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SECTION I — OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

The Wright Institute (TWI) was founded in 1968 by the distinguished psychologist Nevitt Sanford, a pioneer in the integration of social issues and clinical psychology. Located in Berkeley, California, the non-profit graduate school was first accredited by WSCUC in 1977. TWI is led by a 14-person Independent Board of Trustees and President Peter Dybwad.

For much of its fifty-plus year history, TWI has offered a single program in clinical psychology using the motto of “Educating Clinicians to Society.” The Master of Arts (MA) program, begun in 2006, is approved by the California Board of Behavioral Sciences (BBS). With a fall 2018 enrollment of just under 500 students (350 in clinical program; 140 in counseling), TWI operates within a clear niche in higher education behavioral sciences. Recently and importantly, TWI’s clinical psychology program was granted a ten-year reaffirmation of accreditation from the American Psychological Association (APA).

TWI’s most recent WSCUC accreditation action was the grant of a 7-year reaffirmation in 2012. In its action letter of March 7, 2012, the Commission asked TWI to prepare a Special Visit report addressing three issues: 1) student learning assessment and program review (CFR 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.3), 2) shared governance (CFR 3.7, 3.10), and 3) academic and strategic planning (CFR 3.4, 4.1, 4.6, 4.7).

Following the special visit that occurred in April of 2015, the Commission (action letter dated July 15, 2015) commended the progress of TWI in each of the areas addressed within the Special Visit process, but also made further recommendations: 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).

It was within this context that the reaffirmation team engaged in its review of TWI through
the offsite review (OSR) and site visit process, described more fully below.

B. Description of Team’s Process

The evaluation team reviewed the TWI institutional report dated July 2018, in anticipation
of the offsite review, which occurred October 2, 2018. Thereafter the evaluation team
collaboratively created a list of additional evidence requested from TWI, and identified Lines of
Inquiry for the site visit scheduled for March 2019. The team was grateful for the responsiveness of TWI and its Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Gilbert Newman.

During the visit, team members met with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, TWI’s President, Chief Financial Officer, Vice President of Academic Affairs, the self-study steering committee, faculty from both clinical and counseling psychology programs, student advisors and student services staff, the assessment committee and students to further explore in what manner TWI meets WSCUC’s standards of accreditation and Criteria for Review and to corroborate assertions made in the Institutional Report. Team members found interview respondents to be forthcoming and courteous in their responses, and appreciated the warm hospitality extended by the TWI community.

C. TWI’s Reaffirmation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

The evaluation team found TWI’s report to be thorough and to address the key elements of prior WSCUC actions; however, as expressed in the next section, the team was disappointed in the lack of progress on several of the recommendations that had extended back to the reaffirmation action letter of 2012 and reiterated in 2015.

While the team found the evidence provided by TWI in support of assertions of compliance helpful, it also believes that the Institute would benefit from more consistent recording of meetings and exchanges in support of institutional sustainability. By way of example, in a meeting with members of TWI’s assessment committee, it was clear that the Institute had gathered a substantial amount of data. A number of artifacts were presented that reflected a commitment to consistency and comprehensiveness in this area, but less evidence was
available or provided in support of *how TWI makes meaning of and acts on* the data it has

gathered. (CFR 3.7, 4.1)

**SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS**

**A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions**

There are several themes that flow through recommendations made by the Commission in

2012 and again in 2015. The following table summarizes these themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Student Learning Assessment and Program Review</strong></td>
<td>TWI adopt formal expectations and a systematic process for <strong>annual program review</strong>, in both programs, and <strong>clearly articulate the expected relationship between the annual program review data and the longer-term review cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TWI specifically report findings and related recommendations for institutional, program, and course learning outcomes within a framework that is consistent with WSCUC expectations for <strong>assessing, understanding, and improving student learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Shared Governance</strong></td>
<td>TWI adopt a governance model that includes faculty from both programs... 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve Academic and Strategic Planning</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, the major themes from prior WSCUC actions relate to learning assessment and program review, shared governance, and institutional/strategic planning. Of the three themes, the evaluation team was most encouraged by progress that has been demonstrated with
respect to shared governance (CFR 3.6, 3.7). A Faculty Council has been developed that includes faculty members from both clinical and counseling psychology programs. Several committees of the Council (Faculty Development, Academic Policies and Standards, and Diversity) were functioning, and although only one set of meeting minutes (May 18, 2018) was presented, it was clear from interviews with faculty members that the shared governance culture had extended to both programs, and that faculty members were enthused by this improvement.

It was clear too that a great deal of effort has been expended to improve the assessment of student learning process at TWI. A significant amount of data were shared with the evaluation team that reflected input from faculty, clinical partners, and students regarding how well students have met identified learning outcomes. What was less clear was how well TWI has addressed the latter part of the second recommendation from the 2015 visit which focused on assessing, understanding, and improving student learning. Data are abundant, but there was less evidence of how much reflection and understanding of that data is occurring at TWI with an emphasis on continuous institutional improvement (CFR 4.1).

