REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To California Institute of Integral Studies

April 14, 2008

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster
Aimée Dorr, Chair, University of California, Los Angeles
Mary Beth Kenkel, Assistant Chair, Florida Institute of Technology
Jan K. Brown, Pacific Oaks College
Dan Hocoy, Pacifica Graduate Institute
Kenneth A. Tokuno, University of Hawaii at Manoa

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

PART I. Overview and Context

Description of California Institute of Integral Studies and the Visit

The WASC site visiting team spent February 6-8, 2008 at the California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS, or Institute). The Institute's preparation for the visit was organized and comprehensive. The Institute prepared a thoughtful and reflective Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) report, relevant data tables, and a CD and institutional website with supplemental materials. CIIS staff were prompt and responsive to the team's requests for additional materials and schedule changes and made certain that the visit ran smoothly and efficiently. The team room was well organized and provided for every need. During the visit, members of the Institute administration, faculty, staff, and student body were readily available for interviews and provided frank and thoughtful responses to the team's questions. Open meetings for faculty, staff, and students were very well attended, and participants were well aware of the purpose of the EER visit and the Institute's efforts to demonstrate its educational effectiveness.

The California Institute of Integral Studies (CIIS) is an independent, non-sectarian institution founded in 1968 by Haridas Chaudhuri, who served as its first President. It was originally named the California Institute of Asian Studies and operated as an educational extension of the Cultural Integration Fellowship. The Institute was separately incorporated in 1974 and offered graduate degrees only. In 1980, the institution's name was changed to the California Institute of Integral Studies.

CIIS now grants the degrees of B.A., M.A., Psy.D., and Ph.D. The Institute's use of the term "integral" connotes an approach to life, philosophy, and education that focuses on wholeness and integration rather than fragmentation. Institute programs include educational approaches that emphasize integral, comparative, and cross-cultural work, often incorporating ideas from both the East and the West.

CIIS's accreditation history has been variable. WASC granted candidacy status to CIIS in 1974 and accredited it first in 1981. After a comprehensive review in 1991, WASC deferred reaffirmation of accreditation and placed CIIS on a warning for compliance with what were then Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9. A second comprehensive visit was held in spring 1996, following which WASC removed the warning but deferred reaffirmation of accreditation, asking for a special visit in spring 1999. Following the 1999 special visit, WASC continued the deferral of reaffirmation of accreditation and placed CIIS on warning, identifying three major areas of concern: academic quality and rigor, institutional resources, and planning. A special visit was mandated in 2001, at which time the special team noted much progress had been made. In response to a very serious financial situation, the Institute had been downsized, with reductions in faculty, staff, and schools (from five to two, Professional Psychology and Consciousness and Transformation). The Institute's President, Joseph L. Subbiondo, hired in 1999, had been making progress on many fronts. Accordingly, the Commission removed the warning, reaffirmed the accreditation of CIIS, and scheduled a two-stage re-accreditation review under the new model.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit took place March 15-17, 2006. The WASC Senior Commission endorsed the findings and five recommendations of the CPR team

and asked the Institute to address five issues during the Educational Effectiveness Review. Four were also recommendations from the CPR report, specifically: financial planning, faculty and staff workload, diversity, and assessment and educational effectiveness. One, retention and time-to-degree, had been raised in the CPR report but no recommendation addressed it. One recommendation from the CPR report, addressing student support, was not specifically identified in the WASC letter as a topic to address at the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) Report Quality and Alignment with the Proposal

In its February 2004 Proposal to WASC, CIIS stated that "the overarching goal of this review process is to facilitate reflection on and discussion about integral learning" (p. 3, proposal). CIIS also wanted to develop approaches to assessment of student learning that would strengthen and support integral education. The assessment experiences addressed during the EER included capstone experiences at the B.A. and M.A. levels and doctoral dissertation proposals. Additionally, CIIS responded to WASC's request to determine how successful the Institute has been in retaining and graduating students. This last issue, although not a part of CIIS's original proposal, was raised as a concern in the CPR report and a request in the subsequent WASC letter and therefore included in the EER.

The EER report is closely aligned with the goals of the proposal. Essays address each of the thematic areas. The first essay on integral education covers many aspects of this issue, thereby addressing Standards 1, 2, and 4. The essays on assessing dissertation proposals and on capstones and assessment both cover Standards 2 and 4. The retention and graduation essay focuses mainly on Standard 4, although it also includes many insights about support for students (Standard 2). A final integrative essay summarizes what CIIS has learned from the WASC review and outlines directions for the future.

The EER report was very well written and demonstrated significant reflection on issues of educational effectiveness. Questions raised in the Institutional Proposal were answered to varying degrees, but in all cases there was clear evidence of the faculty's, students', and staff's engagement with the questions and reflective dialogue about them. Additionally, the EER report included the results of special data collection efforts pertinent to the educational effectiveness questions as well as the use of regularly collected institutional data to answer questions of educational effectiveness. For some questions, CIIS discovered that it would need to refine measurement tools (e.g., a dissertation proposal rubric with finer gradients) or develop better learning assessment methods (e.g., for some capstone courses). For other questions, such as "what is integral education?", a simple answer was not sought, but instead an intensive reflection and Institute-wide discussion of the meaning, methods, and measurement of integral education.

Supplementary materials and the Institute's website were well organized and well presented and provided a wealth of information on the main topics of the EER. An innovative feature during the visit was a "poster session" on the first evening. Posters and multi-media presentations were used to describe each academic program, its learning outcomes, and achievements. Not only did the team gain a great deal of information from this event, but also faculty and students were enthusiastic about presenting their own programs and learning about the other academic programs.

The EER report and discussions during the site visit provided evidence of widespread participation in the self-study process and of institutional learning.

Capacity and Preparatory Review Update and Follow On

As explained above, the WASC letter of July 7, 2006 requested that CIIS's EER materials include progress reports on five issues identified by the CPR visiting team. CIIS did so. In describing the Institute's progress and current status, the EER visiting team will address three of these issues – financial planning, faculty and staff workload, and diversity – in this section and add to it consideration of a fourth topic, student support, that was the subject of a recommendation in the CPR visiting team report but not explicitly called out in the WASC letter. The two remaining topics from the WASC letter – (1) assessment and educational effectiveness and (2) retention and time-to-degree – will be taken up in Part II of this report, which addresses educational effectiveness. For the four issues covered in this section, the team has chosen to include everything relevant to the topic rather than separate the discussion into just the specifics raised by WASC and/or the CPR team here and matters arising from the EER visit in Part II. In Part III, all aspects of the EER visiting team's experience will be brought together in a summary and set of recommendations.

Financial planning

As reported in Data Tables 5.3 and 5.4, and verified in the audited financial statements, since the CPR visit CIIS has continued to produce operating surpluses. Budgets have been balanced, and it is clear to the team that the Board and the administration are committed to maintaining financial stability (CFR 3.5). Earlier recommendations regarding the building of financial reserves and capital remain, because CIIS has prioritized other financial needs as discussed below.

Enrollment, as reported in Table 2.1, also continues to increase (5% over 2006). Expenditure limitations and controls were discussed with the team in interviews with the Controller, the President, staff members, and faculty members, evidencing institutional awareness and contribution to the budget process across all constituencies. Faculty and staff members of the Institute Budget and Planning Committee expressed their awareness and understanding of budget issues.

Progress has also been made in developing nontuition revenues and fundraising plans. CIIS continues to address nontuition revenue streams, targeting specifically its Public Programs. These programs not only provide additional operating revenues to the Institute, but also serve to increase public awareness of CIIS. The team interviewed the Director of Development, who provided the team an update of the organization of a development plan, which puts structures in place to identify and cultivate prospective donors, including alumni. The team was impressed with the work that has been accomplished since the last visit. CIIS has increased the Development Office staff, which allows for more planning and donor cultivation on the part of the Development Director.

