student learning.

The program review policy requires evidence of alignment of course learning outcomes with program learning outcomes, a curriculum map, and a “closing of the loop” by interpreting the significance of the findings. The policy concludes with a directive to use the findings and analysis “as a foundation for building an evidence-based plan for strengthening the program.” The team commends TWI for creating the 7-year program review policy.

While the team finds that the expectation to finalize formal program review has been met, we recommend a corresponding policy be articulated to establish clear expectations for annual review, and that the annual review include recommendations based on findings (CFRs 2.4, 4.1, 4.2). The recently completed Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Reports for both programs show evidence of annual review, but do not reflect on what the findings mean or provide recommendations that could be used in systematic planning. Clear guidelines for annual program review are particularly important, given recent adoption by the TWI Board of Trustees of a Planning and Budgeting Process whose purposes include “following an annual calendar and timeline” and “utilizing findings and recommendation from internal and external program review.
to evaluate and determine program needs” (Exhibit 20, TWI Special Visit Report Appendices, pp. 71-73). The team’s recommendation for a formalized policy on annual review could also accommodate the suggestion by writers in the concluding comments of the Special Visit Report that procedures be established for both programs to follow up on findings from program review (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 23; CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

**Use findings from student learning data in systematic planning.**

Expectations for the use of findings from student learning for systematic planning are clearly articulated in the program review policy, and there are excellent examples from both programs of findings being used to inform and improve practice. For example, findings from an ongoing review of dissertations have been shared with chairs and doctoral faculty, changes have been made, and improvement documented (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 5). Additionally, findings from a review of the MA program led to recommendations, discussion of recommendations between faculty and administration, and incorporation of key recommendations in strategic planning by the board of trustees (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 6).

The team commends TWI for its use of student learning data to inform change. However, the team noted an absence of a reflection about what the findings mean in Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Reports from both programs, and an absence in both reports of recommendations based on findings (CFRs 4.2, 4.3). The recommendation in the preceding section, *Finalize formal program review*, to formalize expectations for annual review of programs should incorporate interpretation of findings and recommendations from findings—as was recommended in the 7-year program review policy—thereby providing a foundation for building an ongoing, evidence-based system for planning (CFRs 2.4, 4.2, 4.3).
Support quality assurance processes that are faculty driven and internally motivated, with attention to integrating and aligning institutional, program, and course learning outcomes.

Evidence of support for quality assurance processes comes from adoption by faculty in both programs of the 7-year program review policy. Additionally, both programs provided clear evidence of the alignment of program learning outcomes with program assessments (Exhibits 17, 18, TWI Special Visit Report Appendices, pp. 52-56). The MA program in particular, is to be commended for the gathering a wealth of relevant data for program review (6 years of aggregated data for measures of student achievement, each measures aligned with PLOs. Appendices, Exhibit 17, p. 52).

Syllabi provided to the team describe alignment of Program Learning Outcomes with Course Learning Outcomes. The team encourages TWI to consider showing the alignment of Institutional and Program Learning Outcomes more clearly in syllabi. An example of how alignment might be shown with the use of a table is provided in Appendix B.

Establish strong links between the program review process and planning and budgeting protocols.

In response to the WSCUC Education Effectiveness Report (EER), the Board of Trustees adopted a Planning and Budget Development Process to ensure program review processes are connected with planning and budgeting (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 13; Exhibit 20, Appendices, pp. 71-73). The importance of the planning process is evident from statements in the policy such as, “In the fall of each year the President and the Vice President for Finance and Administrative Affairs will review with the heads of each program that program’s performance” and “A key part
of this process is to utilize findings and recommendations from internal and external program reviews” (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 13).

The recommendation to formalize expectations for annual review of programs and incorporate interpretation of findings and recommendations (in the section Finalize formal program review, p. 8) would support the purposes of the Planning and Budget Development Process to review program performance and use the findings in informed planning and decision-making (CFR 4.1, 4.2).

**Issue 2: The system of shared governance.**

The Commission letter of March 7, 2012 urged TWI “to continue moving toward increased faculty engagement, particularly by promoting greater faculty responsibility for academic planning and by clarifying the ways in which the faculty organizes itself to exercise its collective responsibility.”