To make the matter more challenging, there is some reluctance, given TWI’s efforts to improve its focus on diversity and inclusion, to use student-learning data in such a way as to label or in some manner type-cast students who may need additional assistance in support of their academic and personal success. TWI is to be lauded for wrestling with these issues, but the team believes that further interpretation of disaggregated data that leads to improvement initiatives that are implemented could lead to improved student outcomes (CFR 2.10).
The team found less progress had been made on the recommendations pertaining to planning, especially given the emphasis in the 2015 letter, which expressed the need to “explicitly examine sustainability, and integrate academic enrollment and financial tracking, resources, deliverables, and timelines for the whole of the institution into a robust, overarching, institutional strategic plan.” The team received a document entitled “Wright Institute Strategic Plan” that was five pages in length and did not include any environmental scanning or competitive analysis. While the TWI strategic plan was an amalgam of the strategic plans of the two academic programs, it was difficult for the team to understand how TWI, from an institution-wide perspective, arrived at the four overarching emphases highlighted in this plan:

A. Promote academic excellence through pedagogical and curricular enhancements,

B. Create an inclusive campus climate and strengthen community understanding and use of diversity, equity, and inclusion practices [Goal 3],

C. Strengthen community engagement through practica and internship enhancements and organized support for graduates in their careers [Goals 2 & 4],

D. Broaden and diversify the academic programming of the Wright Institute and strengthen its sustainability through the introduction of a new degree program in Organizational Psychology.

As noted later in this report, the team believed that more work needs to be done for TWI to implement the recommendation of the 2015 evaluation team to engage in comprehensive
strategic planning. It may be helpful for TWI to consider having a strategic planning consultant facilitate the process in support of a more comprehensive approach (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards

Evaluation team members examined the degree to which TWI continues to meet the 4 standards of accreditation and 39 Criteria for Review (CFRs). The next section will summarize observations and reflections relating to this topic.

Standard 1:
The institution’s formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character in ways in which it contributes to the public good.

The mission of TWI (CFR 1.1) is clear and is presented on its website as follows: “The mission of the Wright Institute is to educate students to be critical thinkers and ethical problem solvers, to address community and societal needs, and to function effectively as professionals in a diverse society.” As expressed in its Institutional Report, TWI modified its mission statement since the special visit in 2015 to be more expansive, allowing it the freedom to consider additional academic programs.

As expressed in the recommendations section of this report, TWI has the benefit of having access to a great deal of data; however, there is opportunity to further illuminate indicators of student achievement including measures of persistence, completion, licensure-passage rates, and even post-graduate employment (CFR 1.2). As expressed in meetings with
TWI team members, these types of outcome metrics are gaining greater visibility, not only within theWSCUC region, but on a national basis.

It was interesting to hear faculty describe TWI’s approach to academic freedom (CFR 1.3) within evaluation team meetings. Much was said about opportunities for individual faculty members to use their own experiences and gifts to facilitate student learning related to identified course outcomes, but several expressed that faculty are not at liberty to “go rogue” in the process, indicating that academic freedom at TWI has some defined and appropriate limitations.

Diversity (CFR 1.4) is recognized as an important issue at TWI. The entire institutional community is aware of and grappling with how to address diversity, equity, and inclusion. The Institute has established a Diversity Committee of the Faculty Council in an effort to elevate issues and advance a culture that will be more sensitive and responsive to these issues. Faculty spoke openly in discussions about efforts to diminish occasions of “micro-aggressions” or “ruptures” of relationships both inside and outside of the classroom, often due to a lack of cultural competence and sensitivity. The institutional community is aware of it and efforts to model and provide students with tools for responding to micro-aggressions are underway, thus responding to the situation in a thoughtful and reasoned manner. The evaluation team also noted that there might be opportunity for more diverse representation at every level of the institution in support of these aspirations.

The evaluation team observed no issues or concerns with a lack of autonomy at TWI (CFR 1.5), and found that it does a good job of truthfully representing its goals and costs to students.
(CFR 1.6). In one of the student meetings, all students expressed that their experience at TWI exceeded the expectations they had prior to matriculation. TWI also operates with integrity and transparency (CFR 1.7), although as it continues to mature in its interpretation and analysis of data, it will likely have more it can share in a transparent manner to its various constituencies. Some students expressed a desire to be kept better apprised of TWI’s progress on significant or strategic issues as well. There also is a history of TWI operating with honesty in its communication with WSCUC (CFR 1.8).

**Standard 2:**

*The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship, and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.*

TWI’s programs are staffed by faculty who are qualified and experienced practitioners in the field, many of whom are graduates of TWI. The operational responsibilities of the faculty are shared by deployment of multiple committees and regular daily interactions (CFR 2.1). As practitioners, faculty design and modify the curriculum, scaffolding and sequencing included, based on a combination of professional needs in the field and the preparation levels of their students. The Case Conference series, for example, is designed with an intent to observe a cohort’s development over a period of time (CFRs 2.2, 2.11, 2.14). The syllabi reflect the
student learning outcomes, although it may be helpful to include non-course graduation requirements to provide additional clarity.

Faculty share their learning outcomes and syllabi with one another, and new faculty have adequate access to past syllabi and course materials to facilitate efforts to offer a fully integrated curriculum (CFRs 2.3, 2.4). Faculty members are also supported in their private practices through part- and half-time employment models and are encouraged to maintain professional work that guides their teaching practices (CFRs 2.8, 2.9). Two MLIS prepared librarians are available to support students, faculty, and staff, and students are afforded library resources online, on campus, or at UC Berkeley next door (CFR 2.13).

Ongoing assessment is part of the culture at TWI. The program reviews are performed on an established cycle that allows the Institute time to gather and compile the data and gather external feedback (CFR 2.7). As noted in one of the recommendations, TWI should consider instituting practices where policies, procedures, and resolutions are formally documented. The online assessment tool uses a common rubric, which enables faculty to observe trends over time. In order to further improve the examination of student success in all parts of the life cycle, TWI may benefit by including admissions metrics in addition to GRE scores to shed further light on why certain applicants reached various stages of the application process (CFR 2.10).