Since the 2006 visit, CIIS has also addressed concerns about being located in rented space. In May of 2007, the Institute purchased the building at 1453 Mission Street; CIIS had been renting space in the building and had most of its units and activities located in the building. The team was impressed with the thoughtful and comprehensive analysis which culminated in the decision to purchase the building. The team noted that the "Rationale for the Purchase of Building at 1453 Mission Street" document prepared by the Controller took into account the financial, programmatic, and mission-related aspects of the transaction. The financial and structural analyses were both quite complete. Excitement over the purchase of the building was evident to the team. In every meeting conducted during the visit, team members were told of the value of "having our own space." Board members told the team that owning the space gives stability and substance to the institution and provides a new base for future planning.

Financial realities of the purchase required the Institute to adjust certain of its financial assumptions. The building's $16 million purchase price is financed through loans from three entities, each requiring interest-only payments for five years, with balloon payments due at the end of the five years. The team reviewed a document produced by the Controller for review by the Board detailing the rationale for the building's purchase. As the Controller, the President, and the Board members explained to the team, the time was right from a real estate perspective and was in line with the CIIS strategic plan. CIIS had planned in the current year budget to engage an architect to begin planning for space utilization and renovation in the newly purchased building. Because enrollment increases were lower than budgeted, this planning was postponed. The Board expressed its clear intention to continue the work of making the building suit CIIS's mission and strategic plan. The team is convinced that CIIS has an understanding of the financial risks resulting from the building purchase and has addressed foreseeable contingencies.

The Board approved a deficit budget for 2007-08 which is detailed in the data tables. As described to the team by the Controller and the Board, CIIS believes that expenses related to the building purchase must not supplant its commitment to raising faculty salaries and adding staff positions. To honor other institutional priorities, the Board believes it to be prudent to approve a deficit budget for the 2007-08 year and perhaps the following year as well.

Reviewing the Board of Trustees' October 2007 minutes, the team noted that the Finance Committee will discuss "dashboard" financial metrics it believes to be critical for operational excellence. Discussions with faculty and the President confirmed that budget and financial information continues to be disclosed in a regular and transparent fashion. A review of minutes of the Board of Trustees and its Finance Committee revealed regular financial reporting and discussion of the auditors' management letter.

CIIS recently contracted for a capital campaign market study, asking that the consultant test the feasibility of a $12 million campaign to support building renovations, endowment, and debt repayment. The team reviewed a copy of the consultant's report that recommended CIIS modify its goal to $6 million over a five-year period, with funds to be raised primarily for scholarships, academic programs, and public programs. It was the consultant's opinion that donors would be more likely to contribute to scholarships and programs than to a building. In discussions with the Controller, the President, and the Board, the team learned that CIIS believes

that fundraising for the purposes recommended in the consultant's report will provide budget relief which will allow the Institute to decrease debt through operations.

Faculty and administrators interviewed by the team continue to be committed to increasing scholarship support for students, but progress toward this goal may be temporarily supplanted by the need to devote financial resources to purchase of the building. The building purchase has provided more support for students through allocation of space for student use, as recommended in the 2006 report.

At the time of the 2006 Capacity and Preparatory Review, CIIS had produced a 2004-05 to 2008-09 strategic plan that had been approved by the Board of Trustees on February 25, 2005. Four goals were established: enhance academic quality; enroll 1,000 FTE students; increase annual gifts and grants to $1 million; and grow lifelong learning revenue to $1 million. Key performance measures had been established; however, the capacity to document and assess performance and the ability to execute strategies to achieve strategic targets within expected timeframes were still developing (CFR 4.3). Evidence of strategic goal attainment was limited. Planning processes showed potential to drive the allocation of resources, although success in this area was thought to require stronger coordination of the work of planning groups with the process of decision-making. The Institute showed awareness of its need to build capacity in planning and institutional assessment.

Two years later, at the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, the 2004-05 to 2008-09 strategic plan continues in force. The team reviewed the version that had been updated with objectives and tactics for 2006-07. The four goals remained the same except that "lifelong learning" was replaced with "Public Programs" in the fourth goal. The goals continue to seem well chosen, and the objectives and tactics feasible and appropriate. Three of the four strategic plan's goals to be achieved by 2008-09 are related directly to financial improvement. At the time of the EER, enrollment growth has nearly reached the target of 1,000 FTE students. In the data tables provided by CIIS, total FTE students reported for fall 2007 were 971. The goal of increasing annual gifts and grants to $1 million was realized in fiscal 2007 primarily due to the receipt of a large bequest. The Institute made significant progress in its planning for a capital campaign and in increasing its advancement planning. The third financial goal is to grow Public Programs revenues to $1 million. Actual Public Program revenues reported in the data tables for fiscal 2007 were $679,000, up from $248,000 in 2005. Projections shown for 2008 are $811,000.

Conversations with the President and the Board of Trustees indicated that the strategic planning document is actively used by both to guide management choices, set yearly goals, and evaluate the President's performance (CFR 4.1, 4.2). Greater attention is given to the latter three goals that primarily address institutional resources, than to the first, which addresses academic quality. Progress is being made on all four goals, and compared to 2006 there is a clear sense that the institution has better understanding of how it operates and greater capacity to manage that operation effectively to achieve its major goals. The President indicated that the strategic plan will be updated annually, and for the next few years he will continue to focus on the goals outlined in the current plan with the setting and monitoring of new targets for each goal.

Faculty and staff workload

Concerns about faculty workload were noted in the CPR review. During the EER visit, faculty were even more vocal about feeling overworked, being stretched too thin, and having insufficient time for their scholarship (CFR 2.1, 3.1, 3.2). Again this seems to be a particularly serious problem for the program directors who are called upon for numerous administrative tasks in addition to their teaching and advising roles. However, almost all faculty present at the open faculty meeting voiced concerns about being overworked. A common concern is the "invisible work," such as comprehensives, independent studies, advising, and mentoring, that is not given units in the workload assignments. A representative on the Faculty Workload Committee indicated that this is the main issue being addressed by the committee and a proposal would soon go to the faculty. Progress has been delayed by the committee's attempts to be sensitive to the issues and nuances of the different academic programs.

The faculty's increased workload is partly due to their involvement in the development and implementation of a number of new systems associated with building a culture of assessment and evidence at CIIS (CFR 2.4). These include the first cycle of program reviews, the development of learning outcomes and assessment tools, the retreats and discussions on integral education and diversity, and the development of new faculty policies and procedures. Most faculty believe that these processes will require less time once clear measures and procedures are put into place, become more familiar, and are incorporated into academic life. However, since many of these initiatives are still nascent, it is possible that they will not become institutionalized and instead be relegated to the bottom of the faculty's to-do list. Therefore, the issue of faculty workload should be taken seriously, and methods of oversight and reward should be put in place to ensure faculty's continued involvement in maintaining and developing methods for assessing educational effectiveness and for feeding information back into decision making. Additionally, streamlining of some procedures might be in order. Two mentioned at the open faculty meeting were the program review process and the faculty contract renewal procedure, especially for long-term faculty (faculty wonder if multiple letters of reference really are needed). More efficient, non-duplicative governance and administrative systems and better communication systems also were suggested, as well as more staff support for programmatic tasks. Reducing staff turnover and better training of staff were also seen as helpful in reducing faculty workload demands.

Data in Table 5 indicate that adjunct faculty are used heavily, particularly in the School of Professional Psychology, as course instructors. However, for the most part adjunct faculty do not seem to be involved in administrative tasks nor to take part in the many discussions around diversity, outcomes assessment, or integral education. Many have limited availability, and they are not compensated for participation in such non-teaching activities. Therefore, adjunct faculty do not share in the distribution of these "invisible" and administrative tasks that are contributing to faculty's workload strain. Additionally, while CIIS core faculty grow in their understanding of, and competency in, educational effectiveness methods and measures, there appear to be no systematic or sustained trainings occurring with adjunct faculty. Therefore, they may not know or be able to implement the Institute's expectations for learning and student attainment (CFR 2.4, 3.2). Additionally, the proportion of adjunct to core faculty should be examined to insure that all aspects of workload are being sufficiently covered (CFR 3.1, 3.2).

Even with the workload strains, faculty remain highly committed to CIIS and indicate that they enjoy working at a place with such a unique and noteworthy mission and culture. Additionally faculty appreciate the administration's efforts to bring faculty salaries to the national mean and to help the academic programs "mature." In spite of faculty workload issues, students reported that faculty were accessible and timely in their responses. However, a number of students expressed concern about faculty being overworked.