Participants in governance at TWI include the Board of Trustees, the President, the Dean/Chief Academic Officer (CAO), directors of the doctoral and Master’s programs, and faculty and students through various committees. The Board of Trustees has overall responsibility and fiscal authority for governance, sets strategic direction, and oversees the operation of the Institute. TWI’s Board of Trustees described their function as one that contributes “wisdom not wealth.”

**Evidence reviewed by the team.**

The evidence reviewed by the team included:

- TWI Special Visit Report and Exhibits
- EER report
- March 2012 Commission letter
• Supplemental information regarding the current and proposed Governance Policy Manual for the doctoral program

• Interviews with administrators (President, Dean, and Program Directors)

• Interviews with faculty from the doctoral and the Master’s programs.

**Analysis of actions taken in response to the Commission’s concern.**

In conversation with the team, the President indicated that the doctoral and Master’s programs have two separate governance structures because of the distinctive nature of the programs. The current committee structure for institutional governance as defined in the TWI Governance Manual includes only doctoral faculty. Doctoral students contribute to governance of TWI through their service on committees. The Institute Executive Committee (IEC), which functions as an advisory body to the President, is the key vehicle for faculty involvement in decision-making.

Faculty revised the Governance Manual and submitted revisions to the President as of December 2014.

Key changes to the manual included faculty input with respect to voting, membership on faculty committees, curriculum, and hiring (TWI Special Visit Report, p.18). The faculty-initiated revisions have not been accepted in their entirety by the administration, and the resolution of differences is pending. In particular, examples of issues that have yet to be resolved between the faculty and the administration include the process for selecting a future Dean, and composition of the Curriculum and the Faculty Review Committees (Governance Policy Manual. Proposed Revisions pp. 3, 6, 8).

The Master’s program governance currently takes place through a committee of the whole. The Associate Director of the Master’s program is preparing a faculty manual for the Master’s
program to articulate guidelines for faculty for participation in academic planning, policy surrounding assessment of faculty and administrative performance, and support for faculty development (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 15). Master’s students indicated there is no formal structure for their participation in governance.

Although TWI has addressed shared governance in part, it has not fully developed a model of governance that will contribute to synergistic, future development of TWI. The team recommends that TWI develop a more capacious governance structure that acknowledges the shared responsibility and decision-making of faculty from both programs (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

The team puts forward the following suggestions for governance for the TWI community to consider:

- The Chief Academic Officer (CAO) currently has direct responsibility for only the doctoral program, and not the Master’s program. He is available for consultation with the director of the master’s program. TWI could be strengthened if the CAO were responsible for both programs (and any future programs), and thus provide institution-wide academic leadership, coordinate workload policies, and provide oversight for academic planning and governance (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.10).

- In conversation with the Chief Financial Officer (CFO), she mentioned she carried additional responsibilities of student disability and accommodation issues. The team suggests narrowing the focus of the CFO, and shifting the disability and accommodation responsibilities to other administrative personnel (CFR 3.8).

- The TWI Governance Manual defines only the positions of the President and Dean. The team suggests the Manual be expanded to include descriptions of all administrative
positions, including the Chief Academic Officer and Program Directors, and charges identified for each governance committee (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.10).

**Issue 3: Strategic planning.**

The Commission action letter (March 7, 2012, p. 2) requested TWI to attend to strategic planning, and specifically, to “develop a planning model that articulates institution goals,” involves governing board and stakeholders to advance the goals, and for the parties to agree on allocation of resources to accomplish institutional goals.

**Evidence reviewed by the team.**

The evidence reviewed included:

- The March 7, 2012 Commission action letter
- TWI Special Visit Report and Exhibits
- Team visit to newly acquired building
- Interviews with TWI personnel

**Analysis of actions taken in response to the Commission’s concern.**

The President provided the intended framework for institutional strategic planning process by reminding the Board of Trustees in a June 2012 presentation that the first item in the Governance Manual states “the Board of Trustees…will set the strategic direction, engage in organizational, educational, and fiscal planning…of The Wright Institute.” (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 18; Exhibit 24, Appendices). However, The Wright Institute Special Visit Report does not identify an overarching strategic plan, but rather two very separate plans: one for the doctoral program and one for the Master’s program. The team reviewed the plans created for each program.
Doctoral program.

