WASC   Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

REPORT OF THE WASC SPECIAL VISIT TEAM

To **Saybrook University**

March 28-30, 2012

Team Roster
Michael Horowitz, Team Chair
President and CEO, TCS Education System, Chicago

Cherron R. Hoppes, Team Assistant Chair
Dean, Undergraduate Programs, Golden Gate University, San Francisco

Hernan Bucheli, Team Member
Vice President for Enrollment, Notre Dame de Namur University, Belmont, California

Thomas O. Fleming, Jr., Team Member
Senior Vice President and CFO, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles

Natalie Porter, Team Member
Faculty PhD Program in Clinical Psychology/CSPP/Alliant International University,
San Francisco

Barbara Gross Davis, Staff Liaison
Vice President, WASC

Table of Contents

Section I: Overview and Context

Description of Institution:

Saybrook University (Saybrook), formerly Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, is a private, non-profit institution located in San Francisco, California. Originally an institute within California State University-Sonoma, the university became independent in 1972 and was accredited by WASC in 1984. Through the recent addition of programs in Mind-Body Medicine (in 2009) and integration with the Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) in Kirkland, Washington (in 2009), the single focus graduate school has emerged to become a university with three graduate colleges. The full history of its transformation from school/research center to university is documented in the following sections.

Background:

The mission of Saybrook University states the institution "provides rigorous graduate education that inspires transformational change in individuals, organizations, and communities, toward a just, humane, and sustainable world," through essentially asking the question, "What does it mean to be human in the 21st Century?" The schools and programs at Saybrook link with one another through the fundamental focus of humanistic scholarship and inquiry. The Graduate College of Psychology and Humanistic Studies (PHS - the core program of the former school/research center) offers PhD degrees in Human Science, Psychology, and Organizational Systems and is currently teaching out a Doctorate of Psychology (PsyD). The LIOS Graduate College offers masters' degrees in Organizational Systems (Leadership and Organization Development) and Psychology (Systems Counseling).   The College of Mind-Body Medicine (MBM) offers masters' and PhD degrees in Mind-Body Medicine.

While the institution has maintained its accreditation since 1984, it has been required to comply with a number of special visits and interim reports throughout its history. The issues are consistent throughout and relate to concerns of financial stability (enrollment and fund raising) and strategic planning (leadership stability, brand definition, communication/engagement). Each time the institution has provided sufficient evidence to address the Commission's concerns. As a result of the Educational Effectiveness visit of March 2008, where the Commission re-affirmed accreditation and continued a Notice of Concern, the Commission requested a Special Visit. This Special Visit was initiated to address on the following issues: a) strategic planning (particularly prioritization of initiatives and new program development); b) financial stability (particularly fundraising and enrollment management); c) student retention and completion; and d) strengthening of educational effectiveness efforts at all levels.

Recent Accreditation Activity:

Since the June 2008 letter, Saybrook has brought forward, and has been approved for, a number of new programs and partnership initiatives. Each request resulted in a review by the Substantive Change Committee of WASC and, in the case of the addition of the Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) program, required an on-site visit. The following actions have been taken by the Substantive Change Committee since the re-affirmation of accreditation in 2008:

Date	Action
07/08	Substantive Change Committee acted not to accept the Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) program offered in Kirkland, Washington.
09/08	Substantive Change Committee acted to accept the resubmitted proposal for the Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) program offered in Kirkland, Washington.
12/08	Commission Subchange Ratification: The Commission acted to ratify the approval of the Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) program offered in Kirkland, Washington.
04/08	The Substantive Change Committee acted not to accept the following programs: Mind-Body Medicine (PhD and MS).
06/08	Substantive Change Committee acted to grant interim approval of the

	resubmission proposal for the following programs: Mind-Body Medicine (PhD and MS).
05/09	Substantive Change Site Visit: On May 29, 2009, A Sub Change panel visited the campus to fulfill the post implementation requirements for the following change: Leadership Institute of Seattle (LIOS) program offered in Kirkland, Washington.
08/09	Commission gave approval for Mind-Body Medicine (PhD and MS) and LIOS programs
09/09	The institution's name changed from Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center to **Saybrook University**.

While the Notice of Concern and the intent of this Special Visit were specifically directed at the Saybrook Graduate School and Research Center, this institutional report and the team analysis were conducted to focus on the entire university, including the two recent additions to the college structure, Mind-Body Medicine and LIOS.

Off-Campus and Distance Programs:

Saybrook University has one off-campus site in Kirkland, Washington. It also maintains contractual relationships with the Center of Mind-Body Medicine (Washington, DC) and the C.E. Jung Center of Houston (Houston, Texas). Considered high residency programs, the LIOS programs are predominately site based and use online learning technologies to support the residential components of each of the programs (largely defined as web-enhanced). Considered low residency programs, the MBM and PHS programs include a "residential conference" which is conducted in a hotel/conference environment in the San Francisco Bay area or at similar locations elsewhere. These programs actively vary in their use of online learning from web-enhanced (PHS PhD and clinical programs) to fully-online courses that connect with the residential conferences (MBM all programs). There are no programs at Saybrook that would be considered 100% online.

An audit of the online platform was conducted during the Special Visit. The compliance documentation is attached to this report in Appendix A.

Compliance Audit:

As required by policies governing all Special Visits, a full compliance audit was conducted during the team's time on campus. Saybrook staff members were conscientious in compiling the required information and had all materials well-organized and readily available in the team room. A copy of the audit check lists and all related notes are available in Appendix B of this report.

Quality of Special Visit Report and Supporting Evidence:

The team found the Special Visit report to be well written and comprehensive. It not only addressed the issues identified by the Commission in its June 2008 letter but it also provided a context for the changes that have occurred at Saybrook in the intervening years. In addition to the report, Saybrook provided well designed appendices of data that contributed to the overall report and prepared the team for its process of inquiry. Once arriving on campus, Saybrook's ALO and his staff created a comfortable team room well equipped with all the documentation required for the educational effectiveness portion of this review, including samples of student work product, and the compliance audit. Open access was provided to the team for the evaluation of the Saybrook learning management system providing insight to the various ways Saybrook engages online pedagogy to support the learning outcomes of the various programs. The team greatly appreciated the transparent sharing of data. Its availability and applicability to the questions at hand indicated that Saybrook is an institution that embraces the use of data for decision making and planning.

Team Review Process:

The team examined both quantitative and qualitative data as requested by the Commission. Special care was given to the triangulation of data by meeting with multiple

constituencies and conducting follow up interviews as needed. Using all available materials, supplemented with those additional data points made available upon request, the team is confident that it was able to thoroughly explore the issues at hand and provide the Commission with a comprehensive response to the stated concerns. Whenever possible, team conclusions are supplemented with references to data and interview notes reviewed throughout the preparation period and while on campus.

Section II: Team Analysis

Based on the areas of concern outlined in the Commission letter, and as a result of the recommendations of the team visit for the Educational Effectiveness Review in March 2008, the Special Visit team focused its exploration in four areas:

- Strategic planning, particularly prioritization of initiatives and new program development;

- Financial stability, particularly fundraising and enrollment management;

- Student retention and completion;

- Strengthening of educational effectiveness efforts at all levels.

The following sub-sections of the report address each of these areas and provide reference to the appropriate accreditation Criteria for Review.

Strategic Planning:

The role of strategic planning seems to have developed slowly over the history of the university, but now appears to be embedded in the thinking and processes of the institution (CFR 4.1). Planning in prior years was described in its self-study as informal and inconsistent. The

university community may or may not have been engaged in the process; follow up and tracking did not always occur.

The current Strategic Plan was developed by the former president of Saybrook for the period 2007-2012 in consultation with the university community. It addressed primarily the following areas: increasing academic excellence, developing new programs, increasing resources, and practice and service. Subsequent to the last WASC visit in 2008, new goals were added to the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan that reflected the institution's attention to concerns raised in the visit, including implementing enrollment management and creating a multi-disciplinary university with three colleges. Recognizing the lack of rigor of implementation and follow up in the past, structures were put into place for tracking, evaluation and implementation of the plan (CFRs 4.1, 4.3).

The Special Visit has appeared to serve as a catalyst for the university community to become fully engaged in the planning process and recognize its importance to the institution (CFR 4.1). Under the leadership of the interim president (October 2009 to June 2010) and the current president, who arrived in July 2010, structures were put into place to implement and monitor progress (CFR 4.3). New goals to the plan were added in 2011. The self-study included a robust tracking document that reflected the university's monitoring of the plan, and the team found evidence of actions and evaluations being undertaken according to the plan. A new Director of Institutional Research was appointed, and tracking systems now appear to be effective and appropriate (CFR 4.3). An impressive number of desired indicators (17 of 27) have been achieved, with the most success occurring for the goals of implementing integrated enrollment management, creating a multi-disciplinary university, and establishing new programs

(CFRs 4.2, 4.3). The goal to increase resources has mostly gone unrealized (CFR 4.2), and the goal for practice and service has been placed on hold.

The new president appears to be committed to a systematic strategic planning process (CFR 4.1). University constituencies described his attention to strategic planning as a "first." They described their appreciation of the continuity established by his not discarding the current plan, but rather developing a systematic approach to monitoring its success. As the time period for this plan is coming to an end, the president, his executive team, and the University Council, a group comprised of the Faculty Senate, senior administration and staff representatives of the university and colleges, are developing a strategic agenda, which will take the university through 2015 and allow the time necessary to evaluate the success of the strategic plan and devise a plan for the future (CFRs 4.1, 4.3). A new strategic plan will follow and cover the period up to 2020.

The strategic agenda will be presented to the Board of Trustees in June 2012. The agenda was vetted by the broader campus communities through administrative, faculty program and staff meetings and the Faculty Senate, and it appears to have involved more consensus than any previous planning process (CFR 4.1). The purpose of the strategic agenda is to further realize and strengthen the university in the areas outlined in the strategic plan. The agenda was informed by student satisfaction surveys and institutional assessment (perhaps for the first time in such a systematic way) as well as university conversations (CFR 4.3). Key aspects of the strategic agenda (CFR 4.2) arose from the programmatic growth of the university and its three colleges, including the goals to:

- establish and build a consistent university identity across the colleges and increase the visibility of Saybrook;

- develop administrative structures that reflect the new organizational needs and create parity across the colleges;

- attain and sustain financial and organizational robustness by improving the financial models, growing enrollment, and strengthening development efforts; and,

- continue the improvements in educational effectiveness.

It appears that the university has responded to the WASC 2008 feedback on the importance of strategic planning and made significant strides. From the current vantage point, the strategic process is now divided into three historical phases: university formation under the prior president, setting the foundation under the interim leadership, and a growth phase under the current president. It appears that the first two phases strengthened the institution and positioned it to have a reasonable chance of executing the growth phase. The current president has provided a vision that has been embraced by the university community as coherent and inspiring (CFR 4.1). On the cautionary side, some of the key initiatives that require academic and administrative rigor, such as the PsyD program, or new organizational competencies, such as philanthropy, have been reassessed or are stalled, and the goal of increasing financial stability remains a challenge. However, the College of Mind-Body Medicine shows strong potential for growth. As certain aspects of the agenda move forward, such as the building of a new university identity and culture, the embedding of evidence throughout decision-making processes, progress on integrated enrollment management, student retention and completion, and the development of parity across the colleges, the need for the need for redundant administrative structures may be reduced (CFRs 4.2, 4.3).

Through systematic assessment and community engagement, strategic planning now seems to have taken on a central role in the institution. The institution has in place a capable team together that looks like it will make progress in this area, freeing the president to pursue institutional advancement and development efforts (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3). The team commends the president for his grasp of the challenges facing the institution and setting a pragmatic approach to tackle them. The team observed that the leadership of Saybrook has earned the confidence of the university community and the Board of Trustees. The renewed enthusiasm is palpable.

Financial Stability:

In its July, 2008 Action Letter, the WASC Commission stated that there was an admissions shortfall for AY 2007-08, as well as three years of planned deficits, beginning in AY 2007-08 (CFR 3.5). The team concluded that while the institution remains financially fragile, the deficit is being used to fund marketing and recruiting initiatives that may benefit the institution in the long run. In the meantime, the fiscal situation is being carefully managed. Additionally the university indicated, in response to the March 2008 team report, that as a result of a successful restricted fund raising campaign in excess of $1 million, Saybrook expected having working capital of $1.5 million which was to be used to support growth over the following two years. The anticipated increases in enrollment and levels of expected contributions did not occur (CFR 3.5). The enrollment has remained flat for the past three years and is expected to remain approximately the same for AY 2012-13. The level of unrestricted contributions has increased since AY 2007-08 from approximately $7,000 to approximately $75,000 (AY 2011-12).

Saybrook is not expected to meet its budgeted revenue expectations for fiscal year ending

August 31, 2012, with a shortfall of approximately $500,000; however, it is forecasting a small

operating profit of approximately $11,000, because of the non-expenditure of budgeted

contingency expenses for the year (CFR 3.5). The revenue difference from the budgeted amount

is attributed to the university not meeting its enrollment targets for AY 2011-12. Over the past

four years the composite financial health ratio has declined from 3.15 to 2.73 for AY 2010-11

(2.87 estimate for AY 2011-12 because still in progress). Additionally, its net income ratio has

declined from 9.7% to -0.4% (0% estimated for AY 2011-12).

The budget for AY 2012-13 is still in development and has not been approved by the

Board of Trustees. It is not expected to be approved until its June 2012 Board of Trustees

meeting. The Finance Committee is expected to review the proposed budget up to three times

prior to presenting it to the full Board of Trustees. This review allows for input from the

Trustees and for changes and updates to the final budget (CFR 3.8). The draft initial preliminary

budget for AY 2012-13 presented to the Finance Committee on March 28, 2012 showed an

operating profit of approximately $21,000; however unlike in the previous year's final budget

there was no contingency expense budgeted to cushion for potential revenue shortfalls or

unexpected increases in expenditures. In the memorandum accompanying the draft budget it was

stated "a contingency would require a deficit budget or reduction in resources." The enrollment

figures are projected to be up for the current year in two of the colleges and flat for the third;

however, the expected net change in enrollment, although higher than in 2011, will result in

effectively flat enrollment after factoring in graduation and attrition. The ongoing concern is that

Saybrook is a tuition dependent university and that if it is unable to attract increasing numbers of

students then its finances become even more fragile. There is also no cushion if the enrollment targets are not met (CFR 3.5).

The team observed that Saybrook has a significant number of senior management positions for the size of the operations (CFR 3.1). During the visit the team learned that Saybrook has identified a series of procedural, structural and organizational changes that can reduce budgeted expenditures by approximately $500,000 from the amounts reflected in the preliminary AY 2012-13 presented to the Finance Committee on March 28, 2012. The anticipated savings can be used as needed to revise the AY 2012-13 budget in the event enrollment goals are not met (CFR 3.5). The team also learned that there may be additional savings for AY 2012-13 due to consolidation of other activities. Finally, if the budget proves to be significantly off the university estimates, Saybrook will have approximately $3.5 million in cash or investments reserves to cushion it as it revamps the budget. The university expends approximately $ 900,000 in cash per month.

Another area of concern in the AY 2012-13 preliminary budget is the estimated unrestricted contribution amounts (CFR 3.5). The preliminary AY2012-13 budget amount of $221,000 is significantly higher than the current year forecasted results of $75,000 for unrestricted contributions. Additionally, the university is in the process of developing its plan to solicit contributions after several years of neglect in that area (CFR 3.5). The primary course of action if there is a revenue shortfall appears to be reduction of budgeted expenditures (CFR 3.5). The university does not have a multiyear forecast nor does it have a current year cash flow forecast (CFR 3.5). The university has a desire to increase its size over the next several years and is in process of creating marketing plans and college growth plans to facilitate the future development.

Stability of the leadership team is critical at this juncture. Most members of senior management are new to the university since the last visit (CFR 1.3). The president has been in his position for little over one and half years. A new Vice President for Academic Affairs joined Saybrook in the fall of 2011 and was promoted to Provost & Executive Vice President in March 2012. The chief financial officer (CFO) was previously an interim CFO for two years prior to being permanently appointed as CFO in September 2011 (CFR 3.10). The controller was appointed in March 2012.

In addition, to keep expenses as low as possible, there has been one salary adjustment for 3% in the past three years, and no pension contributions for the past six years. During this time, the university continued to invest in faculty development. On the other hand, staff reported limited opportunities for their professional development (CFR 3.4). The leadership of Saybrook recognizes that salary adjustments for faculty and staff are a top priority once the budget is stabilized; however, there was no anticipated date when this is expected to occur.

With 98% of its revenue coming from tuition, enrollment management is critical to the financial stability of Saybrook (CFR 3.5). The position of Vice President for Enrollment Management has been eliminated and the functions were assumed by the provost. The university has instituted a University Growth Committee that is charged with developing enrollment management plans and to recommend where university resources are to be used for specific programs and colleges. Marketing efforts have been enhanced by an increase in resources and the development of specific targeted marketing campaigns. Over time, it appears that the marketing programs have become more data driven.

To supplement tuition revenue and to reduce almost total dependence upon tuition revenues, the strategic plan identifies growth in non-tuition revenues as a priority (CFR 3.5).

Saybrook set ambitious fundraising goals at the time of the 2008 visit. Since the last visit, Saybrook's then new Vice President for Advancement has left the university and the position has been eliminated. The president will be assuming primary responsibility for fund raising. At the time of the 2012 visit, unrestricted amounts raised (approximately $75,000) were below the 2012 budget of $100,000; however, this is down from the anticipated growth in fund raising goals expressed in the 2008 visit. To help secure financial stability, Saybrook will need to continue the work in establishing and building relationships with the alumni, the community at large, foundations and other philanthropic organizations (CFR 3.5). Saybrook should also explore other alternative revenue sources such as grants or contracts.

In summary, Saybrook's financial situation remains fragile, requiring careful management (CFR 3.5). The team believes that the leadership is very aware of the financial circumstances of the institution and knows there is an urgency to grow enrollments and secure greater financial health. The team also believes that there is a significant amount of capability in all the key players involved in managing the financial aspects of the institution – the board, president, provost, and vice presidents. In addition, the leadership is aware that student retention is not only a critical element of educational effectiveness, but also of financial health. The leadership appears ready to increase its focus on enhancing student retention and overall enrollment.

Student Retention and Graduation:

The team acknowledges and commends the gains of overall enrollment since the 2008 visit, which are key indicators of future fiscal stability for the institution: 2008-2009 (481), 2009-10 (586), and 2010-11 (604) (CFR 3.5). Moreover, the modest improvements with retention (year over year) are commendable: 2008-2009 (83%), 2009-2010 (81%), and 2010-2011 (85%)

(CFR 2.10). Saybrook has taken steps to seriously tackle retention issues including surveying students to assess their satisfaction and making the necessary operational changes to respond to student feedback (2.10, 2.12, 2.13). Campus committees are using data from the student satisfaction survey to make changes to hopefully improve student attitudes about the Saybrook experience. The team had an opportunity to meet with students during the visit. During the meeting students were generally pleased with the improved responsiveness of faculty and student services personnel, which was a significant issue that arose in the student satisfaction survey (CFRs 2.12, 2.13). Saybrook may wish to consider a survey tool, which assesses not only satisfaction with services but importance of services. This type of tool can provide Saybrook an opportunity to prioritize what is the most important to students in order to make an impact in a scalable manner (CFRs 1.3, 1.2, 4.4, 4.5).

The institution reports the following as its retention and graduation rates:

PHS

Academic Year	Program	Cohort Start	Graduated	Still Enrolled	Success Rate (graduate plus enrolled)
07/08	All MAs	44	20	3	52%
	All PhDs and PsyDs	69	12	25	54%
10/11	All MAs	52	1	33	65%
	All PhDs and PsyDs	106	1	72	69%

LIOS

Academic Year	Program	Cohort Start	Graduated	Still Enrolled	Success Rate (graduate plus enrolled)
08/09	All MAs	61	52	1	87%
10/11	All MAs	57	0	48	84%

MBM

Academic Year	Program	Cohort Start	Graduated	Still Enrolled	Success Rate (graduate plus enrolled)
10/11	MS	10	0	10	100%
	PhD	27	0	21	78%

Saybrook provided data as far back as the 07/08 academic year for PHS, LIOS back to 08/09, and because MBM is so new only two years of data were available. By comparing the oldest data available to the most recent completed year, the team was able to conclude that overall, Saybrook has made modest improvements in its retention and graduation efforts.

Saybrook prepared a comprehensive report on retention and graduation, disaggregated by ethnicity (CFR 2.10). As one would expect with very small sample sizes, it is difficult to track actual performance looking at single group cohorts. The team suggests that the institution consider a longitudinal study of persistence and graduation by ethnicity to better understand the performance of its underrepresented populations. The university might also want to disaggregate by ethnicity other areas of assessment such as student satisfaction and student learning outcomes to further identify opportunities to improve the Saybrook experience for minority students (CFR 1.5).

The issue of overall small student enrollments impacts all aspects of Saybrook's financial success and educational effectiveness (CFRs 2.5, 3.5, 4.4). Each student lost through attrition has a significant impact not only on the long term financial health of the university but also on the learning environment. Although Saybrook has made gains with overall enrollment through the acquisition of adding LIOS, adding the College of Mind Body Medicine (MBM), and with modest gains in retention, building critical mass through new student enrollment still needs significant attention. For instance, in Fall 2011 new student enrollment was the lowest since Fall 2008: Fall 2011 (97), Fall 2010 (166), Fall 2009 (173), Fall 2008 (121) (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 4.2). Furthermore, the Fall 2012 aggregate admissions funnel as of March 19th indicates a trajectory of lower to flat new student enrollments as compared to Fall 2011 as indicated by the year to date admissions funnel provided to the visiting team: Fall 2012 (149), Fall 2011 (159), Fall 2010 (176), Fall 2009 (169).

The team recommends continued development of enrollment management systems, appropriate resource allocation to where the institution will receive the best return on investment (ROI), and enhanced sophistication and integration of enrollment management and marketing to successfully support the implementation of strategies and tactics to sustain enrollment growth for the institution (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 4.2). During the team's meeting with the front line operations group (Admission Director, Financial Aid Director and Registrar) it was evident that their roles were more tactical in nature, which is appropriate at a certain level. However, for the purposes of developing enrollment targets and budgets, the feedback from the Directors of Admission and Financial Aid are critical since they should be able to provide real time qualitative information regarding funnel management and yield projections. The team was pleased to hear that the Director of Admission was recently added to the University Growth Committee; this addition

should prove useful with providing front line reconnaissance regarding future new student enrollment targets (CFRs 3.1, 3.5).

The team commends Saybrook for building growth teams at the college (PHS, MBM, LIOS) and at the university level. These growth teams appear to be fully engaged in the entire enrollment process from recruitment to retention. However, the team cautions Saybrook to continuously monitor the efficiency of what could be considered an overwhelming and bureaucratic process for the size and scope of the institution. In addition, although the provost is currently serving as the chief enrollment officer, the team encourages the institution to consider a model which includes a chief enrollment officer at the executive level in order to bring subject matter expertise to Saybrook and address critical enrollment issues (CFRs 3.1, 3.5, 3.8, 4.2).

Since institutional marketing plays such an important role with building a future admissions pipeline for Saybrook, the team suggests that the institution develop a sophisticated analytical marketing framework. Such a framework should have a marketing feedback loop regarding prospect to inquiry and inquiry to applicant conversion activities. In addition, the team encourages a marketing resource in order to ascertain not just cost per acquisition, which Saybrook provided to the team, but what is the net marketing spend needed to enroll the number of new students to meet or exceed future new student enrollment goals. The team was pleased that marketing operations is tracking primary inquiry sources and conversions in order to leverage its limited marketing budget to optimize inquiry generation. Furthermore, the centralization of the marketing budget is another area that Saybrook is making progress on, which should help to further optimize their marketing efforts (3.4, 3.5, 4.1).

Strengthening of Educational Effectiveness at all Levels:

Overall the team found much improvement in the efforts for educational effectiveness throughout the academic programs. There is evidence that in the more mature programs (PHS and LIOS) that the overall academic quality is assessed through the extensive use of student work product and multidimensional rubrics for learning. MBM has developed a well thought out plan for assessment but is still fairly new and does not have sufficient numbers of students who have progressed to a level needed for programmatic outcomes assessment. While the programs are at varying levels of maturity there is evidence that Saybrook has embraced the need to be a learning organization and is using the assessment process to make improvements throughout the educational experience. In addition, there is a great deal of shared learning across programs. It appears that the faculty is actively engaged in the assessment process and understands its value beyond meeting any accreditation or regulatory requirement (CFR 4.6). Through the distance education audit process, it was also noted that feedback on student work is formative and comprehensive. Examples randomly reviewed indicated the faculty is actively committed to engage students in the process of expanding learning and improvement (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 4.6).

Program review is ongoing and engaged across the institution as evidenced by materials provided for programs from each of the three colleges. Again, there was a range of maturity shown in the depth of data collected and subsequent analysis provided but the process is clearly defined and the institution demonstrates a desire for continuous improvement through understanding the performances of its programs and cross-functional sharing of best practices. One example of the use of a comprehensive program review for critical decision making was demonstrated in the decision to cease offering the PsyD program due to the difficulties in obtaining secondary accreditation by the American Psychological Association, a necessary

component for the acceptance of the credential in the work place. While strong student learning was evident, other economic and practical factors required of the institution were not achievable. As difficult as the decision was for those in PHS and for the institution as a whole (nearly 40 students are currently enrolled in the PsyD), Saybrook has moved forward with the teach-out plan (CFRs 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

The team was impressed with the level of institutional research capacity and the expertise of researching and addressing strategic data needs from the office of institutional research. Additionally, the office of institutional research demonstrated to the team the ability to shape and influence the future of the institution by being true to the culture of evidence principles. The team was equally pleased to discover that the office of institutional research had a direct reporting line to the president. This link should help the president receive ongoing data analysis in order to help influence "real time" strategic decisions (CFRs 2.1, 4.5, 4.6).

The team observed a heavy over-reliance on the student satisfaction survey, an internal tool developed by the director of institutional research (CFR 2.10). The form of in-direct evidence of student satisfaction and engagement has provided valuable insight to the institution but should not be the only evidence used to determine issues that impact the student experience. Key academic support and student services such as the library, non-academic aspects of the residential conferences, academic advising and financial aid could benefit from a more comprehensive program evaluation beyond a few questions as part of a broader survey (CFR 1.8). In addition and as previously mentioned, the use of a survey that measures satisfaction and importance will allow the institution to prioritize its efforts, a vital step in a resource challenged environment – every decision must be made for maximum impact. It might also be helpful to

consider tools that provide feedback through benchmarking of similar student populations to better understand the institution's performance within a national context (CFRs 4.4, 4.6).

Section III: Findings and Recommendations

Saybrook University has undergone a fundamental transformation in recent years. The team was first made of aware of the cultural shift in its review of an extremely well written institutional report and the included appendices. An understanding of the magnitude of the change, however, was deepened as the team began to learn of the collaborative process used in the preparation of the report. It was evident that the effort replicated itself in the cross-functional dialog in groups such as the University Council, the Friday Operations team, and the Faculty Senate. Throughout the visit, the data collected, along with the ongoing analysis and reflection, painted a picture of an organization that is embracing a culture of evidence based decision making, as well as committed to continuous improvement and learning.

The team was also quite pleased to hear, and see, a sense of enthusiasm and optimism across campus constituencies. Faculty were engaged and ready to embrace their role as "keeper" of the academic mission of the institution, staff felt heard and confident that they are valued in the decision making process, and students noted significant improvements in communication with faculty and support services across the organization. A commendation must be made to the Board of Trustees for making such careful and thoughtful selections in the current university leadership and the team encourages the Board to continue to support this leadership team which has begun to foster a real sense of trust throughout the institution.   This is the same leadership team that has continued the forward progress of the institutional strategic planning process, elevating it to an engaged community exercise that is diligent, thoughtful, thorough, and now beginning to become operationalized by employing tactics that are nimble and reasonable.

A final commendation must include acknowledgement that net student enrollment has improved. An increased attention to retention and activities that foster student success provided modest gains in overall student headcount and foretells improvements in program completion and graduation rates, across all programs. The team encourages the institution to continue that work and find opportunities to further strengthen those efforts because, at a tuition driven institution, improvement in enrollment means a strengthened financial position for the university.

Significant progress has been achieved in strategic planning efforts and in assessment to insure educational effectiveness but the work for Saybrook University is not done. It is with confidence in the institution that the team makes the following recommendations:

1. All roads lead to a need for fiscal stability and growth. To accomplish this goal, Saybrook must embrace opportunities to diversify and strengthen its revenue streams. The most direct way to accomplish this will be through new student enrollments in programs that can provide the greatest return on investment and in ongoing efforts to improve retention and graduate rates. In addition, the pursuit of new grants, contracts, and foundation support, and increased fund raising efforts will improve the financial position of the university. Strengthening the financial picture is key to sustainability through these challenging times. (CFR 3.5)

2. The team recommends the Board and the Saybrook community foster stability with the current university executive leadership team in order to mitigate further transition of key administrative personnel. Stabilizing executive leadership for Saybrook should be a catalyst for meeting university strategic and fiscal goals. (CFRs 3.1, 3.8, 3.10, 4.6)

3. The core message, brand and identity of Saybrook University require further development. Within that core message, and tightly connected to that effort, should be

23

the development of the programs in the PHS brand and identity. While LIOS and MBM have had the opportunity to develop their own "voice" through the recent development and integration of those colleges, PHS has faced the greatest transition in moving from the "only child" to one that must share the institutional brand but be its own person within the "family" structure. In finding that voice, the team feels that PHS will establish its connected mission in a way that will improve its enrollment position and increase retention and graduation rates for its programs. (CFRs 1.1, 4.1)

4. The team recommends that Saybrook simplify and clarify its administrative structure. It is now time to embrace a full integration of its newest "member" by bringing in LIOS in a way that is consistent administratively and fiscally with the university vision. Opportunities abound through sharing of best practices and interdisciplinary collaboration. Finding areas where synergies will benefit the whole university while maintaining distinctive features of each program's value proposition will strengthen Saybrook's overall operations and academic endeavors. (CFR 3.8)

Appendices

Audit of Distance Education Programs

The following provides an audit of the Distance Education Programs at Saybrook

University, conducted March 29, 2012.

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

Institution: **Saybrook University**
Type of Visit: **Special Visit**
Name of reviewer/s: **Cherron R. Hoppes, Assistant Chair**
Date/s of review: **March 29, 2012**

1. Programs and Courses Reviewed (please list)

   MBM5600
   PHS Residential Conference
   LIOS Residential Conference

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

   Saybrook University does not consider its program to be online education but rather uses the learning management system (LMS) to supplement the activities of the residential conferences and to connect the learning community during the periods of time between the conferences. Each college uses the LMS to varying degrees and ranges of reliance from heavy use in the Mind-Body Medicine College to web enhancement of the more demanding residential schedule of LIOS. All programs are using online in some form to supplement the learning environment with plans for further development in future terms.

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

   This reviewer conducted an interview with the primary support person for the LMS, discussed the uses of the LMS with various faculty members in meetings throughout the visit and was given full access to courses not currently active (no Spring 2012 term courses).

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
Fit with Mission. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1)	Saybrook has long defined itself as having a low residency requirement; the use of online tools is providing a cohesion that has been lacking in the program design; strongly encourage that resources for instructional design and technology support be	Ongoing financial concerns for the institution will impact its ability to further support and resource the LMS; however, when seen as an opportunity for building a learning community and connecting students

	considered in the strategic planning of the college. As discovered during the visit process, the institution does not consider itself to be an online learning provider – the degree of ambivalence is reflected in its planning, support and resourcing of this tool.	particularly as they reach their dissertation phase (as being discussed in PHS), the LMS could greatly contribute to student satisfaction and persistence to graduation. Saybrook may want to study the impact of the LMS, consider best practices in this area of student community building and resource accordingly.
Connection to the Institution. How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution? (CFR 1.2, 2.10)	N/A	
Quality of the DE Infrastructure. Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.7)	The residential conference learning environments are well designed to support logistics questions, build community and provide supplemental learning tools; the course review was well designed, clear in its design methodology, encouraged student engagement with one another and facilitated faculty feedback. Current considerations of the platform (Saybrook is using Moodle) and tech support will be important for future expansion of the use of the LMS.	Saybrook may wish to determine the role the LMS will play in educational delivery for strategic planning purposes as a decision regarding the hosting and support services will need to be made in the near future.
Student Support Services. CPR: What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? *EER:* What do data show about the effectiveness of the services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)	As a low residency model, Saybrook has a long history of providing support services for students at a distance. The increased use of the LMS does not change that model. However, if Saybrook moves to a no residence model of education, then evaluation of these services outside of the residential conference will need to be considered.	
Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)	Faculty who use the LMS are also engaged in the other pedagogical efforts of the institution. Saybrook can continue to do more (like most others with a heavy reliance on adjunct faculty) to better integrate their part-time faculty	As use of the LMS expands, Saybrook might consider providing additional instructional designer resources to support faculty content expertise and to expand on ways online technologies are employed.

	but that is not isolated to those who teach online. Training is conducted regularly using synchronous meeting tools.	
Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (CFRs 2.1-2.3, 4.6) (Submit credit hour report.)	All online courses undergo the same approval and review process as the overall curriculum. Use of fully online courses is very limited, fairly new, and in the institution's newest programs so there is little opportunity for comparative assessment and evaluation. However, these courses are included in the overall assessment plans for those programs.	
Retention and Graduation. What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)	N/A	
Student Learning. CPR: How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? *EER*: What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)	See curriculum and delivery	
Contracts with Vendors. Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on *Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?*	N/A	
Quality Assurance Processes: CPR: How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? *EER:* What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)	See curriculum and delivery	

Compliance Audit

The following provides an audit of the necessary data points for the Compliance Audit

for Saybrook University, conducted March 29, 2012:

Compliance Audit Checklist for Special Visits

Name of Institution: **Saybrook University**

Date of Visit: **March 27-30, 2012**

CFR	Documents Required	
Standard 1		
1.1	Mission statement	X
1.2	Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels	X
1.2.1	Public statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning) DRAFT FORM; NOT POSTED	DRAFT
1.3	Organization chart (X 3.8, 3.9, 3.10)	X
1.4	Academic freedom policy	X
1.5	Diversity policies and procedures; Procedures for Special Accommodations	X
1.6	-	-
1.7	Catalog (online __X_, hard copy __X_) with complete program descriptions, graduation requirements, grading policies (X 2.10.1)	X
1.7.2	Student complaint and grievance policies MAY NEED TO BE UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE; POLICY REFERS TO "DEAN OF STUDENTS" POSITION	PARTIAL
1.7.2.1	Policy for grade appeals	X
1.7.2.2	Records of student complaints	X
1.7.3	Faculty grievance policies	X
1.7.3.1	Record of faculty grievances	X
1.7.4	Staff grievance policies	X
1.7.4.1	Record of staff grievances and complaints	X
1.7.5	Employee handbook	X
1.7.6.1	Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc.	X
1.7.6.2	Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files	X
1.7.6.3	Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades	X
1.7.6.4	Tuition and fee schedule	X
1.7.6.5	Policies on tuition refunds	X
1.7.6.6	Policy on credit hour/award of credit Processes for review of assignment of credit Review of syllabi/equivalent for all kinds of courses	X
1.8	Regular independent audits of finances (X 3.5)	X
1.9	WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies	X

CFR	Documents Required	
1.7-1.9	Documents relating to investigations of the institution by any governmental entity and an update on the status of such investigation NO GOV'T INVESTIGATIONS A list of pending legal actions by or against the institution, including a full explanation of the nature of the actions, parties involved, and status of the litigation NO LEGAL ACTIONS	X
Standard 2		
2.1	List of degree programs, showing curriculum and units for each (X 1.7)	X
2.2	Complete set of course syllabi for all courses offered	X
2.2.1	(For associate and bachelor's degrees) statement of general education requirements (X 1.7)	NA
2.3	SLOs for every program	X
2.4	-	-
2.5	-	-
2.6	-	-
2.7	Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention/graduation and achievement of learning outcomes	X
2.7.1	Regular schedule of program review (including for non-academic units) FOR NON-ACADEMIC UNITS, USING STUDENT SATSIFACTION SURVEYS	X
2.8	Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity	X
2.9	-	-
2.10	Data on student demographics	X
2.10.1	Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs	X
2.10.2	Collection and analysis of grades at the course or program level, as appropriate COULD NOT LOCATE THESE ANALYSES	
2.10.3	Policies on student evaluation of faculty	X
2.10.4	Forms for evaluation of faculty by students	X
2.11	List of student services and co-curricular activities GRAD STUDENTS ONLY; NO STUDENT GROUPS OR ORGANIZATIONS	NO
2.11.1	Policies on financial aid	X
2.12	Academic calendar (X 1.7 catalog)	X
2.13	Recruitment and advertising material for the last year	X
2.13.1	Registration procedures	X
2.14	Registration forms	X
Standard 3		
3.1	Policies on staff development	X
3.2	List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, tenure track, by program	X
3.3	Faculty hiring policies	X
3.3.1	Faculty evaluation policies and procedures (X 2.10)	X
3.3.2	Faculty Handbook if available	DRAFT
3.4	Faculty development policies	X
3.4.1	Faculty orientation policies and procedures	X
3.4.2	Policies on rights and responsibilities of non-full-time faculty	X
3.4.3	Statements concerning faculty role in assessment of student learning	X
3.5	Audited financial statements (X 1.8)	X
3.5.1	Appropriate financial records	X

CFR	Documents Required	
3.5.2	Appropriate policies and procedures for handling of financial aid (X 2.11)	X
3.5.3	Campus maps	NA
3.6	Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty	X
3.6.1	If online or hybrid, information on delivery method	X
3.6.2	Library data/holdings, size	X
3.7	Inventory of technology resources and services for staff	X
3.8	Organization chart (X 1.3 and 3.1)	X
3.9	Board list	X
3.9.1	Board member bios	X
3.9.2	List of Board committees NEED TO ESTABLISH SEPARATE AUDIT COMMITTEE (NOW COMBINED WITH FINANCE COMMITTEE)	X
3.9.2.1	Minutes of Board meetings for last two years	X
3.9.2.2	Governing board bylaws and operations manual NEED TO ADD CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY TO BYLAWS (HAVE A STANDALONE POLICY NOT IN BYLAWS)	X
3.10	CEO bio	X
3.10.1	CFO bio	X
3.10.2	Other top administrators' bios (e.g., cabinet, VPs, Provost)	X
3.10.3	Policy and procedure for the evaluation of president/CEO	X
3.11	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority	DRAFT
3.11.1	Faculty organization chart (if applicable)	NA
3.11.2	Minutes of last year's faculty meetings	X
Standard 4		
4.1	Strategic plan	X
4.1.1	Operations plan PART OF STRATEGIC AGENDA	X
4.1.2	Academic plan PART OF STRATEGIC AGENDA	X
4.2	Description of planning process	X
4.2.1	Process for review of implementation of strategic plan	X
4.3	-	-
4.4	New program approval process	X
4.4.1	Program review process (X 2.7)	X
4.5	Description of IR function and staffing	X
4.6	Process for review and analysis of key data, such as retention, graduation (X1.2)	X
4.7	-	-
4.8	-	-

Accuracy and Availability of Records		
	Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media	NOT REVIEWED
	Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents	NOT REVIEWED
	Records are accurate and up to date	NOT REVIEWED