CRF 3.1 explicitly states the need for staff sufficient in number to maintain the Institute's operations and provide academic program support. The CPR report indicated some shortage of such staff. Data Table 4.4 (as revised) shows that there were 50 full-time and 24 part-time staff in 2001 and 77 full-time and 18 part-time staff by 2007. This is roughly an addition of 14.0 FTE in 6 years, which is significant.

The team met with a significantly large group of staff; at least 40 were present or about half of the total staff in a standing-room-only setting. The presence of directors and other high level employees in the room may have constrained some staff from speaking out, but the general tone seemed to be one of considerable candor. Staff feel under-appreciated and neglected. A number of reasons were given for this, but it is not clear which, if any, of these would sufficiently address what is clearly low morale within this important group of employees. It is equally clear, however, that the staff have a distinct and resounding passion for the Institute.

Given the staff's love of CIIS, low morale is hard to explain, but it might be attributed to a number of causes. Staff comments indicate that they believe there is an increased workload due to larger enrollment. Data tables show, however, that the staff has increased by about 25% over the past six years, while enrollment has increased by 16%. Alternative explanations for the staff feeling overworked are the expansion of technology, requiring the learning of new procedures and skills, growth in specific areas where staff has not been increased, and staff turnover, adding burdens on those left behind which are proportionate to the time it takes to fill the vacancies and train new employees.

Another cause of low morale might be the pay and benefits, yet pay would seem to be commensurate with what is received by staff in similar positions at peer institutions and the fact is that the staff work 35 hours a week, giving them one less hour of work per day in contrast to the common 8 hour day. Benefits are also good. CIIS allows for 17 holidays per year and a maximum of 25 days per year of vacation time. This is in contrast to the CSU system in which staff get 14 days of holidays and a maximum of 16 days of vacation. The total difference for the combination of both forms of leave is 12 days in favor of CIIS staff.

It is possible that the perception of inadequate pay is a major contributor to low morale. Staff pointed out that there are ways to get pay increases, but they believe increases are hard to get. Some staff said they felt "trapped" as there is no career ladder for them to climb and no true merit pay to recognize good performance. CIIS offers a STEP (Success Through Exceptional Performance) program. The employee must qualify by completing training, community service, and a special project. The resulting pay increase (a minimum of $10,000 annually) will depend on the availability of funds and the number of employees who qualify. Staff do get a cost of

living increase of approximately 3% annually based on the national COLA amount. Major pay increases are difficult to get according to at least one director.

Program coordinators are a special case. Each of these fills a key role as administrative support to the program directors. Both they and the program directors noted that program coordinators have too much to do for hours they have. At the end of the visit, the team believed that only one of the coordinators is full time and the rest are generally at 0.6 FTE. At the time the draft final report was reviewed, CIIS leadership indicated that "three of the program coordinators are full-time, eight are 0.8 FTE, one is 0.6 FTE, and one is 0.5 FTE." In addition to being a main point of contact for students in the program, program coordinators maintain records, work with adjunct faculty, handle correspondence, work with other offices on site, and manage the curriculum. The extent of duties suggests that this be a full time job in all cases except for programs in which there are only a few students enrolled.

There is a staff handbook. It does not include information about the STEP program and some staff said they have not seen it, although it is posted on the web. There was also some confusion as to whether staff can depend on the information since the cover states that the handbook is in draft form and can be changed at any time without notice. This could be symptomatic of a general problem with internal communication, which in turn might be another reason for low morale.

Staff have a voice in the administration as there is a staff representative who is a full voting member of the Board of Trustees. Given CIIS's size, there is also ample opportunity for solid communication throughout. Despite these elements, staff feel they do not have enough communicated to them. A common modern problem is for important information to be placed on the web site with the sense that people will know to seek it there. It may be necessary for the administration to find a more active way to transmit information which is now passively available. Whether this is needed or whether some other approach is needed was called into question, because after reviewing the draft final report, CIIS leadership reported that "When information is initially placed on the intranet, an email is sent with an attachment of the information or a link to the information. Also every new employee meets with the Human Resources Manager and receives a tour of the information on the Intranet." In any event, for whatever reason, staff attending the meeting seemed to feel insufficiently informed.

The workload of the staff was identified as a concern in the CPR report, but it appears that the situation is now worse (CFR 3.1). This is open to debate, but there is no question that morale among staff at the meeting is low, whatever the reasons. CIIS's administration needs to make a special effort to understand the causes of staff concern and then seek out appropriate remedies. They might be as simple as creating more ways to acknowledge the importance and value of the staff to the day-to-day operation of the Institute; they might involve changing staff expectations or hopes; or they might involve changing work responsibilities or some other remedy or set of remedies. With more information should come the opportunity to improve staff circumstances and/or morale.

Diversity

CIIS hails a commitment to cultural diversity as the third of its seven ideals (CIIS website). Indeed, the San Francisco location would seem to make this a nearly unavoidable value, even without the existence of CFR 1.5. In the CPR report, WASC recommended that the Institute think of diversity along multiple dimensions beyond gender and race/ethnicity.

The CPR report suggested that the male gender could be seen to be under-represented with only about one-fourth of the students, stating that if one's criterion were resemblance to population characteristics then "It would be desirable to enroll proportionally more men" (p. 10). From 2005 to 2007, the balance shifted slightly in this direction. Table 2.2 (EER Data Tables, November 2007) show 69.7% of the student body is now female. At the same time, the proportion of male faculty has also increased, but in this case, it has created a clear imbalance of 56% male faculty (EER Data Table 4.1). At this point, however, gender diversity is not a concern.

In considering race/ethnicity, curiously, there was a large decrease in the number of students who did not declare their race/ethnicity. In 2003, this number was 31.9%; it had dropped gradually to 19.2% in 2007 (EER Data Table 2.3). Over the same time span, the percentage of White/Non-Hispanic students increased from 52.2% to 61.2 %. The data are not sufficiently detailed to explain why this has happened and no one at CIIS was able to explain the reason for these changes other than suggesting that more of the White students were willing to declare their race. Among the faculty, there have been small but steady gains in minority faculty since 2003 (EER Data Table 4.1), as was noted in the CPR report.

In April, 2007, the American Psychological Association (APA) chose to visit the Psy.D. program largely out of concern for diversity issues. The subsequent report cited some specific problems arising out of what could be a lack of sensitivity on the part of faculty toward diversity. To its credit, as described in the APA report available to the team (dated May 21, 2007 and sent to CIIS for review for matters of fact), the program took initiative in creating a diversity seminar, holding a retreat focused on diversity, and asking White faculty to share in the teaching of courses on diversity in order to learn from them. The May 21 Site Visit Report (p. 13) noted that the program "made a concerted effort to correct the problems. These efforts are taking hold and this program is, in fact, far ahead of most programs in its emphasis on cultural diversity. Diversity is built into all aspects of the program."

In the student body, there is no evidence that any progress has been made in the area of improving diversity with respect to under-represented minorities. Further, the CPR report noted the lack of data on forms of diversity beyond those based on gender and race/ethnicity. Judging from the WASC-required EER Data Tables and as previously noted, this is still the case. Students of color express concerns that they may be asked to represent their entire race/ethnicity and feel that as long as they are so few in number, they are singled out. It may be the case that once a critical mass has been enrolled, the problem will be resolved, but CIIS is not there yet.

The Institute's response to the report of the Capacity and Preparatory Review section on diversity outlined a three-year plan for recruitment, retention, and inclusivity. The plan

acknowledged that a vital mechanism for improving diversity lies in recruitment of students, staff, and faculty. The plan calls for a new hiring guide that will steer interview questions to see if candidates have "understanding of and commitment to working with diverse students." It will also seek student input for all searches. The plan includes the idea that a rapid way to increase diversity is through the hiring of adjunct faculty. The plan falls short of specifying the nature of diversity and does not target any hiring goals.

For student recruitment, CIIS's plan recognizes the importance of financial aid. The plan includes seeking donors to provide scholarship funds for diversity by asking donors to restrict their awards to specific groups of students. Outreach efforts for recruitment for diversity are also part of the plan. The plan increased the range of diversity dimensions by one: LGBTQQI (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning, and intersex). Although this is a step in the right direction, it is only one additional category.

The plan addressed staff recruitment and retention as well as student and faculty retention for diversity. The plan replaced the Diversity Action Team referenced in the CPR Report with a new group, the Diversity and Inclusion Monitoring Group which is to monitor progress each semester and create a report. At the time of the WASC EER visit, this group had not yet met.

The visiting team met with a large group comprised of three separate committees with a focus on diversity: the Faculty Diversity Committee, the Integral Psychology Diversity Committee, and the Clinical Psychology Diversity Committee. Members are aware of the results of the student satisfaction survey of 2006 in which the students' most common response to the question "What are the most important steps CIIS can take to enhance diversity?" was to hire more diverse faculty. They explained their efforts to recruit more diverse faculty. Six recent faculty hires were from diverse backgrounds – people of color, international faculty, LGBTQQI (2 in each category). They noted that they are attempting to create a "culture of humility" with respect to what they see as "diversities," a reflection of the perceived need to broaden their understanding of diversity as multi-dimensional. Students in this group noted that the environment was getting better, with an increased consciousness of diversity issues and more attempts to get students to feel comfortable, for example, at orientation. Issues remain, notably around financial matters. Salaries and financial aid offer solutions to this. Additionally, staff have had little training on diversity issues and need to be brought into the discussion. The team noted that during the visit discussions about diversity were lively and focused, indicating a firm engagement with this issue among faculty and students.

Progress has occurred in the area of diversity but not to the extent that diversity is no longer an issue. Students are concerned that each WASC team makes a recommendation on diversity, and yet at each WASC visit the team finds continuing concerns and a recommendation continues to be offered. There has been progress, albeit slow. Although the Institute is following the CPR recommendation to "promote diversity as a high priority," CIIS continues to need to show specific results, in terms both of broadening the conception of diversity and also of increasing the populations of diverse groups at all levels.

Support for students, particularly financial support and space for meeting and research

A meeting with the Dean of Students involved questions arising from the CPR report and WASC letter regarding student concerns, as well as other topics involving students. The report had indicated that a Director of Student Life was actively working on a number of concerns, such as affordable health care, community space for students, and assistance with career development. The Dean of Students has taken on the role of Director of Student Life and has hired one new staff member to address the issues of health insurance, student space, and other student services.

An earlier section described CIIS's decision to purchase the building in which it had been renting space and some of the results of that decision. With the purchase of the building, CIIS has a new multipurpose room on the second floor that may be used for studying, student group meetings, and events. There are also a meditation space and a roof-top garden created by student volunteers and funded by the student association. The visiting team found no indication that there continues to be serious needs among students for additional space of any kind. There is, however, continuing need for increased student financial support, and the building purchase has increased CIIS's challenges in meeting this need.

Of particular concern at the EER visit was the Institute's job placement record (CFR 2.13). There is now a full-time Director of Career and Field Placement. There is also a staff member who is responsible for health insurance, new student orientation, disability services, and student space. The Institute has no central record showing where graduates are placed, but some programs maintain their own alumni data bases. It is important for CIIS to develop a central record for all graduates because this will increase operational efficiency at CIIS and provide information as to how graduates' positions relate to their CIIS education, an important form of program assessment. If the placement record is good, it can help with the recruitment of new students.

CIIS has a large student handbook to go along with the new Pathway student web portal noted in the CPR report. A review of the handbook and supporting documents raised some questions about the student complaint/conduct procedures (CFR 1.7). The Dean of Students said that the procedures were relatively new. Last year, there were only five complaints processed. Most of these involved claims of abuse of power by the faculty and were resolved at the highest level by an external mediator. There are no procedures for student-on-student problems, but the Dean said that these are rare and are largely handled at the informal level by the faculty.

The only current assessment of student services is an annual survey distributed to students. Students' level of satisfaction is ascertained, the results are made public, and the Dean states that the Institute tries to use the survey results to make changes in student services (CFR 2.10). The data analysis is a simple frequency count of ratings on a 5-point scale, with the mode (highest percentage) of the ratings from the previous year given as a comparison. CFR 2.10 suggests that assessment should be deeper than simply surveying student satisfaction. The Dean of Students has been exploring the use of an external measure, but she has yet to select one and has some concerns as to whether such a measure would be of use, although it would allow her to compare the Institute's results to those of other student service units in the area. The Dean of Students needs to identify or develop additional measures beyond the satisfaction survey,

implement them, and use the results to drive improvements. This is part of developing a culture of evidence for the Institute as a whole.

The current satisfaction survey itself is a problem. The items are too vague to be useful for providing specific feedback on what needs to be improved or sustained. For example, a few items follow the pattern "Service in the ____ is good." What is it about the service that is good – or not so good? Its timeliness, accuracy, friendliness, or usefulness? In addition, it is not clear that other offices whose work affects students are asked what kinds of items would be of use to them. It was also the case that the survey results posted on the web site were from February 2005. For the data to be useful at all, they need to be disseminated in a timely fashion and provide information that better points the way to action.

CFR 2.12 stresses the importance of advising. In meetings with the faculty, the review team explored how they handled advising and how much advising support they had from the Institute. Only core faculty do advising so this is a workload issue as well as a retention concern. The student satisfaction survey indicates that students rate the quality of advising lower than most other areas of service. Each graduate student is assigned an adviser who then becomes more of a mentor at this level. At the undergraduate level, all intake advising is done by the program director, which seems to be an overwhelming workload for that individual. There is no formal training for advising, and the program directors felt that this would be a good thing to consider. It is not clear how the faculty learn to do advising. There seem to be no guides nor assistance available to the core faculty in this important area.

Admissions data raised questions about the criteria by which students were screened. From 2004 to 2007, about 70% of all applicants were accepted and 44% paid deposits to secure the offers of admission. These figures seem high, especially at the graduate level. Pursuant to CFR 2.3. the admissions staff were asked about the procedures by which applicants are screened. Each degree program has different criteria and requests different application materials.

Admission is a key process, perhaps the most important decision that a program can make about a student. The high rate of admissions might be explained by the high level of assistance and counseling that prospective applicants get and continue to receive after they have applied. There are three admissions counselors who work with anyone who inquires about any program. Their goal is to assure that there is a fit between the possible applicant and the program. Applicants who do not fit the program are encouraged to look elsewhere. Program faculty, similarly, begin to engage prospects even before they apply and are seeking the same kind of fit.

The Admissions Office does not make any admission decisions, but only after the applicant has a complete file will they send the application to the program. Although program criteria differ, all use grade point criteria for admission. When a promising applicant has a low GPA, they will often interview the applicant to investigate other factors which might recommend the applicant. Some of the programs interview all applicants as a matter of course, because their primary concern is fit.

The visiting team spoke with six students in the two CIIS <u>on-line programs</u>, Transformative Studies (Ph.D.) and Transformative Leadership (M.A.). The students were unanimous in their praise of the rigor and quality of these programs. They were somewhat less enthusiastic about the services, with the exception of admissions and the library (CFR 3.6). Most of them had had some difficulty in connecting with the needed staff off hours or getting timely or sufficient service. For some, these problems are consistent and troubling; for others, they are rare. One student in the program happens to be living in the area, and she noted that she has much more success getting her needs met when she comes to the Institute than when she tries to get the same services remotely. According to CIIS leadership who reviewed the draft final report, responsibility for reviewing and improving services to online students has been given to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and he has been assessing the on-line students' perceptions of the quality of services and where improvements could be made. The Student Satisfaction Survey did not distinguish whether the respondents were on-line or physically present. A few students complained of a failure of faculty in some rare instances to provide timely feedback on their work. Faculty on-line advising is good. When asked about support in preparing for and writing their dissertations, the Ph.D. students were unanimous in their praise of faculty efforts in this area. Technological support for the on-line program could be improved, especially for first-time students. The students said that there is no training and that recent increases in the use of audio and video formats can be overwhelming to those not adept in internet technology.

PART II. Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness

CIIS chose three themes for its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). The goals and findings for each theme are presented below, along with consideration of CIIS's retention, graduation, and time-to-degree, an additional topic added at WASC's request. In the last section of this part of the report, the team provides an overall evaluation of CIIS's educational effectiveness inquiry and systems to enhance teaching effectiveness and student and institutional learning.

<u>Conceptualizing Integral Education</u>

Integral education was one of three topics CIIS chose as foci for its re-accreditation. CIIS's founder Haridas Chaudhuri espoused integral yoga and integral education as essential aspects of CIIS's institutional identity (CFR 1.2). The choice to focus on integral education was an obvious and important one for all of CIIS's efforts to create a well functioning educational effectiveness system.

As stated in the introduction to its Educational Effectiveness Review report "the overarching goal of the review process was to facilitate reflection on, and discussion of, integral learning" (p. 3) and at the beginning of the Integral Education Essay "the intent has not been to bring everyone to consensus nor to provide a template for all of the academic programs" but to honor "the contested nature of the term 'integral' and the corresponding necessity for CIIS to specify a pluralistic approach as explicitly as possible without generating a new dogma" (p. 8). In the Integral Education Essay six specific goals for CIIS's work on integral education were also identified:

- To encourage dialogue and the sharing of ideas to move programs, and CIIS as a whole, toward a more explicit understanding, and better public communication, of the education we seek to provide.

- To consider the diverse perspectives and models that claim a space under integral education and see if they can be formulated into a working model broad enough to encompass the Institute's range of practices and perspectives and focused enough to be meaningful.

- To identify dimensions of integral education and see how they inform different academic programs and the pedagogy used by faculty.

- To consider how integral goals impact the learning environments provided to our students.

- To understand how the programs and the institution as a whole enact in practice what is espoused philosophically.

- To better articulate CIIS's distinct vision and so be better able to assess how it is being achieved.

Overall, the various goals explicated in the essay and introduction have been achieved in whole or in part. Of the six above, greater progress by far has been made on the first two than on the last four.

The Integral Education Essay offers several conceptualizations of integral education, or integral learning; they include single sentence descriptions of integral education (e.g., p. 9, first full paragraph), four dimensions of integral education (p. 10), and nine elements of integral education (pp. 11-12). The various characterizations have substantial similarities one with the other but they are not the same; they use somewhat different language, the sentences do not obviously encompass all nine elements, and the dimensions address teaching practices and subject matter. The characterizations are the same in that they address generally and/or specifically what programs and teaching and learning experiences in class and outside of class are like. One can infer from them what the desired learning outcomes for students would be; however, there is nowhere in the essay a clear statement of the CIIS community's expectations for what students would know, believe, feel, value, or be able to do as a result of having experienced a well functioning integral education.

The development of explicit conceptualizations of integral education, particularly the nine elements of integral education (Educational Effectiveness Review report, pp. 11-12) and the general acceptance by every CIIS undergraduate and graduate program within the CIIS community were major achievements. The lexicon, as it was called by faculty leaders of the effort, made the implicit explicit and, as one faculty member quoted, "What goes without saying is probably what needs to be said." It is also the most wide ranging and the most explicitly dimensional of the various conceptualizations presented in the essay. It was also used in student and faculty surveys assessing the extent to which they believed integral education was achieved. As such, in the team's report the lexicon will be referred to more than will other conceptualizations.

CIIS provided evidence that it has done, and is doing, considerable work related to integral education and its assessment. Following community efforts to conceptualize integral education, in August 2006 faculty "were asked to connect program goals and integral education, to provide examples of integral education and identify types of student work that would be illustrative of how well the program was achieving its integral goals" (p. 9, Integral Education Essay). The team received copies of the learning goals for each program and examples of integral education within each program. The examples were easily seen to represent one or more aspects of integral education. Because they were examples rather than a full explication of the program, one cannot know the extent to which the various aspects of an integral education are represented in each program. An informal review of the learning goals, which are appropriately framed in terms of student outcomes (see more below), was done to relate the student outcomes to the nine elements in the lexicon. It suggested that no program explicitly addresses all nine, and at least one program arguably does not explicitly address any. Most programs explicitly address several of the elements. All programs identify "traditional" scholarly goals and, where appropriate for the program, clinical goals. In order for CIIS to use assessments meaningfully to ensure that an integral education is experienced by students in all programs and that the outcomes expected of integral education are achieved by students in all programs, the CIIS community will need to move further than it has as yet moved to arrive at shared understandings both of the nature of integral education and also of the student outcomes expected from an integral education (CFR 1.2).

Conversations in several meetings during the site visit suggested that the predominant view in the CIIS community would be that an integral education was expected to be achieved from the totality of course and other academic and co-curricular activities and that not all elements of an integral education needed to be experienced by each student in order for the CIIS community to believe that there was a well functioning system of integral education at CIIS. Moreover, faculty members were acutely aware of the high value placed on the Difference element of the integral education lexicon and of what seem to be CIIS norms of program autonomy. Some faculty, in fact, interpreted the existence of notable differences in program goals as evidence that integral education had been implemented at CIIS. There did not seem to be any consensus about what would be minimal expectations for an integral education. Such a consensus, in the team's view, is needed and can be achieved in a way that honors CIIS's desire for a pluralistic approach to the meaning of integral education, its belief in "the value of paradox and of multiple perspectives, approaches, and practices in developing the potential for individual and societal transformation," and also its belief that "CIIS stands out as an institution that is willing to engage a variety of perspectives on integral education without a perceived necessity to agree on a single theory of the world, norm, or standard" (pp. 8-9, Integral Education Essay).

Incorporating CIIS's work on integral education into a well functioning educational effectiveness system is complicated by the fact that most of the community-wide conceptualizations are about "what are the qualities/components of integral education?" rather than about "what are the *outcomes* for students who experience integral education?" (CFR 2.2, 2.3). However, several programs have articulated such student outcomes in their goal statements (found on CD provided with CIIS's printed EER report), as shown by the following examples:

- Ph.D. graduates will be capable of pursuing scholarly inquiry and engaging ideas from a transdisciplinary perspective, including a sufficient mastery in depth of at

least one subject area, with an eye to the paradigmatic assumptions and implications for the transformation of culture and society at large. (Philosophy, Cosmology and Consciousness)

- Students develop the capacity to engage multiple perspectives. (B.A. Completion Program)

- Develop knowledge of the dynamics of psycho-spiritual development and of their own psycho-spiritual dispositions. (East West Psychology)

- SLOs for drama therapy students are conceptualized as a demonstrated mastery and integration of the following skill sets: Ongoing cultivation as a person in integral self-development and growth across the dimensions of body, mind, culture, and spirit, consistent with the capacities needed to serve others as a psychotherapist. This dimension is assessed via yearly review of student progress by all core faculty. (Drama Therapy Program)

There is, however, as yet no analysis of the extent to which the student outcomes of each program if achieved would be sufficient, as compared to the conceptualization of an integral education, for CIIS as a community to feel that all programs were accomplishing the goals implicit in CIIS's conceptualization of integral education.

During meetings with team members, faculty and students often had a hard time identifying the characteristics that would distinguish a CIIS graduate from graduates of other institutions (CFR 1.2, 2.4, 2.6). CIIS prides itself on being a distinctly different institution of higher education and integral education is an essential feature of this difference. If so, CIIS graduates should themselves have some distinguishing characteristics clearly related to accepted conceptualizations of integral education that could be well articulated by the CIIS community and recognized by others interacting with CIIS graduates. Moreover, assessments of students should provide evidence about the development of such characteristics. Many of the assessments currently in use did not seem to team members likely to produce clear evidence regarding achievement of the outcomes implicit in the various conceptualizations of integral education and discussions with faculty during the site visit did not indicate that the connections between the assessment, the evidence it produced, and the desired outcomes for students experiencing an integral education were necessarily clear to faculty or students. A key component of educational effectiveness is a focus on student outcomes; in the team's opinion, given CIIS's representation of itself and of the centrality of integral education, student outcomes expected from an integral education must be explicated and assessed.

CIIS has accomplished a very great deal with respect to its goals for the integral education focus it chose for EER. Its accomplishments are notable on their own without consideration of the context in which they have been achieved. They are especially notable considering the CIIS context: a community that has only recently recovered from several budgetary, operational, and morale problems; a community that prides itself on diversity, autonomy, and inclusiveness; a community that can be uncomfortable with many of the usual forms of assessment. CIIS is to be congratulated on all it has accomplished. It now needs to move even further along the path to creating and implementing a well functioning educational effectiveness system.

In short, CIIS has taken big strides down a long path. It has substantially improved the articulation of its distinct vision and is so better able to assess how well that vision is being achieved (paraphrase of the last bullet, p. 8, Integral Education Essay). CIIS needs to continue the journey and along the way ensure that student outcomes, including those expected as a result of having had an integral education, become a central feature of it educational effectiveness system.

Assessing Capstone Experiences in the Bachelor's and Master's Degree Programs

For the EER, CIIS undertook the task of examining capstone experiences to ensure that they reflect an integrative culminating experience and assess learning outcomes delineated for each program. Since the bachelor's and most of the master's programs had capstone experiences (e.g., projects or integrated seminars), but few programs had good metrics for assessing the quality of the capstones, this was a good choice for the EER.

The undergraduate program and all but one master's program now have capstone courses/experiences. Some programs recently moved from a thesis as the culminating project to a capstone course. In most cases, faculty and students believe that a capstone seminar/project fits better with the students' future goals and better reflects the totality and integration of the students' learning. Additionally for some students, the thesis was a major obstacle in completing their degrees, and therefore had a negative impact on graduation and retention rates.

CIIS defines the capstone as:

...the quintessentially integral component in an integral education. It is the place where the student is asked to bring together his/her learning; it is a symbol that communicates that the student will be expected to undertake this kind of integration. The capstone is also a privileged site for assessment and reflection on how well each program is achieving its stated learning outcomes and preparing students for their next steps.(CIIS EER essay, p. 28)

In its assessment of the capstone experiences, CIIS reviewed syllabi for the capstone integrated seminars, reports submitted by each program, and copies of student work. These same supporting materials were reviewed the WASC team.

As might be expected, the academic programs varied in the degree to which their capstone experiences reflect the goals listed above (CFR 2.6). The most developed component of the capstones was the student experience. Most syllabi clearly and comprehensively describe for the student the capstone's purpose, and both faculty and students report high student investment in the capstone projects. Many of the capstones include some type of "public performance" by the student, such as an oral presentation of a project, research endeavor, or case study. Faculty and student alike felt that this public presentation was an important step in students' transition to professional life.

There was greater variation among the programs in other aspects of the capstones. Because they are preparing students for professional practice careers with competencies mandated by licensing and/or specialty accrediting boards, the programs within the School of Professional Psychology (SPP) generally have developed specific relevant learning outcomes for the capstone. These outcomes generally include the ability to integrate previous learning, including clinical skills, and demonstrate some selected hallmarks of integral education, such as developing one's own professional style, showing the ability to self-reflect, and learning to collaborate across disciplinary boundaries. Written case studies or research projects have been used and evaluated in many of the SPP programs to determine if outcomes are achieved. However, projects specific to the aims of certain programs also have been created. For example, in the Drama Therapy program, students can do a "self-revelatory performance" to demonstrate learning. Most programs in the School of Consciousness and Transformation have articulated relevant outcomes for their capstones and are using a variety of means, such as community research projects or portfolios, to assess them.

Most of the programs are in the emerging or developing stage in their efforts to devise explicit criteria or rubrics for assessing the level of student attainment in capstones (CFR 2.6). In many cases, faculty rate students or products on broad criteria without clear metrics. However, there are notable exceptions, such as the Drama Therapy program which not only developed evaluation rubrics for each product/process in the capstone, but also included them in the capstone seminar syllabus so students could use them to develop quality products.

A common component of the capstones is a written reflection by the student on her/his learning, future goals, and program quality. Since one of the major goals of capstones is this type of reflection, such an essay seems worthwhile. However, in many cases the overarching goal of this reflection or the components of "quality" reflection are not well articulated, at least in written documents. Therefore, it is unclear if, or how, faculty are using such essays to assess the capstones' effectiveness or how these can be used in a diagnostic way to improve program quality. To remedy this, faculty in the undergraduate program (BAC) have taken a number of steps to use and assess students' integrative essays. They provide students with detailed instructions for writing essays so that students address expected learning outcomes. Faculty determined the aspects of an effective essay and developed rating criteria for measuring them. As in many of the programs, the BAC faculty have had several rounds of development and revision to refine the capstone experience and measurement tools.

Measuring reliability and establishing high reliability among raters have been attempted by only a few programs at this time. However, in many programs, especially in those with a small number of students, faculty often meet together, discuss their results, and reach consensus in their assessments. There is also a sense that the programs are struggling with what they see as a mandate for quantitative data and analyses which are usually not compatible with CIIS's qualitative, narrative, and often non-textual educational culture. Faculty need to find a way to develop evidence they are more comfortable in understanding and using if they are to make full use of their assessment efforts. In the team's view, qualitative measures can provide a strong evidentiary base for evaluation and decision making. There is no *a priori* reason why CIIS cannot establish meaningful, credible assessments compatible with its culture.

Several programs use portfolios as a part of their capstone experiences. Generally both students and faculty value the portfolios and believe they are very useful in illustrating the students' competencies to faculty as well as to potential employers. In some programs, students start assembling their portfolios in the first year of the program and add to the portfolio over time. This demonstrates an *accumulation* of learning outcomes, but not necessarily an *integration* of the learning that has taken place in the program. If the portfolio is to be a major capstone assessment tool, parts of it should capture students' ability to integrate and apply their learning. In most programs, faculty are in the initial phase of using portfolios to assess program outcomes. More needs to be done to ensure that the portfolio components assess each relevant program learning outcome, including those related to integral education. Additionally, most of the programs do not use standardized criteria for assessing the portfolios; more needs to be done to ensure that faculty use explicit criteria in the same way to evaluate portfolios.

More progress is needed in programs' aggregation of capstone data in order to improve the programs (CFR 4.7). Currently, faculty will discuss assessment findings and make some adjustment in the course or measures, but they do not routinely use the results to improve the program. However, there are some examples where programs are taking this next step to "close the loop." For example, in reviewing capstone outcomes, the Counseling Psychology concentrations in both Somatic Psychology and also Integral Counseling Psychology discovered that their students needed to improve their diagnostic skills. As a result, the relevant programs are now working to enhance that part of their curricula.

In summary, the evaluation of the capstone experiences was a useful part of CIIS's EER. It involved faculty in deliberate discussions about the goals and processes of this penultimate educational experience and challenged them to find ways to measure the learning that occurred in and was reflected by the capstone. Although all programs need continued work in this area, many programs have developed unique and effective methods and assessment tools that could be instructive to others. The team agrees with CIIS's assessment (see thematic essay) of the next steps that need to be taken to improve the use of the capstone experience for educational effectiveness purposes. CIIS suggested the formation of a Teaching Commons where faculty can routinely engage in Institute-wide discussions. There faculty can share capstone best practices, can celebrate successes, and can encourage each other's efforts to engage in continual learning and improvement. Additionally, to continue and reinforce the hard work that has occurred with the capstones, some faculty committee, such as the proposed Assessment Committee or the Institute's Curriculum and Academic Review Committee, will need to provide guidance and oversight to the capstone efforts.

Assessing Dissertation Proposals in the Ph.D. and Psy.D. Programs

For the CPR, the Institute took on the task of building a common set of expectations and standards for dissertation proposals across the doctoral programs (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.5). The Faculty Research Committee, after reviewing designated high quality proposals from all programs, agreed on a common set of expectations for dissertation proposals and, from that understanding, developed a rubric to be used for proposal review. This rubric was implemented in 2005. In addition to the dissertation committee, the program director and the Academic Vice President use this rubric to review all dissertation proposals. The rubric has proved useful in

creating Institute-wide standards for proposals. Additionally, students appreciate the greater clarity and focus the rubric provides as they write proposals. For the EER, faculty assessed the impact and results of using the rubric, by looking at the quality of both the proposals and the final (post-proposal) chapters (e.g., results and discussion) of the dissertation.

The team requested a finished dissertation and proposal, so the two could be compared. A review of one of the four dissertations offered as samples showed a dissertation of very high quality and one that matched the proposal very well. However, a spot check of dissertations in the library revealed much weaker dissertations. There is evidence here that the doctoral programs are capable of generating scholarship at a high level but also that there is a need to develop methods to ensure that such a level is reached consistently. The dissertation proposal rubric is a promising tool, but CIIS has yet to determine whether use of the rubric at the proposal stage is consistently associated with the production of final dissertations of high quality.

The dissertation proposal rubric constitutes a good starting point for operationalizing the desired qualities of proposals (and hence dissertations) and contains a fairly comprehensive list of assessable outcomes. However, because the rubric is being applied across all the doctoral programs, it does not seem to be aligned with program-specific learning competencies. Similarly, it does not contain any evaluation of outcomes that on the face of it would be expected from a well functioning system of integral education, presumably an essential aspect of all doctoral programs. These outcomes might be additional elements to be included in the rubric. It is also curious that the rubric is sometimes used only as a formative tool (apparently only for the Psy.D.) while being used as an evaluative tool in other programs (apparently all Ph.D. programs). How the rubric might be used or modified for use with the Psy.D. (vs. Ph.D.) dissertation would be a useful next step.

The development of the rubric as an evaluative tool for the dissertation proposal is a significant step in the assessment of academic excellence in the dissertation. However, from an assessment perspective, the final, approved dissertation would seem to be a more valid indicator of educational effectiveness, as it serves as a natural capstone for a variety of competencies. For instance, the final dissertation might serve as a learning outcome measure for both integral education and also research competence. There is also a question of the universality of the program-specific evaluation criteria used by individual programs; a formal external review of the quality of all programs' dissertations (in addition to the external program reviews) would ensure that the criteria for evaluation are commensurate with doctoral-level standards established in comparable fields in the academy.

Because the rubric is a very useful means for assessing the research competencies of the doctoral programs, as the number of completed rubrics becomes sufficiently large, results from its use should be aggregated and fed back by program faculty so the result could be used to improve the program. The results also should be incorporated into the program review and improvement cycles (CFR 4.7).

Assessing Retention, Graduation, and Time-to-Degree

CIIS prepared information on retention after the first year and later graduation for seven years (2000-06) of entering cohorts for each degree in each CIIS program and for programs combined into the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree (see Tables 3.2 from the EER Data Tables) (CFR 1.2, 2.7). Because retention data are not provided for any program after the first year, it is impossible to determine retention in later years unless it should happen that all students continuing beyond the second year eventually graduate (then the drop out rate is identified in the first-year figure). For example, data on the Bachelor of Arts Completion program cohort of 2002 show that 74% of entering students had graduated after three years, 68% graduated after one year, and 16% continued from the first year to the second. From the graduation and retention percentages after one year, one can infer that 16% of entering students did not continue beyond the first year. After three years, 26% of students entering the B.A. program had not completed the degree, and 16% had left after the first year. What should one assume about the 10% unaccounted for? Are they continuing to work on completing the B.A. or did they drop out sometime after beginning the second year?

Interpretation is further complicated for the master's and doctoral programs where retention percentages from the first to the second year are presented in the tables, but the first graduation percentages are for the third year. One has no idea what percentage of students are still trying to finish the degree after three (or more) years or have dropped out anytime after beginning the second year. Overall for the master's and doctoral programs, retention from the first to second year is high every year from 2000 to 2006; the lowest percentage is 83%, percentages have risen from 2000 to 2006, and recent first-year retention rates were above 90% (and 100% for some programs). For all master's programs combined, 50-60% of 2000-04 entering students have graduated after three years and 70-75% of 2000-03 entering students have done so after four years. Again the question arises as to which students after three or four years are continuing and which have dropped out. If 20-25% of an entering cohort ultimately do not complete the degree (which the 6-year data suggest could be the case), is this satisfactory? The question also arises whether a usual time-to-degree of 3-4 years is reasonable for a master's program. These are issues for CIIS to ponder. Similar issues arise for the doctoral programs, where the completion rates were 5-7% after four years and 29-39% after six years. What percentage of entering students are still working on the doctorate after six years? Is this a reasonable percentage? Is doctoral degree completion after more than six years desirable?

Given the Institute's dependence on tuition, it is important to manage recruitment and retention to the fullest extent possible. CIIS has concerns about retention. Exit surveys indicate that students leave for personal, generally financial not academic, reasons. Clearly greater financial assistance could increase retention. Also, CIIS staff believe that students who drop out are more likely to have applied late and as a consequence are setting an earlier application deadline.

Overall, the B.A. Completion program has a high retention rate, high graduation rate, and very good time-to-degree. M.A. first-year retention is high and graduation rates are adequate (CFR 2.7). Time-to-degree, to the extent it can be inferred from graduation data, may or may not be a little long. For the Psy.D., attrition was high for the 2001 class, but that seems to have been

an anomaly. For the doctoral programs, there is some concern over the lack of high percentages of students graduating in six years. From the 2000 entering cohort of doctoral students, only 29% had finished the degree after six years. The 2001 cohort fared better, with 38% completing after six years. It is not possible to gauge from these data whether the fairly low completion rates after six years are due to long time-to-degree or attrition, because—as noted above—there are no retention data beyond the first year. If students are taking a long time to complete their degrees, the programs need to find ways to speed completion. If the students are leaving the program, an entirely different solution is required.

CIIS recognizes that financial aid is an important element for retention and often for time-to-degree as well as for diversity. To the extent that the problem, at any level, is in retention, the recommendations made to find ways to raise or move funds for scholarships would certainly apply to a problem with doctoral retention.

Overall Evaluation of the Educational Effectiveness Inquiry and Systems

Clearly, efforts have been made to implement academic assessment and review across programs, as is evidenced by the program reviews and learning outcomes identified by each of the academic programs (see CIIS Supporting Materials' CD) (CFR 2.7). The program review of the Somatic Psychology program, in particular, serves as a model for best practices, as it contains well defined learning objectives with assessment feedback loops that inform program development. The Institute should be commended for making progress with program review and assessment. Additionally, many programs have developed formal student outcome measures and are using the results to make curricular and programmatic changes. Faculty began to lose their reluctance to carry out student and program assessment when they discovered the value and utility of the results. For example, in one program, faculty who had been resistant to formal assessment changed a major course when they discovered that surveyed students felt they were not getting from the course sufficient preparation to meet some of the program's learning outcomes. Faculty were surprised because these findings did not match their own beliefs, but faculty were responsive to the data, moving to institute a capstone course that would emphasize the learning students felt needed more coverage.

However, for many programs (e.g., Asian and Comparative Studies (ACS); see Learning Outcomes from Supporting Materials CD, and CIIS Memorandum of Understanding, ACS Program Review, Fall 2007), there remains considerable work to be done (CFR 2.7). The lack of progress in *these* programs is particularly notable given that program review has been identified in previous WASC reviews as an area in which the Institute needs to continue progress toward full implementation. In addition, a great many programs – including those that have already made substantial progress – need to address the following set of common challenges:

- *How is "Integral" Operationalized at the Program Level?*: The identification of nine dimensions to CIIS's definition of "integral education" is an important step in the development of CIIS's institutional identity (Integral Education Essay, Educational Effectiveness Review report, November 2007, p. 8). However, there seems to be a lack of clarity or operationalization with regard to what constitutes the specific core student competencies (i.e., skills, knowledge, attitudes) that are derived from the nine general dimensions and used in meaningful ways by each program to indicate achievement in

CIIS graduates of student outcomes expected from effective implementation of the Institute's mission of "integral education." Without this specificity, educational effectiveness – understood to include student outcomes – cannot be measured (CFR 1.2).