In July 2012, the President asked the Dean and the Chair of the Doctoral Program to co-lead a strategic planning process for the doctoral program (TWI Special Visit Report, p.19). With broad internal and external constituent engagement, the doctoral program faculty completed a comprehensive planning process Fall 2014, and made 26 recommendations organized into six major areas of focus. The recommendations were approved by the doctoral department in November 2014, and submitted to the President (TWI Special Visit Report, Exhibit 32). The visiting team assessed the doctoral plan, and found priorities that purposively focus the department on improvement of academic quality and student outcomes, including building American Psychological Association accredited internships, and increasing licensure pass rates. The Wright Institute Special Visit Report states that the President has requested budget projections to carry out the recommendations. Budget recommendations were not completed at the time of the site visit.

Master’s program.

In the Master’s program, the process of strategic planning formally began in Fall 2012. The process was shaped by two influences: the Commission letter of March 7, 2012 that included an expectation for systematic use of data in planning; and findings from a recently completed program review that were used as a basis for beginning strategic planning (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 19). The process involved a broad constituency, faculty engagement, and included a SWOT analysis.

The resulting plan advanced four initiatives for the Master’s program: moving the program to a new location, creation of a family therapy clinic, diversification of program delivery, and recruiting additional faculty (Exhibit 31, Appendices). The Board of Trustees approved the
Master’s program strategic plan at its December 2013 meeting (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 20). A new building for the Master’s program was purchased, and at the time of the site visit, the team toured the newly acquired building. Building renovations are underway, and faculty are discussing integration of the family therapy clinic. Plans are in development to diversify the Master’s program to include day and evening classes. The institution has committed to hiring faculty consistent with planned increases in Master’s program enrollment.

**Findings and conclusions about progress in addressing the system of strategic planning.**

The team assessed the Master’s program plan to be strategic and highly focused. Actions had been taken to advance the program’s goals including the purchase of a new building to independently house the Master’s program. However, in response to the team’s questions about the final cost of the building, including extensive renovations, the Program Director, Chief Financial Officer, and President gave different responses ranging from $3M - $4.5M. Additionally, the team was told there is a plan to add staff dedicated to the expansion of the Master’s Program, and to place them at the new site. At the time of the visit, there was no formal business plan in place to detail the cost and timing of the new hires.

To be financially successful, TWI is seeking an enrollment increase in the Master’s program of 50% in 2016-17; 33% in 2017-18; 12.5% in 2018-19; 11.1% in 2019-20; 10% in 2020-21; and less than 10% from thereon forward. At the time of the visit, there was no formal admission/recruitment and marketing plan to achieve such an increase in projected enrollment. TWI is planning to use endowment funds to pay for the new building, including needed renovations. According to the President and the Board of Trustees, the fact that the cost of this new initiative is almost equal to the total endowment is not of concern because the purchase and renovation is viewed as a shift in investment to the real estate market.
The team assessed the doctoral program plan to be a comprehensive academic program review. At the time of the visit, the President and Dean were still deliberating as to which of the numerous priorities advanced in the plan should receive initial focus. A significant risk factor communicated to the team is the cost that will be incurred to build-out and sustain APA-accredited internships for the doctoral program. Despite this institutional concern, the projected costs have yet to be estimated and accounted for in the budget projections.

The President and Dean do not currently see the need to advance an overarching strategic plan as they consider the two program plans to be sufficient for planning purposes. There is no articulated desire to seek commonality between any of the Master’s and doctoral program plans as the two programs are viewed as completely separate from each other, including at the institutional planning level. At the time of the visit, there was no overarching plan that prioritized the allocation of time and estimated resources to ensure success of both programs and the institution. No risk or SWOT analysis has been conducted at the institutional level.

The President, in the team meeting, stated that two-thirds of all expenses are personnel related. The President, in the exit interview with the team chair, stated he has concerns about sustainability, and would like to diversify programmatic offerings by adding additional Master’s programs. He stated, however, that doctoral faculty are not open to proceeding in this direction.