Throughout the visit, it was apparent that TWI employs a student-centered approach with a genuine desire to understand and take action on their feedback through direct and indirect measures. Groups of faculty members who teach in the same program meet as a
cohort and discuss individual students to determine the best course of action for each. Formal services are also provided to support students, including the writing center, mentoring office, and extra-curricular initiatives on multi-cultural awareness (CFRs 2.11, 2.12, 2.13). While individualized attention is provided, TWI should consider formally documenting common resolutions and trends that could enable future faculty to address similar situations based on established and documented best practices (CFR 2.5). The team also encourages the faculty to continue engaging in grading calibration exercises to arrive at a common understanding of student performance and further enhance the meaning of collected data (CFR 2.4).

Standard 3:

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

Faculty demographic data provided by The Wright Institute reflects 18 full-time, 23 part-time core and 52 adjunct faculty, with appropriate backgrounds, disciplines, and degree levels. The institute employs a diversified group of faculty, especially in the full-time rank. In team meetings, faculty were satisfied with the current level of faculty numbers for the size and nature of the student body they were serving, but were concerned about staffing levels in support of programs and operations. Counseling faculty felt it might be wise to stay ahead of the enrollment growth of that program by hiring more faculty. It was evident that the faculty were
clearly committed to the students and the Institute (CFR 3.1 and 3.2). The Counseling program’s strategic plan called for the acquisition and renovation of another building to meet the educational needs of the students and the program as well as increased enrollment within the program (CFR 3.5).

Drafts of faculty policies, one for the Clinical program and one for the Counseling program, have been developed. The Institute is encouraged to fully implement these policies to assure consistent application that may lead to improvements in teaching and learning (CFR 3.2). The Wright Institute’s faculty, by way of participation in faculty committees and the Faculty Council and through the governance structure, has freedom in the development of the curriculum, the teaching methodologies, advising, program assessment and related decision-making (CFR 3.10).

The VPAA serves as the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) and works with the faculty chairs to develop recommendations to engage all faculty (full-time and part-time) in the processes related to assessment, program review and professional development. These recommendations are scheduled to be reviewed at the Faculty Council (CFR 3.3).

The audited financial statements of The Wright Institute reflect a financially well-managed institution. The annual budget operating reserves have contributed to the establishment of the endowment fund, and the budgeting process aligns resources to the Institute’s initiatives (CFR 3.4, 3.7).

TWI employs a full-time President, VP of Academic Affairs (CAO) and VP of Finance and Administrative Affairs (CFO), to provide leadership and management to the Institute’s academic
and administrative programs (CFR 3.8). The leadership team seems to wear multiple hats in performing the day-to-day operations of the institute, as is typical for a small institution.

The Board of Trustees has the overall responsibility and authority for governance and will set the strategic direction, engage in organizational, educational, and fiscal planning and oversee the strategic operation of the Wright Institute. The Board conducts an annual self-assessment survey and shares the results with its members (CFR 3.9). Board Committees are closely engaged with the Institute’s leadership on academic and fiscal matters. The Board of Trustees evaluates the President’s performance annually and the Board Chair gives feedback to the President (CFR 3.6).

The governance policies of the Institute, revised and adopted by the board in June 2017, define the CAO’s responsibilities for both the clinical and counseling programs, for providing leadership and oversight for academic planning and governance (CFR 3.7) and define the role of the faculty in developing the curriculum and participating through the Faculty Council in decisions impacting faculty (CFR 3.10).

**Standard 4:**

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.
The Program Review Policy outlines TWI’s approach to academic program review; however, a similar quality assurance process for non-academic areas is not presented. Putting such in place for all areas of the Institute may improve clarity of expectations and performance throughout. Extensive student data is available in the annual reports, created by the Institutional Research Office, and these reports (disseminated to faculty and administrators) play a role in program reviews (CFR 4.1). The annual reports are primarily compilations of data, and as such are not particularly actionable. Although the reports are discussed by faculty, the process appears to be informal and documentation of these discussions does not yet appear to be taking place (CFRs 4.2, 4.3).

Conversations with faculty demonstrated that there is ongoing improvement that occurs as a result of meetings and conversations, although the history surrounding these improvements has not been formally captured. The faculty did speak to multiple formal and informal opportunities to share information gathered from their classes and interaction with students. Documenting and formalizing policies and procedures, as well as the current meetings and their outcomes so as to better be able to identify both short term issues and long term trends could lead to better use of resources, better institutional learning, and facilitate the review of the results of any changes made.

Faculty were able to speak well of the plan to implement student portfolios, which would avoid focusing on only one metric, and spoke to indicators of the success of this initiative. This example speaks to the Institute’s ability to use data to make changes, but the information about
changes appears to be primarily held by several faculty members rather than captured in a systematic fashion.

The Wright Institute acknowledges that there has been little recent focus on grading and evaluation procedures and plans to remedy this (CFR 4.4). The creation of a recently completed Strategic Plan implies a process involving a variety of stakeholders, use of data, and consideration of the current context of higher education and of similar institutions. The Board of Trustees spoke of the use of evidence, of discussion, and of environmental scanning for at least one of the items in the Strategic Plan, but evidence of the integration of and reflection on data and an environmental scan is not apparent. Such evidence, captured transparently, would make it more likely that others would understand the items and help move them forward (CFR 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

Federal Compliance Checklists (see appendices)