- *How Does the Capstone Measure Student Learning Without the Operationalization of "Integral" and Clarity as to Other Program Goals?* : When specific core competencies expected as a result of completing a bachelor's or master's program are not identified, the evaluative criteria used in the capstone will not necessarily refer to the specific learning that took place in the program. The capstone then ceases to be a valid measure of cumulative program learning. Moreover, if every program expects to achieve student outcomes deriving from an integral education, which the team assumes CIIS would want, then these student outcomes (i.e., skills, knowledge, attitudes) must be explicated and operationalized sufficiently to assess via the capstone whether they have been achieved (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 2.10).

- *The Absence of Alumni Data: How is the Learning Translated into the Real World?* : Without identified core competencies that students are expected to achieve, particularly those derived from experiencing integral education, it is also unclear how learning translates into real world outcomes (e.g., employment) and into the "value added" by having a degree from CIIS compared to another higher education institution that does not offer integral education. Post-graduation indicators should be included as educational effectiveness indicators, as they can demonstrate the cumulative learning that has taken place (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.8).

- *The Absence of a Link between Program Review and Decision-Making:* Many programs seem to be lacking in program review strategies that effectively link the program's mission and pre-defined learning outcomes with the use of evidence for program improvement and decision making (CFR 2.6, 4.7).

Lastly, the Institute is developing key metrics for assessing institutional effectiveness and using evidence to determine progress, establish priorities, and allocate resources. Most notable are the quantitative goals and evidence provided in the strategic plan and in the President's performance goals and evaluation. This provides substantial evidence that leadership at all levels is involved in institutional learning and improvement (CFR 4.6).

PART III. Summary, Major Findings, and Recommendations

Accomplishments, Value, and Impact of the Educational Effectiveness Review

Core faculty are committed to the mission and values of CIIS and feel fortunate to be a part of a special and unique institution. Some were resistant to the increased emphasis on assessment and program review, and all viewed the proposed changes with trepidation fearing the effort to "quantify" might alter their integrative approach to education. They also doubted that their educational outcomes and processes could be accurately and comprehensively assessed by formal measures and, not knowing how to accomplish this task, were reluctant to start. However, with direction and support from upper administration, most notably the Academic Vice-President and the Director of Assessment, faculty with few exceptions have moved beyond resistance and reluctance, to seeing the value of being more systematic in identifying learning

outcomes and finding ways of measuring them. Most critical to this move was the strong message that each program needed to develop measurement tools compatible with the values and nature of the program. As faculty found answers to questions that they were interested in and able to pose, they moved from a position of doing assessment out of a sense of compliance to one of doing so as creative inquiry. As a faculty member stated, we "always collected lots of data, but only recently started organizing and analyzing it" to answer questions of concern. In a comparatively short time, CIIS has made very substantial advances in its educational effectiveness system:

- CIIS has created a shared lexicon for talking about different aspects of integral education. All constituencies in the Institute can articulate how integral education is a core aspect of the education experienced in CIIS. Similarly, faculty and students can to some extent delineate integral education expectations for student outcomes.

- CIIS has created and implemented program review processes and developed a rubric for evaluating the quality of dissertation proposals.

- CIIS has created or revised capstone experiences for bachelor's and master's programs to better serve as culminating learning experiences, and assessment tools have been put in place to determine their effectiveness in doing so.

- CIIS has used evidence from the dissertation proposal rubric, capstones, and program reviews to change course content, practicum work, course sequence, and guidance regarding the dissertation.

- CIIS has created a climate in which there is an expectation that evidence of student learning is available and used.

There is much to commend in CIIS's progress, but CIIS's educational effectiveness work is not done. The following are the next steps needed for CIIS to better implement and evaluate its educational effectiveness system:

- Variations in accomplishments across programs need to be addressed, with all programs held equally accountable for developing and using educational effectiveness measures and assistance provided as needed to each program to achieve these goals.

- More work is needed to explicate and operationalize "integral education."

- More work is needed to make explicit connections among integral education goals, course and other educational experiences, and student outcomes related to mind, body, and spirit.

- More work is needed to connect evidence to decisions, such that evidence-based decisions become the norm.

- Assessment needs to be broadened beyond academic programs, notably—but not exclusively – in the area of student services.

- Educational effectiveness work, which is still a new part of life at CIIS, needs to become routine and embedded in the culture of the Institute.

Major Recommendations Addressing Both Capacity and Educational Effectiveness

CIIS meets the general requirements for all four WASC standards. Nonetheless, like even the most well functioning institution, CIIS has areas ripe for improvement. Although progress on issues identified in the CPR report has in this report been addressed separately from findings regarding educational effectiveness, the team does not see CIIS's capacity issues as separate from or unrelated to its educational effectiveness issues. In fact, improvements in some capacity areas are critical if CIIS is to improve its educational effectiveness. Consequently, the team has combined both capacity and educational effectiveness recommendations into one set of eight and offers them for CIIS's consideration.

1. Further elucidate the meaning of integral education and the ways in which the results of an integral education could be exhibited by, or found in, CIIS students and graduates. Make explicit connections among integral education goals, course and other CIIS experiences, and what students learn and become as a result of them. Ensure that assessments provide useful information about the nature of integral education experienced by students in each program and about the resulting student outcomes and feed information from such assessments back into the education CIIS provides. (CFR 1.2, 2.3)

2. Further develop and implement academic assessment plans and capstone assessments that effectively link program/course philosophy, desired program outcomes regarding student learning and competencies, the processes for achieving these outcomes, the multiple ways of measuring these outcomes, and the use of evidence for subsequent decision making. (CFR 1.2, 2.3, 4.4, 4.7)

3. Sustain and improve CIIS's financial environment with the goals of meeting obligations of loans taken to purchase the building, diversifying income streams, developing longer range models and plans, directing resources to highest priority items in the strategic plan, increasing the capacity to use data for financial decision making, maintaining control on expenditures, sustaining transparency and availability of information about the budget, increasing student financial support, and developing appropriate reserve and contingency funds. (CFR 3.5)

4. Promote diversity as a high priority in every aspect of CIIS. Issues to be considered include the Institute's conceptions of diversity, given its unique mission and heritage, the need for a sufficient body of diverse groups of students, staff, and faculty, and the promotion of multicultural awareness, respect, and competence in the curriculum and climate. (CFR 1.5)

5. Examine the current responsibilities and workload of all core faculty and develop mechanisms (e.g., removing redundant functions across faculty, increasing the number of faculty, decreasing faculty time on committees, reducing the amount of report writing and data generation, reducing the effort required by the current contract renewal process) to ensure that faculty are able simultaneously to meet all their responsibilities and to keep workload within manageable limits. Pay particular attention to providing "regular" work time for scholarship and to managing the additional responsibilities of program directors. (CFR 3.3)

6. Develop ways to educate and involve adjunct faculty in CIIS work addressing academic quality, assessment, and diversity and prepare them to support the development at CIIS of a "culture of evidence" and a climate supportive of diversity. Develop mechanisms for rewarding adjunct faculty for doing so. (CFR 3.4)

7. Make a special effort to identify the causes of staff feelings of being over-worked and their low morale and see if specific remedies can be found. If indicated, create more ways to acknowledge the importance and value of the staff to the day-to-day operation of the Institute. If indicated, re-balance current responsibilities, especially for those below the director level, through such mechanisms as removing redundant functions across staff, increasing the number of staff, decreasing staff time on committees, reducing staff responsibilities, or other changes that ensure staff are able simultaneously to meet all their responsibilities and to keep workload within manageable limits. (CFR 3.3) [Postscript: On February 21, 2008 CIIS mounted a web-based survey to ascertain staff opinions relevant to these concerns. By March 7, 90% had responded. This is a good first step in addressing this recommendation.]

8. Undertake a thorough analysis of the ways in which efficiencies could be realized in CIIS, identify the most promising, and implement them. As examples of the choices that could be made, consider simplifying the administrative structure, combining academic programs, removing redundant activities (e.g., overlapping databases that are separately maintained), removing or simplifying activities that do not much influence decisions (e.g., contract renewal for established faculty), simplifying requirements for various reports (e.g., self review for program review), decreasing staff turnover, speeding up staff training through development of handbooks/guides for each position, decreasing the use of adjunct faculty, or increasing the use of a limited number of adjunct faculty. (CFR 3.1, 3.4)