At the time of the visit, both the President and the Board of Trustees representatives said they believed that TWI occupies an outstanding financial position. However, the Board members stated they do not have a fund raising plan, and are committed to the Board not having a fund raising requirement or agenda.

The Special Visit team recommends that TWI be asked to specifically attend to the following in preparation for the 2018 review:
1. The Board of Trustees engage in professional development activities (such as use of Association of Governing Boards resources, self-assessment of Board skill sets and functioning, and so on) as specifically related to strategic planning, resource allocations, risk assessment and institutional sustainability (CFR 3.9, 4.6).

2. An institution-wide strategic plan be developed to integrate and prioritize the approved plans and projections of both academic programs from an institutional perspective (CFR 4.7).

3. A projected budget be developed to show allocation of resources for implementing the priorities identified in the program plans and the institutional strategic plan recommended in preceding point (CFR 3.4).

Section III: Commendations and Recommendations

Commendations.

The team commends The Wright Institute for the following:

1. TWI community is deeply committed to the institute’s mission and educational purpose and regularly engages in conversations and activities that advance their clinician-to-society and social justice agenda (CFR 1.1).

2. TWI has adopted a detailed 7-year program review policy and process, including an expectation for program faculty to interpret significance of findings and make appropriate recommendations (CFR 2.7).

3. TWI is to be commended for the discussions and activities underway to advance matters related to institutional governance as evidenced by the proposed faculty and administrative revisions to the Governance Manual for the doctoral program faculty and the observable increase in engagement of faculty in academic planning. (CFR 3.7).
4. The Master’s program is to be commended for advancing a comprehensive strategic plan that is future focused on growth, diversification of programmatic delivery, and enrichment of the student experience (CFR 4.6).

5. The doctoral program is to be commended for advancing a comprehensive program plan with merging priorities that purposively focus the department on academic quality and improvement of student outcomes in areas such as APA-accredited internships and licensure pass rates (CFR 2.7).

**Recommendations.**

Having reviewed the inquiry, evidence, and analysis presented by TWI, the visiting team recommends that:

1. TWI adopt formal expectations and a systematic process for annual program review, in both programs, and clearly articulate the expected relationship between the annual program review data and the longer-term review cycle (CFR 2.7).

2. TWI specifically report findings and related recommendations for institutional, program, and course learning outcomes within a framework that is consistent with WSCUC expectations for assessing, understanding, and improving student learning (CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.3).

3. TWI adopt a governance model that includes faculty from both programs (CFR 3.7, 3.10). The current model of “shared governance” is historical having a single focus on the doctoral program faculty. With the robust development of the Master’s program, it is incumbent upon TWI to develop a more capacious governance structure that acknowledges the shared responsibility and decision-making of the faculty from both programs (CFR 3.7, 3.10).
4. TWI develop an institutional planning model that explicitly examines sustainability, and integrates academic enrollment and financial tracking, resources, deliverables, and timelines for the whole of the institution into a robust, overarching, institutional strategic plan (CFR 3.4, 4.7).

The team is appreciative of the time and effort of all who contributed to The Wright Institute Special Visit Report, and the hospitality of the whole of the TWI community during our visit.
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## Appendix A: The Wright Institute Special Visit Schedule