C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

As The Wright Institute prepares to celebrate a major anniversary, it is apparent that its faculty and staff have been reflective on their long-term pursuits to educate clinicians to society. Its institutional history of 50 years is further augmented by numerous graduates who maintain a recognizable thread as learners to instructors to professionals in the field. With most faculty also being practitioners, the Institute naturally keeps up with the trends and demands of the profession, as well as the socio-political climate and needs of the community (CFR 4.6). In this way, the Institute lives out its mission and demonstrates that its degrees are more than simply the sum of credit units.
Faculty are not only dedicated to the quality of education and their students’ experiences, but to the underserved and economically disadvantaged populations that many of their graduates will ultimately serve. The program requirements and pedagogy reflect a deliberate combination of didactic and experiential learning, as well as carefully apportioned credit units to maximize preparation for professional work (CFR 2.2). The cohort and relational model facilitate a community of learning, and enable faculty to provide ongoing and holistic feedback on each student (CFR 2.5), in addition to the culture of mentoring it has established between students and their peers, students and faculty, and students with other professionals. While the primary learning measures are summative (i.e. licensure and match-rates), the small size of the Institute facilitates their ability to assess, advise and pay close attention to the needs of individual students. While the online assessment tool and accompanying rubric also provide some formative assessment measures, TWI should consider additional approaches to systematically identify students before placement, particularly before admission and during their first year. The evaluation team encourages faculty to further collaborate with the director of admissions to examine the admissions criteria and other attributes of an applicant that would contribute to student success and seek further clarity in metrics that demonstrate what leads to the development of a good clinician to society (CFRs 2.6, 2.10). Further, the faculty could partner with the Institutional Research team to examine additional common trends that are predictors of success, as was attempted with the GRE scores.

Some integrity checks are inherently built into the clinical program through compliance with APA and measures of licensure and placement. Beyond this, TWI engages students in feedback,
performs program reviews, and recently instituted a mid-term evaluation for the classroom (CFRs 2.7, 4.1). Institutional Research data is presented to faculty as is student feedback and examinations of the dissertation process, and while leadership is well-versed in the existence and use of Institutional Research data, it is recommended that all systematically track and document the uses of data for the benefit of sustained practices and to further orient future employees (CFR 3.7).

Putting in place documented and sustainable assessment practices should help the Institute better understand the results of incremental changes in the curriculum, policies, and placement (such as tracking how clinical students who had the extra didactic component perform compared to those who did not). Additional data from alumni of the clinical program may provide further insights into the effectiveness of the program (CFR 4.5).

Students are supported by dedicated faculty and a supportive administration. The clinical assessment program, as an example, was built from the ground up by the faculty with the support and resources afforded to them by the administration. The faculty, who are clinicians and gatekeepers to the professional field, are seen as role models and resident experts. The Institute should continue to foster the creativity of the faculty and explore opportunities that can further support their learning environment, as they themselves have expressed, with additional post-doc support, creative dissertation models, and increased field supervision training.
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

The mission of the Wright Institute is clearly articulated: to “educate students to be critical thinkers and ethical problem solvers, to address community and societal needs, and to function effectively as professionals in a diverse society.” The institutional learning outcomes which flow from and are aligned with the mission, include critical thinking and problem solving; written and oral communication; intercultural knowledge and competence; ethical reasoning and action; and foundation for lifelong learning (CFR 2.2).

Program learning outcomes were designed to both meet the national competency and licensing requirements and align with the institutional learning outcomes. Course syllabi map to program and licensure outcomes. Information about institutional and program learning outcomes are available on institutional and program websites and in student handbooks for each program. They are disseminated during open houses for prospective applicants and during new student orientations (CFRs 2.2, 2.3).

The Clinical Psychology program has thirteen learning outcomes. Students demonstrate achievement of these learning outcomes, in part, by successfully completing a required and sequential course curriculum (including fieldwork). The Wright Institute uses multiple assessment tools in different contexts throughout the curriculum in order to evaluate student learning. The Clinical Program Curriculum and Student Learning Objectives Matrix articulates, for each course, which learning outcome is introduced, developed, or mastered (CFR 2.4).
The 2016-17 Clinical Program Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Report (available as an appendix to the institutional report) cites multiple measures which include grades, the Case–based Clinical Competency Examination, a passing score on knowledge-based competency exam, Field Placement Evaluations, Time to Graduation, Time to Licensure, and successful completion of the internship requirement. Together, a voluminous and wide range of data are produced (Table 28 in Box). Faculty, together with the Field Placement Director, the Dissertation Advisory Committee, the Clinical Program Director, and the Office of Institutional Research are charged with interpretation of the evidence. The evaluation team found that their method and process of synthesis and interpretation are not formal (CFRs 3.7, 4.1). Indirect assessment measures include students’ evaluation of in-house field placements and student evaluation of the programs (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.10).

The Wright Institute has used assessment findings for program improvement. For example, data on the quality of dissertations indicated that this was an area of concern requiring attention. After a detailed analysis of the problem and an assessment of needs, several strategies were implemented for improving dissertation quality including (1) changing the timing and sequence of research courses and the due dates for the dissertation prospectus and proposal, (2) providing additional summer research classes, (3) providing faculty with day-long training and detailed dissertation guidelines and rubrics to standardize expectations, and (4) establishing a Dissertation Advisory Committee that annually reviews dissertations and provides feedback to dissertation chairs to maintain high program standards. This committee is also charged with updating dissertation policy, guidelines, and rubrics. As a result of these changes,
faculty express that dissertation quality has increased. In the counseling program, curriculum changes were implemented in order to improve student achievement of learning outcome 1.3. These include changes in course content and exam questions and the creation of a new standardized examination.

Response to student academic deficiencies has included a clinical case application of theory to practice; efforts to assure inter-rater reliability; modifications to curriculum; revamp of the case study manual; and dissemination of the case study manual throughout the faculty. Because of these efforts, scores improved. Faculty in the Clinical Program meet weekly to evaluate student-learning data, and to observe edits and modifications of case study assignment and assignment tools.

The Counseling Psychology program has eleven learning outcomes (CFRs 2.2, 2.3. 2.4). The program’s Curriculum Map identifies which program learning outcome is introduced, developed, or mastered for each course. Select courses in the program embed a faculty-developed signature assignment that is consistently used across sections of a course and designed to ensure that all students demonstrate competency in core areas of the program. Assignments are graded using a standardized, faculty-developed scoring rubric which is used to measure student learning outcomes and to provide faculty with information about the effectiveness of the curriculum. Students who do not achieve benchmark are flagged for conversation, intervention, and if necessary remediation (CFR 2.13).

Results of signature assignments have been used to identify students who may need additional assistance with writing or with statistics as well as to recommend faculty
development, reflective examination of grading or scoring, calibration, improved use of current literature, and curriculum revision (CFR 4.4).

Evidence of student achievement at graduation is provided through faculty course evaluations, field placement evaluations, signature assignments, and knowledge-based competency exams. Faculty, together with the Field Placement Director, Counseling Program Chair and the Office of Institutional Research interpret the evidence (CFRs 2.6, 4.4). Their method and process of synthesis and interpretation were not readily available to the evaluation team.

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

The emphasis in Component 5 is summed up with the statement that “student success includes not only strong retention and degree completion rates, but also high-quality learning. It means that students are prepared for success in their personal, civic, and professional lives, and that they embody the values and behaviors that make their institution distinctive” (page 31, 2013 Handbook of Accreditation).

TWI has a strong culture in support of these definitions of student success. Inspired students and faculty spoke in evaluation team meetings about the Institute’s commitment to facilitating success; success which means far more than knowledge transfer and the development of skills associated with becoming an outstanding therapist. The academic community lives out the phrase, “they won’t care how much you know until they know how much you care.” At TWI, faculty care for their students, and students indicated that they know it and appreciate it greatly.
Student success in the Clinical Program is measured in part through a written case analysis, which is followed by a comprehensive oral examination conducted by a faculty panel. Responses to student deficiencies have included curriculum modifications and the revision of the case study manual which has subsequently be disseminated throughout the faculty. Observed individual student deficiencies have resulted in recommendations for work at the writing center, mentoring for social support, and other remediation.

Student success in the Counseling Program consists not only in the development of academic skills, but also of the ability to practice therapy, self-monitor and to constructively respond to feedback. These characteristics are observed and assessed through course evaluations and rubrics applied to signature assignments and practicums (CFRs 4.3, 2.2, 2.3).

While the institution has gathered a great deal of data, the evaluation team believes that more could be done to track some of the key measures of success as identified by WSCUC. Close examination of persistence, graduation rates, board-passage rates, and post-graduate placement rates could help TWI to have a better sense of whether students and graduates are achieving outcomes that are important to various external stakeholders. As noted on the TWI website, measures such as attrition and licensure rates are presented, but it is not clear whether TWI is satisfied with their interpretation of the data (CFR 1.2). The Institute can develop ways to interpret causal or contributing factors, create action plans, and then improve outcomes as necessary.
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

Both the Clinical Program and the Counseling Program engage in periodic program reviews. The program review process consists of development of a self-study, external review (culminating in that reviewer’s report), which then forms the basis of action plans which are intended to guide the programs until the next program review cycle (CFR 4.1). The most recent program reviews occurred for the Clinical Program in 2017 and for the Counseling Program in 2012.

The Office of Institutional Research provides an annual Program Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Report. As stated previously in this document, the Institute received a recommendation from WSCUC to 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. Annual reviews serve as an opportunity for systematic reflection and analysis, and offer opportunities to build and implement action steps having to do with all aspects of the institution, as well as to reflect on the results of past action steps. There is much discussion going on at the Institute, but reflection, learning, and response was not perceived to be integrated or formalized. The samples of the Program Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Reports include a great deal of data collected from multiple sources but they appear to be more reports than reviews. Faculty, administrators, and staff are well aware of these reports, although some faculty spoke to being overwhelmed with the amount of data. A proposal to revise the reports to present
primarily data of special interest within the report with other data presented as appendices is being considered. It is not clear how “of interest” will be defined nor is it clear who will be deciding what is of interest. Better definition of these issues would be helpful as would including comparable data from peer institutions.

While the evaluation team could find little formal evidence that systematic analysis and action planning occurs, it did observe that the Institute is thoughtfully making changes. A curriculum committee exists in the clinical program, and faculty were able to speak to its use, and provide examples of changes made as a result of meetings and discussion. There are a number of other structures in place including the case conference leadership meetings that faculty in the clinical program were able to speak to, which offer opportunities for curricular and academic revision. The counseling program is smaller, and while the faculty were able to speak to changes made to curriculum, and a process for doing so, there is not yet a curriculum committee or similar formal committee in place. In meetings with faculty and staff, it was clear that information is shared and discussed, and the clinical faculty were able to speak to it as well as to frequent faculty meetings being a part of the ongoing quality assurance and improvement processes. As acknowledged by the institution, better documentation of these meetings would provide evidence as well as longitudinal data. Faculty in the clinical program commented about their ability to make minor changes and adjustments quickly as a result of interaction with others as well as student feedback (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4).

The Doctor of Psychology (PsyD.) in Clinical Psychology degree program was deemed to be of such quality by the American Psychological Association so as to earn a grant of 10-year
reaffirmation of accreditation. This reaffirmation speaks to The Wright Institute’s commitment to serve students well. The APA letter dated May 15, 2018 contains only a few items needing additional attention. And the action steps taken to respond may well provide a model for formalizing responses to issues raised in the annual self-study process, and in faculty meetings. As identified in TWI’s Program Review Policy, program reviews are to take place every seven years, and annual reports feed data into the reviews. The Counseling Psychology program has begun work on a Program Review due later in 2019. Enrollment fluctuation, licensure pass rates, student complaints, strategic planning, accountability for action steps, and budgetary considerations are some of the items that could be covered annually (CFR 2.7, 4.1, 4.6).

The Institutional Research office provides a significant amount of data that might be useful for academic and other decision-making, but its value cannot be assessed without further reflection and interpretation. It is also not clear that there is a process in place by which faculty and others might request specific data other than that provided in the report (CFR 4.2).

Formal staff reviews do not appear to be taking place, and staff could not speak to formal policies regarding performance nor of formal policies regarding opportunities for professional development. Staff were able to reference several professional development opportunities, but were not able to identify an expectation, process, or procedure for taking part in professional development as a part of their jobs. One staff member indicated that he had received a performance review, but only after requesting it. While both the APA and WASC self-studies involved many at the Institute, the evaluation team could not find evidence of formal
procedures in place to review the various non-academic offices and departments that are a part of the Institute, including admissions, marketing, and the IR Office (CFR 4.3, 4.4).

Several faculty were able to speak to their participation in inter-rater reliability exercises in support of authentication of the grading process. Faculty also spoke to consistent use of rubrics, which may lead to greater effectiveness and consistency of grading. As expressed in the Institutional Report (page 18), “(TWI) has not devoted time in recent years to conducting an analysis of grades and evaluation procedures...” A formal analysis will only strengthen what is already taking place informally.

At several meetings, faculty and administrators spoke to ongoing reflection about their roles in the Institute, which may be consistent with the idea of “practice” in clinical psychology. Faculty identified presentations and attendance at conferences as one way in which TWI stays current with changes in the theories and profession of psychology. The VPAA is quite active in APA, which helps to keep the Institute current with APA policies and procedures, although faculty and the VPAA also spoke to being at the forefront of such thought. Feedback from clinical sites that TWI works with provides another way in which the Institute stays abreast of changes in the profession (CFR 4.5, 4.6, 4.7).

While students were concerned about transparency of decision-making processes, they were on a first name basis with the VPAA, and spoke glowingly of the academic support that they receive, and several acknowledged that there are many avenues for input into academic decision making. They did not speak to taking part in the Strategic Planning Process, but did feel that they had a voice in academic matters.
A Strategic Plan, containing four initiatives, was approved by the Board of Trustees in December 2018. The Board of Trustees spoke of engaging a consultant and forming an ad hoc committee to look into the creation of a new academic, degree-granting program. At this time the creation of the program continues to be under consideration. There was no evidence presented of an environmental scan, pro forma budget, or job market and competitive analyses having to do with the proposed program. Given the resources required to create a new program the Institute may wish to consider gathering further data prior to doing so (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

Another item included in the Strategic Plan, promoting Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, appears to have emerged in part from students and from expectations of both the clinical and counseling psychology professions, as well as WSCUC and the APA. Students, faculty, staff, and administration expressed concerns about diversity issues. A consultant has been involved in addressing these concerns, and is anticipated to help move the Institute beyond the discussion stage (CFR 1.4).

Strengthening community engagement, specifically through internship programs, and promoting academic excellence both appear to be well underway. The first is exemplified by the robust clinical program overseen by the Institute wherein students begin clinical work in their first year. The counseling program faculty spoke to a 100% internship placement rate. The Institute acknowledges that it could do more to involve employers in discussions and planning to formalize a process for doing so (CFR 4.6).

The Institute should continue with the 2015 WSCUC recommendation to 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) and a formal action plan which assigns responsibilities, and integrates budget and other resources (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

The President and VPFAA meet annually (CFR 3.8) with the key employees of the clinical and counseling programs to develop the operating budget before it is presented to the Board Finance and Personnel Committee for recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Wright Institute develops its budget from a review of prior year’s performance. Prepared by program leaders, this review is used to help evaluate progress, identify gaps, and determine the priorities on which to focus (CFR 3.1, 3.4). A key part of this process is to utilize findings and recommendations from internal discussions and external program reviews, which informs the budget planning process for the development of the next budget (CFR 3.7, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6).

TWI is a tuition-dependent institution, with 90% of its 2018/19 annual operating budget of $15 million derived from student tuition and fees. Downward fluctuations in enrollments have an impact on the operating budget, creating a challenge for enrollment planning. Compensation makes up approximately 67% of the $15 million operating budget. Given these facts, the institute may need to have a contingency budget to forestall any decline in enrollment. That said, TWI has successfully met its budgeted revenue and has produced net revenue after expenses or net surplus on its statement of activities the last three years (CFR 3.4).
To reduce TWI’s enrollment dependence for revenue sources, the development of a revenue diversification plan is encouraged, with goals that are consistent with the Institute’s mission (CFR 3.4). Another area for consideration is the development of a Strategic Enrollment Plan. The development of such a plan can help an institution to understand the market demand for their programs, the program strength, the competition, and tuition pricing strategies. A multi-year enrollment plan can also inform a multi-year budget plan as well as contribute to TWI’s strategic plan (CFR 3.4).

The institute has unqualified annual financial audits, which are performed by an independent certified public accounting firm (CFR 1.7, 3.4). The most recent audited financial statements provided by the Institute (FY 2016/17), reflects an increase in total assets of $1.6 million over the previous year.

The 2016/17 Statement of Activities reflect that 85% of the Institute’s revenue is derived from tuition and fees. The change in net assets for the fiscal year ending June 2017 reflects a positive increase of $1.8 million.

The United States Department of Education utilizes a Financial Responsibility Composite Score (DOE Federal Composite Score) to gauge the fundamental elements of the financial health of an institution. This measure is derived by combining three ratios reported in an institution's audited financial statements: the primary reserve ratio, an equity ratio, and a net income ratio. The Wright Institute’s DOE Composite score of 3.0 for FY 2013/14 and 2014/15 is the highest possible score an institution can achieve.
In addition, an analysis of core ratios (Operational Ratios, Liquidity Ratios, and Capital Related Ratios) compared to Moody’s Higher Education Median “A” rated institutions, and to Moody’s small private University medians reflects that TWI’s Operating ratios, such as Operating Margin ratio, indicate a healthy 10.9% and 13.5% for FY 2016 and 2017 compared to 3.6% to Moody’s “A” rated medians.

The Return on Net Assets ratio, which indicates whether the institution’s total assets are increasing or decreasing, reflects a positive 9.7% and 12.2% respectively for FY 2016 and 2017 compared to 9.1% for Moody’s “A” rated medians. Liquidity ratios measure the institution’s ability to meet its short-term financial obligations. TWI’s Days Cash on Hand ratio reflected 284.4 and 207.2 days respectively for FY 2016 and 2017, compared to 397 days to Moody’s “A” rated medians.

The long-term Debt ratio is a measure of the debt an institution carries compared with the value of its assets or equity. TWI’s ratios for FY 2016 and 2017 are below the Moody’s “A” rated medians, but their core ratios are within 20% above or below “A” rated institutional medians, reflecting a positive financial position.

Enrollments for the Clinical program for the past five years have been mostly flat, averaging just over 350 students. Enrollment for the Counseling program over the last 5 years has increased from 81 to 151 students. To accommodate this growth, TWI pursued a substantial expansion of academic space through the purchase and renovation of an additional building. The purchase was made possible through the board-designated endowment fund and a mortgage on the building. The annual debt service, principle and interest, for FY 2018/19 is budgeted at a
manageable 4.3% of the annual operating budget (CFR 3.4). Overall, total enrollment for The Wright Institute have seen modest annual increases.

Based on data provided related to faculty demographics, two-thirds of TWI’s full-time faculty are people of color. The Institute has taken steps to address prior concerns regarding diversity, equity and inclusion through the establishment of diversity committees, training, and the engagement of an outside consultant whose work is in progress (CFR 1.4, 3.1).

TWI’s faculty have identified the need for support in developing teaching innovations, in particular those related to technology. The VPAA, working with the Faculty Council chair, will be making recommendations at the May 2019 meeting regarding how TWI can improve its use of instructional technology (CFR 3.5).

The Wright Institute board, faculty and administrative leadership are cognizant of the changing higher education and professional landscape. They work to remain current with changes in their related disciplines, and in response to the perception that a growing percentage of their graduates are working in the field of Organizational Psychology, are considering the addition of that as an additional degree-granting program. The Institute appears to effectively interact with the local community and its needs, at the same time keeping in mind national trends to be sustainable in its program offerings. A comprehensive strategic plan, integrating academic, enrollment, technology, capital and financial plans can provide TWI with a roadmap to guide and sustain it into the future.

H. **Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes** – Not applicable
I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

The institutional reflection presented in Component 9 includes well-deserved pride in the accomplishments of TWI since the last WSCUC reaffirmation process. In particular, the Institutional Report points out changes to the mission statement, revised assessment policies and instruments, acquisition of additional space, doubling of unrestricted assets, and significant increases to enrollment within the Counseling program. There is further expressed satisfaction that the academic programs it offers are of interest to the markets it serves, and the ten-year reaffirmation by the APA is a testament to the quality of the clinical psychology program. TWI has also created important clinical education relationships with first responders and within Contra Costa County, serving to provide both clinical education opportunities for students as well as a public benefit.

TWI also acknowledges opportunities for improvement through the self-study process. It expresses the need, endorsed by the evaluation team, to further engage employers of graduates as an important source of assessment information. There is also opportunity to engage in the periodic review of grades (4.4).

The team advocates for greater documentation of policies, processes, procedures and meetings. As expressed in the institution’s self-study: “While the Institute benefits from operating in a very collaboratively and relatively informal manner, thoughtful policies help to ensure an orderly environment should times turn stressful.” One way to do this would be for the Institute to “revise its handbooks” (page 64). As reflected in the evaluation team’s commendations and recommendations, there is a great deal of alignment between TWI’s
reflections and opportunities for improvement on the basis of the self-study and the team’s findings and conclusions.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the evaluation team was impressed with The Wright Institute. As expressed previously, the culture of the institution is one of collaboration and support of students and their success. The following commendations and recommendations summarize the team’s perspective on this reaffirmation of accreditation review.

Commendations

The team commends the Wright Institute for:

1. Living out its mission and institutional goals.

2. Adopting a student-centered educational pedagogy that emphasizes faculty-student relationships in support of student success.

3. Faculty who are clearly engaged and passionate about the academic success and personal and professional well-being of their students within an institutional setting that offers many benefits of a small, individualized education. It is impressive to observe the degree to which faculty members use experience, networks, and external resources in their support of students.

4. A collaborative culture that reflects mutually supportive relationships between the Board, administration, faculty, staff and students, which responds to the best interests of the students.
5. A Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) in Clinical Psychology degree program deemed to be of such quality by the American Psychological Association as to warrant a grant of 10-year reaffirmation of accreditation.

6. Acquiring a new and spacious facility to house the well-respected Counseling Program, which allows space for additional programmatic possibilities.

7. Audited financial statements, which reflect a financially well-managed institution.

**Recommendations.** The team recommends that the Wright Institute focus on the following:

1. Continue in the maturation of assessment activities, with a particular commitment to improvements in data retrieval, review, interpretation, analysis, and more effective and efficient evidence-based decision making in support of improved student outcomes and achievement of institutional goals (CFR 1.2, 2.6, 4.1).

2. Continue with efforts to identify and improve key outcome measures of student success across both programs, including persistence, completion, licensure-passage rates, and placement, and commit to improving those outcomes over time (CFR 1.2, 4.1, 4.4).

3. Evaluate human resources and staffing models at all levels to ensure sufficiency of staff in support of identified goals (CFR 3.1, 3.5).

4. Advance the institutional culture in support of diversity, inclusion, and equity, including an assessment about how staffing at all levels of the organization reflects the diversity to which the institution aspires, and communicate progress of diversity-related initiatives regularly throughout the organization (CFR 1.4).
5. Formalize and document policies, practices, procedures, processes, meetings, and committee charters in support of memorializing institutional history and to facilitate future planning and decision-making (3.7).

6. Fully implement the 2015 WSCUC recommendation that 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, 4.6, 4.7).
### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where is the policy located?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Wright Institute Credit Hour Policy is available to students on the Institute’s internal portal online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy attached to Institute report as an appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Credit Hour Policy.pdf](Credit Hour Policy.pdf)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Wright Institute reviews credit unit policies and compliance with federal regulations on a revolving three-year basis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical program 2007-2018 Course Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling program 2016-2018 Course Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course schedules for both programs show names of courses, dates to meet, and units to be earned upon completion of course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? TWI offers no online or hybrid courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                       | What discipline(s)?}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</th>
<th>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) | How many syllabi were reviewed? | | |
| Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. | What kinds of courses? | | |
| | Supervised Fieldwork Agreement - Contract | | |
| How does credit for field placement work? Six semester units of credit equals a minimum of 500 total training hours (which includes 280 hours of direct, face-to-face client hours), over a period of at least nine months. Students receive credit once Field Placement has received all required forms and passing evaluations. There is no partial credit given for field placement. | What degree level(s)? | AA/AS | BA/BS | MA | Doctoral |
| | | | |
| What discipline(s)? | PsyD Clinical | MA Counseling | | |
| Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? | YES | NO | |
| Comments: | While in practicum, students are concurrently enrolled in a Professional Development Seminar that oversees and tracks their progress at external agencies. | | |
| Supervised Fieldwork Agreement. This form between the practicum agency and the Wright Institute outlines the expectations and responsibilities of both parties. | | | |

| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials) | How many programs were reviewed? | 2 programs |
| | What kinds of programs were reviewed? | PsyD Clinical | MA Counseling |
| | What degree level(s)? | AA/AS | BA/BS | MA | Doctoral |
| | What discipline(s)? | Psychology | Counseling | | |
| Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? | YES | NO |
| www.wi.edu/psyd-program-overview | www.wi.edu/ma-program | | |
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2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal regulations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
<td><strong>YES ☐ NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>The Wright Institute does not provide incentive compensation to employers or third party entities for securing student enrollments,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion and cost</td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <strong>YES ☐ NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyD 3 years of coursework and 2 years for dissertation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Counseling 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.wi.edu/student-achievement">www.wi.edu/student-achievement</a></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <strong>YES ☐ NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are able to find information on cost of degree and financial aid on the Institute websites:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wi.edu/tuition-financial-aid">www.wi.edu/tuition-financial-aid</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.wi.edu/ma-coursework">www.wi.edu/ma-coursework</a></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition costs fully described on websites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Careers and employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</th>
<th>YES ☐ NO ☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [www.wi.edu/psyd-program-alumni](http://www.wi.edu/psyd-program-alumni)  
[www.wi.edu/ma-program-alumni](http://www.wi.edu/ma-program-alumni) | |

| Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? | ☐ YES ☐ NO |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Institute provides information about specific employers but not about specific jobs secured by individual graduates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)*

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

Review Completed By: Bonnie Paller  
Date: March 6, 2019

### 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>
</table>
| Policy on student complaints | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
☑ YES ☐ NO  
If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?  
Clinical Program Student Handbook, p. 56  
Counseling Program Student Handbook, p. 41 |

| Comments:  
Grievance Process  
https://wascsenior.box.com/s/cyqpc7wvam2e8m1bn75ejmanha5shsg | |
| Process(es)/ procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|  
|                        | □ YES  ☐ NO  
|                        | If so, please describe briefly:  
|                        | Both programs have a process for recognizing and resolving student complaints. All documents are maintained in accordance with federal, state and institutional policies regarding record keeping and privacy. Every complaint must be in writing; the respective Program Director documents the process for addressing the complaint and the outcome of the process.  
|                        |  
| If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
|                        | □ YES  ☐ NO  
| Comments:              |  

| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
|---------|-------------------------------------------------|  
|         | □ YES  ☐ NO  
|         | If so, where?  
|         | Records maintained by VPAA in Clinical program and by the Registrar in Counseling program via a log system. Complaint form allows for tracking and monitoring of student complaint  
|         |  
| Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  
|         | □ YES  ☐ NO  
|         | If so, please describe briefly:  
|         | Log system seems fairly new.  
| Comments: |  
|         | Perhaps a web-based archive would serve their needs better.  

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

Review Completed By: Bonnie Paller  
Date: March 6, 2019
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 publically available?  
  □ YES □ NO  
  If so, where?  
  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  
  Comments:  
  The Wright Institute does not accept transfer students. |

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

(1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

(2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

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

Review Completed By: Bonnie Paller  
Date: March 6, 2019