### The Day Before the Visit (Monday, April 13, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Michele Nealon-Woods</th>
<th>Ron W. Germaine</th>
<th>Muriel Poston</th>
<th>Elizabeth Griego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team arrives at hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 pm</td>
<td>First team meeting in hotel in two-room suite (the Chair’s room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Gilbert will remain on-call until 7:00 PM (or later as needed) to meet with the Team for 45 minutes to an hour and to receive any additional information requests. Notify Gilbert if there are any technological needs such as a printer or big screens.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 pm</td>
<td>Team dinner in executive session at hotel or restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The First Day (Tuesday, April 14, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Michele Nealon-Woods</th>
<th>Ron W. Germaine</th>
<th>Muriel Poston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30–9:00 am</td>
<td>Team receives: orientation to team room, technology resources, documents in team room</td>
<td>(Room 310)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10 am</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>President Dybwad</strong></td>
<td>(Room 103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11 am</td>
<td>Meeting with <strong>Dean Newman (ALO)</strong></td>
<td>(Room 105)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 am -12 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods and Dr. Germaine meeting w/Dr. Milena Esherick, MA Program Director</td>
<td>Meeting at Master’s Program Building</td>
<td>Dr. Poston meets with Faculty Steering Committee, including, Dr. Patsy Wood, Chair of the Curriculum Committee; Dr. Susana Winkel, Chair of the Faculty Review Committee; Dr. Steve Kanofsky, Chair of Diversity Committee; and Dr. Beate Lohser, Faculty Chair. The smaller Master’s program operates as a committee of the whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 1 pm</td>
<td>Team Lunch with Board of Trustees</td>
<td>(Room 310)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# The First Day (Tuesday, April 14, 2015) Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Michele Nealon-Woods</th>
<th>Ron W. Germaine</th>
<th>Muriel Poston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods and Dr. Poston meet with Tricia O’Reilly, Vice President of Finance and Administrative Affairs (Room 218)</td>
<td>Dr. Germaine meets with Dr. Gilbert Newman, PsyD Program Director (Room 105)</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods and Dr. Poston meet with Tricia O’Reilly, Vice President of Finance and Administrative Affairs (Room 218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods meets with key executive staff Dr. Becky Pizer, Director of PsyD Field Placement and PsyD Mentoring Program; Dr. Karen Godfredsen, Associate Director of MA Program; Stuart Lee, Director of MA Field Placement; John Pitts, Director of Admissions and Student Services; Virginia Morgan, Dean of Students (Room 312)</td>
<td>Drs. Germaine and Poston meet with Dr. Lynette Beall, Director of Institutional Research; Dean Newman; Milena Esherick, Director of the MA Program; and Alexis Carroll, Coordinator of Institutional Research (Room 318)</td>
<td>Dr. Poston to meet with core MA faculty Karen Godfredsen, PsyD, Nancy Ulmer, LCSW, Bernadette Torrez, PsyD, Ulash Dunlap, MFT, Deanna van Ligten, PsyD. (Room 318)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 4 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods and Dr. Germaine meets with PsyD students Rula Razek, Curriculum Committee, Maiga Berzins, 2nd Year Cohort Rep.; Julia Baron, Student Trustee; and 2nd Year MA students Hilary Altman and Dahlia Case (Room 312)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods and Dr. Poston meet with Tricia O’Reilly, Vice President of Finance and Administrative Affairs (Room 218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Team Walks to Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30–11:30 am</td>
<td>Team to work on report (Room 310)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 - 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Lunch to be provided for team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 - 1 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods meeting with President Dybwad (Room 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 pm</td>
<td>Team members drafting sections of the report on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# The Second Day (Wednesday, April 15, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>Michele Nealon-Woods</th>
<th>Ron W. Germaine</th>
<th>Muriel Poston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 am</td>
<td>Team Walks to The Wright Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 11:30 am</td>
<td>Team to work on report (Room 310)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 - 2:45 pm</td>
<td>Lunch to be provided for team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45 - 1 pm</td>
<td>Dr. Nealon-Woods meeting with President Dybwad (Room 103)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 2 pm</td>
<td>Team leaves for airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Example of Alignment Table

One way of showing alignment of Program, Course Learning Outcomes, and assignments to illustrate how each element of the program fits in the big picture is shown in the two tables below. The illustration is not provided as a “best way,” but as one way of showing alignment. Adding such tables to syllabi would accommodate a suggestion in the concluding comments of the TWI Special Visit Report to develop a revised syllabus template that will provide uniform information to all students and faculty about how each assignment and learning outcome fits within the program (TWI Special Visit Report, p. 23).

Table B1: Example of table showing alignment of Programs with the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Wright Institute</th>
<th>Doctoral Program or MA Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>List the 5 Institutional Learning Outcomes (as identified at <a href="http://www.wi.edu/learning-objectives">http://www.wi.edu/learning-objectives</a>)</td>
<td>Align program learning outcomes with Institutional learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B2: Example of table showing alignment of Program and Course Learning Outcomes with Assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Course Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>Align course learning outcomes with program learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C: A Reading Recommendation

A source that some of the team have found helpful for building knowledge in assessment is the following book: