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President’s Message

On behalf of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (TCSPP), I am pleased to submit our Reaffirmation Institutional Report in preparation for the WASC Senior Colleges and University Commission’s (WSCUC) evaluation team visit scheduled for March 2017. During the past five years, TCSPP has been involved in assessment, planning, and collaborative self-examination efforts which have resulted in this comprehensive Self-Study Report which evaluates all aspects of The Chicago School’s mission, vision, and operations.

This report examines and assesses the WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs) through the lens of educational effectiveness and student success. By engaging in an open and candid process, this report is the product of campus-wide collaboration of internal constituents, who provided input through various committees and open channels.

Furthermore, this review has provided an opportunity to reflect and examine how we meet the various educational standards and demonstrates our commitment to the culture of change in higher education. This candid assessment will serve as the foundation that we will use to shape the next phase of our history in educating successful practitioners in psychology, and related behavioral and health sciences.

I look forward to the team's off-site review and visit, and I am confident they will find an institution committed to the success of its students and excellence in education.

Sincerely,

Michele Nealon-Woods, Psy.D.
President
### Reference of Key Terms (Acronyms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AALC</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Leadership Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAI</td>
<td>Association for Behavior Analysis International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERC</td>
<td>Academic Effectiveness Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABG</td>
<td>Academic Budget Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGB</td>
<td>Association of Governing Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APA</td>
<td>American Psychological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR</td>
<td>Academic Program Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAC</td>
<td>Academic Standards Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY</td>
<td>Academic Year (Fall through Summer Semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Bachelor of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Budget Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACB</td>
<td>Behavior Analyst Certification Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, I, A</td>
<td>Basic Level, Intermediate Level, Advanced Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CACREP</td>
<td>Council for Accreditation of Counseling &amp; Related Educational Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO(s)</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLO(s)</td>
<td>Course Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHC</td>
<td>Clinical Mental Health Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COA</td>
<td>Commission on Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Community Partnerships Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Customer Relationship Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAB</td>
<td>Diversity Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQP</td>
<td>Degree Qualifications Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Financial/Fiscal Year (June 1 to May 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA(s)</td>
<td>Grade Point Average(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLC</td>
<td>Higher Learning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEI</td>
<td>Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IERC</td>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO(s)</td>
<td>Institutional Learning Outcome(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEDS</td>
<td>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRB</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCs</td>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>Learning Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRP</td>
<td>Long-Range Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Master of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQID</td>
<td>Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAERC</td>
<td>National Academic Effectiveness Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASP</td>
<td>National Association of School Psychologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>North Central Association of Colleges and Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDE</td>
<td>National Center for Academic and Dissertation Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSP</td>
<td>National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTL</td>
<td>National Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFCEC</td>
<td>National Faculty Council Executive Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSC</td>
<td>New Program Support Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIR</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>President's Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;L</td>
<td>Profit &amp; Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO(s)</td>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMO(s)</td>
<td>Program Maintenance Outcome(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMR(s)</td>
<td>Program Modification Request(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy.D.</td>
<td>Doctor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO(s)</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME(s)</td>
<td>Subject Matter Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS</td>
<td>The Chicago School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCS ES</td>
<td>The Chicago School Education System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCPP</td>
<td>The Chicago School of Professional Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tk20</td>
<td>Third-party data collection and reporting software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSCUC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD</td>
<td>Year to Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History of the Institution

The Chicago School of Professional Psychology (TCSPP) is a not-for-profit institution offering certificates and degrees in the fields of psychology and behavioral and health sciences. The training and education model and the values set forth at the time of its founding—encapsulated today as Education, Innovation, Service, and Community—continue to influence its identity as an educational institution, its planning, its allocation of resources, and the manner in which it pursues the mission. This has been evident as TCSPP has developed and grown, during both moderate and substantial growth periods. TCSPP is a nationwide organization made up of three physical campuses, as well as a robust online learning community and additional standalone locations, with a myriad of diverse disciplines within the fields of psychology and behavioral and health sciences.

TCSPP holds at its core a strong sense of innovation and adaptability, a deeply embedded commitment to community partnerships and accountability to the communities it serves, a consistent use of data-driven decision-making frameworks, and a constant focus on student success. TCSPP academic programs bring together hands-on, real-world curricula with applied research to fuel the creative thinking needed to solve critical societal problems.

TCSPP was founded in 1979 by psychologists and educators committed to advancing the field and providing professional training in a nonprofit setting. In 1980, The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) awarded candidate-for-accreditation status, and in 1984 the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) granted accreditation. Professional accreditation of the Doctor of Clinical Psychology (Psy.D.)
program at the Chicago campus by the American Psychological Association (APA) followed. A new era began in January 2010 when TCSPP made a strategic decision to transition its main campus from Chicago, IL to Los Angeles, CA and then sought and obtained regional accreditation through the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). As this report discusses, TCSPP embraces continual self-reflection through assessment and academic program review, which is the heart of the accreditation process. TCSPP is guided by its mission, which states:

*Integrating theory, professional practice, and innovation, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology provides an excellent education for careers in psychology and related behavioral and health sciences. The school is committed to service and embraces the diverse communities of our society. (CFR 1.1)*

TCSPP is committed to:

- **Preparing exceptional practitioners.**
- **Providing psychology and related behavioral and health sciences education that encompasses all facets of life, work, and human interactions.**
- **Ensuring an environment of mutual respect and inclusion in which all individuals are valued for who they are and what they can contribute.**
- **Understanding the local and global communities served.**
- **Emphasizing service projects, field experiences, and extracurricular opportunities.**
- **Retaining faculty who are practitioners, leaders, and scholars.**
- **Providing programs with intense and unyielding emphasis on students: their disparate backgrounds, academic challenges, professional aspirations and learning styles, and contributions to the field.**
- **Providing programs that reflect a strong ethical dimension inherent in the practice of professional psychology and that adhere to professional ethical standards.**
- **Providing learning experiences built on the Engaged Professional Model of Education.**
- **Expanding the base of knowledge in psychology and related behavioral and health sciences.**

The institution, as a whole, provides a high-quality educational experience that produces engaged, ethical, and competent graduates through collaborations involving the faculty, the staff, and the community. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, and 1.5)
The mission, vision, and values of TCSPP and its strategic priorities guide all aspects of institutional planning. In 2014, President Nealon-Woods led a strategic planning process that resulted in the following three strategic goals:

1. Be recognized as the Preeminent University of Professional Psychology in the World.
2. Innovate the education and the profession of psychology for the future.
3. Advance psychology education through technological innovation and streamlined operations.

TCSPP evaluates strategies and initiatives within each of these three goals through regularly reappraised measures of success. Data are used to identify gaps that are then targeted as the focus for new interventions. In addition, TCSPP continuously aligns short-term and long-range planning to help guide and align TCSPP in two ways: in raising the educational attainment of its students and in embracing and supporting a student body that mirrors the diversity of the communities it serves by producing well-prepared, ready-to-lead graduates. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 4.6, 4.7)

Plans and Priorities
What began in 1979 with a seed of commitment—to prepare psychology practitioners in a nonprofit setting—has grown into a portfolio of programs that has expanded the boundaries of psychology and related behavioral and health science education. The single campus, born in rented rooms at the YMCA 35 years ago, has become a coast-to-coast enterprise with programs and services that reach around the globe. The initial offering of a single degree—the Psy.D. in Clinical Psychology—has developed into a selection of more than 25 degree options and career paths, with new programs added to the TCSPP academic portfolio on a regular basis.
TCSPP long-standing focus on practitioner-centered education is the foundation for the institution. Its curricula are designed to intentionally transform students into professional change agents through hands-on, evidence-based education that emphasizes community service and lasting positive community impact. TCSPP recognizes that mental wellbeing is much more than how we think and feel—it is at the core of our actions, reactions and interactions, and an essential factor in every achievement, challenge, and setback experienced by individuals, organizations, and cultures around the world.

The strategic plan, titled *Leading the Way Toward a Healthier World* (Attachment I.A) focuses on the institution’s “Engaged Professional Model of Education,” the values of Education, Innovation, Service, and Community that undergird our curriculum, and assists us in focusing on our emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism. In this new plan, our central focus has remained unchanged: psychology will be at the core of our teaching, central to our mission, and infused into the knowledge bank of every professional we prepare. With this strategic plan, TCSPP is advancing its long-held intention to be, and be recognized as, the preeminent institution of professional psychology in the world. *Toward a Healthier World* details how TCSPP plans to increase its emphasis on interprofessional education substantially throughout the curriculum and to introduce new behavioral and health sciences programs that are deeply enriched by integration with psychology. (CFR 1.5, 3.6, and 4.6)

**Overview of Strengths and Challenges**

Through the planning and self-study process, TCSPP identified the following institution strengths:

- *Educating and training practitioners.*
- *Innovating the education of behavioral and related health science practitioners.*
- *Promoting multicultural awareness, competence, and diversity.*
- *Emphasizing the deep understanding of communities served.*
Advancing active learning, multicultural immersion, and community engagement.

Providing a transformative educational experience.

Taking our mission, commitments, and model of education to new professions, communities, and internationally.

Committing to community service.

These strengths are the basis for continued improvement and growth. Using the strategic planning and assessment processes, TCSPP will continue to focus on improvement in all areas. Like any institution, TCSPP has opportunities for improvement. These areas are identified through an ongoing, comprehensive and collaborative effort by each academic and non-academic department to assess all aspects of the institution through a systematic process involving all constituents.

Through the institution-wide culture of continuous improvement, TCSPP strengthens and ensures proper resourcing of our programs and departments. From these efforts, opportunities have been identified to strengthen program alignment through the review process and to ensure adequate resource allocation for new and existing programs. (CFRs 1.5, 3.6, 4.3, 4.6, and 4.7)

Contributing to the Public Good

TCSPP has a commitment to the public good as demonstrated by its intentional and carefully planned efforts to address the needs of the communities served. As a mission-driven institution, TCSPP is committed to “…service and embraces the diverse communities of our society.”

This commitment is realized through our ongoing programming and our faculty members’, students’, and graduates’ work in the community. The graduates of TCSPP emerge ready to make positive changes in diverse communities and organizations at both local and global levels (Attachment I.B). (CFRs 1.5 and 2.11)

TCSPP provides a wide range of mental health and community agency support services to the public through Community Partnerships, International Studies projects, the Counseling Center in West Los Angeles, and the Forensic Center in Chicago. During the 2014-2015 academic year
(AY), a total of 444 TCSPP Chicago campus students (about 42%) participated in long-term community service projects through the Community Partnerships Department (CPD). Seventy-eight percent of participating community partners reported that their partnership with TCSPP made a positive impact on their organizations by increasing their effectiveness in reaching program objectives. Highlights of this service are detailed in Attachment I.C. (CFRs 1.5 and 2.11)

**International Studies**

During the 2014-2015 AY, the National Center for International Studies awarded over $30,000 in faculty grants for a variety of international projects and sponsored six study abroad courses (in addition to those offered within specific degree programs). A recent outcome from these grants includes collaboration with the Global HOPE Training Initiative and READ literacy program in South Africa to provide free intensive training on trauma recognition, assessment, and intervention to members of the community who train schoolteachers on effective ways to educate and support children in their classrooms. Another grant resulted in working with the Royal University of Bhutan and Ministry of Education and the University of Medical Sciences of Bhutan in their efforts to develop Bhutan’s psychology programs. Upcoming work from faculty grants include developing a post-graduate diploma in school guidance and counseling for teachers in Rwandan schools in collaboration with the University of Rwanda, Institute of Education. This project will also contribute to the development of a strategy to implement a whole-school approach to school guidance and counseling in Rwandan Schools.

**Clinical Services in Los Angeles and Chicago**

From July 2010 through March 2016, TCSPP students and staff provided more than 50,000 hours of low-fee direct mental health services to nearly 4,700 community members from the greater Los Angeles and Orange County communities. According to TCSPP Counseling Centers’ most recent Client Satisfaction Survey, 75.4% of clients responded that their condition (or their
child’s condition) improved (51.4%) or greatly improved (24%), and most would recommend TCSPP Counseling Centers to friends and family. These services are provided to community members on a sliding scale with an average fee of $20 per hour.

Funded by grants, Medicaid/Medicare subcontracts, and a sliding scale self-pay option, the Chicago Forensic Center has serviced over 300 clients annually (over 1800 since operations began in 2007) in collaboration with 32 community partners. Forensic-centered mental health services are provided in the downtown area to clients referred by Child Protective Services, Juvenile Justice, Adult Criminal Court, and various other agencies by post-doctoral fellows, interns, and practicum students under the supervision of faculty who are licensed clinical psychologists with forensic training. Additionally, between eight and ten service learning projects that benefit the community are completed at the Forensic Center each year.

TCSPP Profile

The diversity of the more than 4,256 students who attend TCSPP reflects the regions served. Recent data show that the Hispanic population TCSPP serves is 15.2%. In addition to Hispanic, the student profile for 2015 includes 0.4% Native American/American Indian, 21.5% African American, 5.6% Asian/Pacific Islander, 46.0% Caucasian, 2.6% two or more races, and 3.4% Non-Resident, and 5.3% Unknown. The percentage of Underrepresented Minority (URM) students (African American, Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and Native American) has grown from 19.5% in fall 2009 to 37.5% in fall 2015 (Attachment I.D). The student population is substantially female. In fall 2015, the student population was reported as 80.2% female and 19.8% male. Approximately 94.8% of incoming TCSPP students in fall 2015 received some form of financial aid, with more than 40% receiving aid in the form of scholarships. As of spring 2016, TCSPP had 161 full-time and 61 part-time faculty members, and 750 adjuncts across all campus locations and online. In spring 2016, the faculty included more women than men (63% vs. 37%). TCSPP
employees (faculty and staff) are also diverse. In spring 2016, 37% of employees identified as African American, Hispanic, Asian, Native American, or Pacific Islander (Attachment I.E). (CFRs 1.2 and 1.4)

Organizational Changes
Since TCSPP’s WSCUC initial accreditation review in 2010, the institution has made important organizational changes to ensure operational effectiveness. The changes are indicative of a growing institution and have been guided by its strategic priorities. Changes were made in three areas: new departments/divisions, changes in administration, and changes to key personnel (Attachment I.F and Attachment I.G).

Accreditation and Response to Previous WSCUC Reviews
From 1984 to 2011, TCSPP was accredited by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). As a result of the move of the main campus/base of operations and TCSPP’s incorporation in California in 2011, the institution was granted WSCUC Initial Accreditation through an expedited process, combining a Capacity and Preparatory Review and an Educational Effectiveness Review (Attachment I.H). Accreditation was granted for a period of five years. Since that time, seven Substantive Change Proposals have been submitted for programs to be offered in face-to-face on ground modality, and 10 Substantive Change Proposals for distance education offerings. Six have received WSCUC Commission approval (on ground); eight have received WSCUC Commission approval (distance education). Commendations (Attachment I.I) and recommendations (Attachment I.J) have guided the institution’s development.

TCSPP’s academic programs consist of: 12 doctoral programs, one educational specialist degree program, 11 master’s degree programs, one bachelor’s program, and four certificate programs. TCSPP program offerings are found in the Academic Catalog and Student Handbook. TCSPP serves 4,256 students in Chicago, Los Angeles, Irvine, and Washington, DC, including 1,313
students enrolled in online programs (as of fall 2015). TCSPP has sought to sustain a strong relationship with WSCUC by demonstrating close attention to WSCUC Standards, successful substantive change proposal submissions, faculty and administrator participation in accreditation activities, and progress on all Commission recommendations.

Upon Initial Accreditation, WSCUC asked TCSPP to address four issues: (1) clarify TCSPP’s relationship with The Chicago School Education System (TCS ES) and clarify the role of faculty in the institution’s decision-making processes; (2) reflect on the appropriate rate and pace of change in introducing new academic programs, procedures, structures, and processes. The Commission asked that the degree of change be reviewed in light of the institution’s capacity (human, financial, and technological) to implement new programs effectively while maintaining academic quality, distinction, and prominence; (3) provide definitions of research and scholarship, and specifically the research and scholarship required of students and faculty engaged in the School’s present and proposed PhD programs; and (4) describe how the institution is preparing to address the modified and additional reporting requirements of the revised WSCUC accreditation process.

Following review of a 2013 Interim Report, the WSCUC Committee decided that TCSPP had addressed these four issues (Attachment I.K) and stated,

*With respect to the four issues, the panel members found that the relations between TCSPP and its parent entity have been appropriately negotiated and memorialized in the Service Agreement provided with the report. Likewise, the documentation describing the role of the faculty in decision-making processes is evidence of an appropriate, if evolving, governance structure. TCSPP’s plans for continued development, contained at the highest level in the Strategic Plan and realized in action through program development activities, are robust, detailed, and actionable. The discussion of research and scholarship, as defined and practiced by TCSPP, conforms fittingly to the mission and reach of the institution. Finally, the institution has shown a commitment to adopt, and develop according to, WASC Standards.*

TCSPP prides itself on taking all accrediting recommendations seriously and addressing them appropriately and continues to show tenacity and commitment to improve. This is evidenced in
the attached reference document detailing all recommendations with actions and reviews (Attachment I.L). (CFRs 1.7, and 1.8)

Preparation for the Accreditation Review
This Institutional Report was prepared by the Offices of Accreditation and Academic Affairs with the assistance of many individuals within TCSPP and TCS ES. Initial planning began in early 2014 as working, writing and editing teams were formed. An Institutional Report project plan with timeline and Steering Committee was created, and senior administrators provided committee leadership. The Institutional Report teams included both faculty and staff. Drafts of this Report were reviewed by faculty, staff, executive leadership, and the Board of Trustees. The attached detailed list is an acknowledgement of the many contributors to this Institutional Report (Attachment I.M).

Summary of Component 1: Self-reflection
Component 1 presents a history of TCSPP, an overview of the capacity, infrastructure, and operations highlights changes since the last accreditation review. It also provides a description of the mission, vision, values, and qualities of the educational experience that make graduates of TCSPP unique through its contribution to the public good and focus on diversity. In reflection, TCSPP has made great strides in advancing its mission and leveraging its resources to provide a quality education for its students. The Chicago School has demonstrated that it is a learning organization that has in place the systems and institutional culture to plan for and address whatever it faces in the future.
Component 2: Compliance with Standards: Review under the WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Worksheets for Self-Review and Compliance Checklist/Inventory of Educational Effectiveness

To complete the Self-Review and Compliance Checklist (Attachment II.A) and the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) (Attachment II.B), TCSPP engaged campus constituents from faculty, staff, and administrators. The IEEI identifies all programs, learning outcomes, accrediting bodies and any findings, and the assessment cycle. The IEEI was initially completed by the working group and guided by the Director of Educational Effectiveness who compiled information from the program review process. Once completed, the IEEI was sent to Campus Deans and Program Chairs who worked with their respective faculties to further detail the information needed to complete the inventory. The IEEI demonstrates that TSCPP is fully engaged in assessing learning and effectiveness at all levels of the institution.

The Self-Review under the Standards was the topic of many conversations at TCSPP. Initially the self-review was completed by the institutional report writing leads and editing team. It was then turned into a survey (Attachment II.C) and sent to faculty and staff. The results were discussed in the editing and steering committees to analyze more deeply the areas identified as strengths and opportunities for development (Attachment II.D).

Areas of Strength
CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.9, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7

Being mission driven, TCSPP unsurprisingly has strengths in defining institutional purpose and ensuring educational objectives, including clarity of policies, procedures, mission, vision, values, and strategic planning. TCSPP has shown a strong commitment to open and honest communication with all accrediting bodies and regulatory entities. Its core functions are enhanced by its strengths with respect to employing effective data-gathering practices and creating clear
descriptions of degree requirements and curricular processes. Quality assurance systems are data-driven. TCSPP’s effectiveness in annual assessment and program review continues to evolve and improve as the faculty complete annual iterations. Assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) is another area of focus at TCSPP.

Additional strengths include faculty contributions to scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service, along with TCSPP’s support of development opportunities for faculty and staff. TCSPP demonstrates a solid commitment to student success, which starts at the recruitment stage (by making sure students understand requirements and expectations and are well matched to the degree program of interest) and follows the student through courses (assistance from all co-curricular and support units) to completion.

The growth of TCSPP, in part due to solid strategic and fiscal planning, is evidence of TCSPP’s strength in developing programs and deploying resources. Resource planning and development includes realistic budgeting, enrollment projections, sound management, and annual oversight. Organizational units (for example, Academic Affairs, Admissions, Student Affairs, Information Technology, and Human Resources) use data well to ensure that TCSPP supports student success through all aspects of teaching and learning. Public availability of information, including graduation and retention data and the full availability of the catalog and schedule of courses on the website, enables broad transparency and strong accountability. As evidenced by the identified strengths, leadership, faculty, and staff are all committed to improvement through a culture of assessment.

**Integrity and Transparency**

For TCSPP, integrity and transparency take many forms, including delivering on our obligations to students; using fair, open, and inclusive processes; practicing shared governance; and regularly auditing and assessing our work. Framing integrity and transparency in these terms,
TCSPP engages in sound business practices, demonstrates consistent integrity, operates in a transparent manner, and adapts to changing conditions both in the communities it serves and in higher education as a whole. To ensure integrity, TCSPP collects and reports annual data relative to key performance indicators, which include student persistence, attrition, degree conferral, satisfaction and student experience data, disaggregated program data, and benchmark data (Attachment II.E). (CFRs 1.6 and 1.7)

Additionally, TCSPP demonstrates integrity through published policies. TCSPP has well-articulated and fair student grievance policies that are clearly outlined in the Academic Catalog and Student Handbook. TCSPP affirms that academic freedom and responsibility are important aspects of institutional integrity and therefore has published statements concerning academic freedom in a number of documents including the Student Handbook and the Faculty Supplement to the Employee Manual. Finally, TCSPP practices shared governance and has communication structures (Attachment II.F and Attachment II.G) in place that include and involve all campus constituents. (CFRs 1.3 and 1.4)

Opportunities for Growth
CFRs 1.7, 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.8, 2.11, 3.1, 3.2, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 4.2, and 4.5

A review of the survey results show that areas for improvement include: internal decision-making transparency, alignment of co-curricular activities with the academic goals of students, and clarification of expectations for both students and faculty specifically related to research, scholarship, and creative activity. The self-review revealed that we can even further improve communication, transparency, and data dissemination, and can further develop a culture of engagement within our multi-campus structure.
Addressing Areas of Opportunities

Communication (CFRs 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, 3.9, 3.10, 4.2, and 4.5)

While TCSPP has taken steps to ensure a collaborative culture, including strong shared governance and synergistic communication structures (detailed in TCSPP’s Decision-Making Process document Attachment II.G above), dissemination of outcomes and processes can be better supported. TCSPP will build on the current communications and socialization process in place, which include; Town Halls, newsletters, panels, webinars, and synergistic presentations. Additionally, TCSPP’s decision-making structure ensures that faculty are represented on all institutional committees. Shared governance is a system of open communication aimed at aligning priorities, creating a culture of shared responsibility for the welfare of the institution, creating a system of checks and balances to ensure the institution stays mission-centered and maintaining focus on strategic goals.

It is a guiding principle of the shared governance recognized by the Board of Trustees that the faculty and the administration shall collaborate in major decisions affecting the academic affairs of TCSPP both nationally and at each individual campus. The nature of that collaboration, shared as appropriate with students, staff, and alumni varies according to the nature of the decisions in question. The faculty takes the lead in decisions concerning selection of faculty, educational policy related to teaching, curriculum, research, academic ethics and all other academic matters. The administration takes the lead in matters of internal operations and external relations of TCSPP. In every case, the faculty and the administration participate in the governance of academic matters as provided by and in accordance with the bylaws and policies of the Board of Trustees. The institution has formal structures in place for fostering greater shared governance and open communication between faculty, staff, and administration. Examples of these formal
structures are the Academic Standards Advisory Committee (ASAC), the Academic Affairs Leadership Council (AALC), the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), and the President’s Council.

This past year, the President facilitated Consultant Stephen Bahls from the Association of Governing Board’s (AGB) to assist TCSPP in a yearlong reflection on shared governance with TCSPP faculty. This discussion is part of a larger effort to continue to facilitate and enhance communication among faculty and administration. President Bahls’ report (Attachment II.H) was shared with members of the National Faculty Council Executive Committee (NFCEC) during the summer 2016 retreat. Faculty leaders met to discuss and reflect on the conclusions and recommendations of the report in order to prioritize items for further advancing shared governance throughout TCSPP.

**Co-curricular Alignment (CFR 2.11)**

TCSPP has structures and support in place for co-curricular alignment and is working diligently to strengthen this area as is described in Component 6. The opportunity now lies in making sure the institution is making the most effective use of data collected for co-curricular assessment. Further, work is being done to link various assessments (such as experience surveys) with assessments of academic programs to triangulate direct and indirect assessment and gain a more holistic view of student achievement.

**Clearly Defined Expectations (CFRs 2.1, 2.2, 2.2a, 2.8, 3.1, and 3.2)**

Further advancing a culture of engagement will continue to be a priority through strengthened planning and shared governance structures. Faculty participation and buy-in will be sought in order to continue to define research, scholarship, and creative activity expectations of faculty, students, and employees. In this manner, TCSPP will continue to work to build faculty buy-in and participation in concrete, practical ways through consistent and strengthened
communication structures guided by the Engaged Practitioner Model of Education (Attachment II.I) and TCSPP’s Strategic Plan.

**Summary of Component 2: Self-reflection**

Through Component 2, TCSPP completed a systematic review under theWSCUC Standards that assisted in identifying areas that TCSPP can develop further. The required federal checklists helped to provide the opportunity to show how and where TCSPP is meeting all federal requirements. Additionally, the IEEI provided assurance that TCSPP has in place a solid assessment and review process that is used annually to track and improve student learning. As part of this self-study and specifically this component review, TCSPP was able to begin useful conversations about the institution’s strengths and identify opportunities for growth and improvement.
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees

Meaning
The meaning of an education at TCSPP is expressed in the philosophy of teaching, “The Engaged Professional Model.” This model emerged from a 2008-2009 institution-wide project that was framed by the institution’s four values and the four Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), and built on a practitioner-scholar model. The essence of The Engaged Professional Model is that students are transformed into professional change agents by a hands-on, practitioner-oriented, evidence-based education that emphasizes community service and lasting positive community impact (Attachment III.A). It is through this framework that TCSPP defines the meaning of its degrees. TCSPP challenges students to reach their highest level of academic achievement by inspiring learning. One of the resulting outcomes of this project was the refinement and clarification of the institutional effectiveness review process. This process has continued to evolve and improve, recently incorporating formal processes for new program development and orderly program modification. The TCS Model of Education remains a living document and the Engaged Professional Model has been developed further to design an Action Research/Community Partnerships model, supported by a task force (Attachment III.B).

A TCSPP degree goes beyond theories and skills. It consolidates learning from a broader arena, encouraging students to discover and explore concepts and questions that connect essential areas of learning within their chosen field of study. A TCSPP degree combines traditional and non-traditional cognitive skills, which can include analytic inquiry, diverse perspectives, quantitative
and qualitative abilities, ethical reasoning, and effective communication. Additionally, a TCSPP degree provides students with the ability to recognize their responsibility to the global community. A TCSPP graduate has experience integrating their knowledge and skills in areas that facilitate student engagement in the classroom, socially, and relative to local, national, and global challenges. TCSPP faculty and administration take seriously the mission to provide an excellent education by integrating theory, professional practice, and innovation. Therefore, all degree programs are designed to equip graduates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to assume leadership roles in the community. It is expected that graduates will be able to generate and apply knowledge in real world situations, to make evidence-based decisions, to monitor progress toward personal and professional goals, and ultimately to improve the quality of life in the communities they serve.

In the 2014-2015 academic year, TCSPP students were involved in 244 research projects (including theses and dissertations) that generated 104 presentations and numerous publications in journals and other academic media (Attachment III.C). Additionally, there were a total of 490 approved Institutional Review Board (IRB) applications – 220 for the Chicago/Washington, D.C and Online campuses combined, and 189 for the California campuses. During the same time period, students were involved in 1.2 million hours of service to the community through service-learning coursework, course-embedded fieldwork, practicums, and internships. Graduates of TCSPP go on to become mental health care providers, counselors, professors, community leaders, researchers, teachers, consultants, mentors, policy makers, and entrepreneurs. Results of the 2015 Alumni Employment Survey indicate that nearly 83% of respondents report being employed in
their field of study. Additionally, 86.3% of respondents secured their job within 90 days of graduating from TCSPP. Almost 41% were employed when they were enrolled, over 28% secured employment before graduating, and 17.3% were able to secure employment within three months of graduating, which is also a slight improvement from calendar years 2012 and 2013. (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.3, and 4.4)

Reports of the Annual Employment Surveys can be found here (log in instructions provided here). The success of our graduates speaks to the institution’s overarching vision of being recognized as the school of choice for professional psychology.

**Quality Processes to Ensure Quality of Degrees**

The institution has a faculty-driven assessment process that works to ensure educational effectiveness and continuous improvement. Every program has Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and every course has Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) that are directly aligned with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and TCSPP mission. The ILOs define the overarching meaning of every degree at TCSPP and provide the basis for assessing the knowledge, skills, and applications that prepare TCSPP graduates to succeed in their profession and in the communities they serve. During the program development process, including both initial course development and subsequent revisions, TCSPP faculty refer to curriculum guidelines provided by external agencies such as the American Psychological Association (APA), the National Council of Schools and Programs of Professional Psychology (NCSPP), Association of Behavior Analysis International (ABAI), and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), as they develop a sequential (basic, intermediate, advanced) curriculum. At the course level, faculty are trained by experts in TCSPP’s National Center for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) to use Bloom’s Taxonomy to determine the appropriate level of academic challenge for course
learning outcomes. All learning outcome statements and assessment data are evaluated periodically by faculty during the annual program review cycle, at regular course revision discussions, and during establishment and review of signature assignments and PLO rubrics used for assessment of student learning.

Through the program development process, faculty members identify domains of learning and the levels of proficiency needed for courses, programs, and degrees. Based on these domains, the faculty develop a curriculum map and assessment plan (Attachment III.D) that details when and how domains and levels of proficiency are assessed. Curriculum maps clearly specify where PLOs are expected to be achieved and measured, and PLO Rubrics (Attachment III.E) provide a framework for assessing student work. Using these documents as guides, faculty members create learning environments that enable students to meet expectations. The process also identifies when and how each outcome is to be assessed. Assessment plans emphasize direct (but also utilize indirect) measures to capture appropriate indicators of student learning. Direct measures of student learning outcomes are derived from a variety of sources including signature assignments, capstone courses, course projects, research papers (including dissertations), comprehensive examinations, and presentations. In addition, independent external measures are also used, where applicable, such as pass rates and scores on national licensure exams or professional certification competency exams (Attachment III.F). Indirect measures of student learning outcomes consist of alumni and exit surveys as well as other survey-type evaluations in non-academic or co-curricular units (Attachment III.G).
Assessment at TCSPP focuses on understanding student learning trends and how curriculum adjustments, when applicable, improve long-term effectiveness. As student learning data are analyzed and gaps in learning are detected, timely and effective responses are made in the curriculum to address the identified issues and to improve the experience of both faculty and students. Annual reports on assessment activities, to include evaluation of the effectiveness of previously implemented changes, are presented and submitted to the Director of Educational Effectiveness who oversees the entire process and works with the Deans of Academic Affairs to assure the data are acted upon. (CFRs 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7)

Program Approval and Review

All new programs go through a structured new program approval process (Attachment III.H). New degree programs must be aligned with the strategic plan and approved by the Board of Trustees. The Associate Provost for Academic Program Development, Review, and Online Synergy, along with subject matter experts (SMEs) and faculty members, develops new program proposals, which must be approved through the internal approval process. Internal approval must be obtained before submission to WSCUC for substantive change review or state authorization agencies for applicable programs. New courses and changes to existing courses go through a similar internal process (Attachment III.I). While assessment is ongoing, formal program review is conducted every three to five years (depending upon programmatic accreditation cycles) (Attachment III.J). Program review provides the mechanism for faculty to evaluate and document the effectiveness, progress, and status of their academic programs over time. The primary purpose of the review is to improve the program by thoroughly and candidly evaluating the following:

1. The goals of the program and their relation to the mission and strategic priorities of the institution, and the continued viability of the program.
2. The curriculum through which program and goals and outcomes are pursued.
3. The assessment of PLOs, program revisions based upon those outcomes, and plans for future assessment activities.
4. The range and quality of research activities, emphasizing those involving students.
5. The quality and diversity of faculty.
6. Institutional support services (library and other educational resources).
7. Facilities necessary for a quality learning environment.
8. Service and contributions to the community.

A progress report to the Chief Academic Officer (CAO) summarizing activities in response to the program review is provided annually (Attachment III.K). (CFRs 2.7, 3.1, 4.1, and 4.3-4.7)

In addition to TCSPP process, the TCS ES New Program Support Committee (NPSC) brings together the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) of each institution and their staff and/or faculty responsible for developing or modifying degree programs with lead TCS ES staff in the areas of marketing, admissions operations, financial aid, library, instructional technology, compliance, and academic program support units. This advisory body and process, launched in March 2015, occurs monthly. An institutional lead describes the internally approved new or modified program to the group and solicits feedback from all parties. The lead faculty and CAOs have described this interaction as being highly beneficial. It provides the institutions with access to a wealth of academic and functional expertise and assistance in coordinating project plans to implement and launch new or modified programs.

Finally, at the completion of the Annual Assessment Report presentations and discussions each spring, the Deans of Academic Affairs review results to identify common themes across academic programs. Action items that may more effectively be addressed at the institution or campus level and best practices that others may wish to adopt are identified. The Deans also review action plans resulting from the Annual Assessment Reviews and periodic self-studies to ensure all issues are being addressed and that the action plans are appropriate and properly
supported. Special attention is paid to action items that may require funding so that these are included in budget planning for the next fiscal year. (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 3.3, 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4)

**Programmatic Accreditation**

Discipline-specific programmatic accreditation is essential to many TCSPP degree programs. TCSPP is engaged in work to expand current programmatic accreditations as detailed in the attached plan (Attachment III.L). The program review process uses programmatic accreditation self-studies and team reports to assist in further analysis of programs. TCSPP affirms external validation for all program curricula through accreditation processes and the use of standards set by national and international professional bodies such as APA.

In keeping with its continuous improvement philosophy, TCSPP is implementing the Baldrige Quality assurance framework to improve organizational processes and to assess the various components of the strategic plan (Attachment III.M). The Baldrige framework is being used by TCSPP as an assessment tool for strategic planning, while simultaneously serving as the vehicle that drives and supports educational quality through cycles of improvement and process refinements. TCSPP also has solid policies in place to promote learning, such as those that define the academic progress of students and expected ethical standards. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4)

**Informing Planning**

At the program level, faculty determine the findings from program reviews. After completion of the annual review, the faculty makes recommendations for improvement that are documented in the action items update chart and monitored until completed, thus closing the loop on all items. These findings and issues assist in guiding annual, strategic, and long-range planning. Recent recommendations include additional technology resources for programs, additional staffing resources (e.g., hiring faculty), and recommendations for modifications of specific courses or program sequences. Other recommendations include revising courses and their rubrics to
improve the results of some PLO findings. The findings of annual reports provide evidence of program-level assessment and collaborative discussions about the continuous improvement of student learning outcomes and to guide strategic planning. Programs maintain an action items update chart (Attachment III.N), and the Director of Educational Effectiveness has quarterly checks with each program to see how items are progressing and to ensure faculty are supported if there are any barriers to their actions. The informative and iterative nature of program assessment and review at TCSPP can be seen throughout the annual review cycle, which demonstrates how feedback from the process help faculty reshape students’ learning experiences. (CFRs 2.7, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8)

Summary of Component 3: Self-reflection

Component 3 details how TCSPP provides several unique co-curricular opportunities for students that are designed to enhance their academic and professional development and that demonstrate the TCSPP Model of Education. While a solid structure is in place to close the loop on regular assessment of the meaning, quality, and integrity of all programs, a need to better align co-curricular assessment with academic assessment has been identified. Ultimately the meaning of a TCSPP degree is clear and distinctive, and the quality is assured by both internal and external validation processes.
Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by TCSPP. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology, as is further detailed in Component 6. Crucial to ensuring that TCSPP’s courses meet standards of excellence and consistency across different modalities and campuses is our commitment to curriculum alignment and student learning assessment. (CFRs 3.3 and 4.4)

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Program faculty are the authors of curriculum. PLOs, CLOs, and curriculum maps are designed through collaboration of faculty in a designated program across locations and modalities. Program and course delivery modes are designed to leverage technologies that have been demonstrated to be effective for student learning and engagement. The delivery modality is determined by the Department Chair in consultation with the Deans of Academic Affairs, Campus Deans, program faculty, and the Chief Operating Officer. (CFR 2.4)

Discussion of student learning begins at the individual program level, where the faculty define the PLOs and the CLOs for each course (Attachment IV.A). Faculty members receive regular training on how to design and define PLOs and CLOs through workshops and webinars sponsored by the NCTL and the National Academic Effectiveness Review Committee (NAERC) (Attachment IV.B). In addition to these regular trainings, TCSPP subject matter experts (SMEs), are contracted to build online courses, and complete an internal nine-week online workshop called SME 101. While in the workshop, SMEs receive training in developing learning outcomes using Bloom’s
Taxonomy of Educational Objectives and work with instructional designers to build course components. The SME receives a variety of support from the workshop facilitator, and checkpoints along the way with the department chair ensure that CLOs are aligned with PLOs and that the course level and content domain are appropriate for the degree. For programs that exist in multiple locations, including the online modality, coordination of course development and adherence to CLOs across locations and modalities is required (Attachment IV.C). (CFR's 2.2, 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.4, 2.6, and 4.4)

Unless program accreditation standards or applicable regulatory agencies dictate otherwise, each location or modality of program delivery has the same required courses, course learning outcomes, PLOs, curriculum map, and assessment plan. There are two exceptions to this—one specific and one broad. The specific exception is made for the Psy.D. in Clinical Psychology. Accreditation by the American Psychological Association (APA) requires separate accreditations for each location offering the program (Chicago, Los Angeles, Washington DC, and New Orleans) and accredits each location separately. APA requires that each program have a unique, distinctive focus on a location basis. Therefore, the curriculum maps of these four versions of the degree are matched at the PLO level. The PLOs for this program reflect the nine competencies prescribed by the APA. Below that level, program structure and content are determined by the location’s faculty.

The broad exception for curricular differences is for programs leading to professional licensure where the license is administered by the state. Variations of curriculum offerings are usually restricted to the elective pool, but in some instances a state requires additional coursework or longer field experiences for (internship and practicum) which influence the core curriculum (Attachment IV.D).
Curriculum maps specify the connections between the ILOs, PLOs, and CLOs within programs (Attachment IV.E). A matrix format is generally used to cross-list PLOs with core courses. Curriculum maps identify which PLOs are taught in which course. Curriculum maps also identify the level at which the outcome is addressed. These relationships are documented in the program assessment plans, which also display the development of learning outcomes across the curriculum. (CFR 2.4)

The Director of Educational Effectiveness meets regularly with the Department Chairs of each program and the NAERC to facilitate the process of curriculum alignment across campuses and modalities so that all students receive the same degree upon graduation. The Director of Educational Effectiveness tracks the alignment of each program and their learning outcomes through a course comparison chart (Attachment IV.F) which illustrates which course syllabi are aligned across campuses and modalities and which need to be addressed. (CFR's 2.2a, 2.2b 2.4, and 2.6)

Crucial to the curriculum mapping process is ensuring that students achieve mastery of PLOs for their particular degree. Determinations are made based on faculty expertise in the field and published curriculum guidelines created within the discipline itself (Attachment IV.G). For example, TCSPP’s Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Psychology curriculum adheres to APA’s recommended learning goals for bachelor’s level programs in psychology. Similarly, our Psy.D. Clinical Psychology programs adhere to the standard benchmarks and competencies established by the APA for accredited clinical doctoral programs. The Clinical Mental Health programs adhere to the standard benchmarks and competencies established by the CACREP and the School Psychology program in Chicago adheres to the standard benchmarks and competencies established by the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP).
Standards of Performance: Assessment of Student Learning

Faculty members are responsible for developing and executing a programmatic assessment plan that identifies the methods and timetables for collecting SLOs on every PLO and conducting a review of both the student learning data for the Annual Assessment Report (Attachment IV.H) and periodic programmatic self-studies. For students in practicum/internship, SLO data also include the ratings of students on each program competency by both a practicum/internship supervisor (on-site) and the practicum/internship seminar leader. The results of this review are developed into action plans (Attachment IV.I) for programmatic improvement, which become part of the program’s action plan for the year. A comprehensive description of the Academic Program Review (APR) process is provided in Component 6. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, & 4.4)

At the individual course level, faculty members also set the standards for mastery of their PLOs and CLOs by collaborating on the creation of PLO Rubrics (Attachment IV.J). Faculty members participate in regular training on designing rubrics at both the program and course level through the NCTL (Attachment IV.K). TCSPP uses a four-point rubric, with a rating of “4” being mastery of PLO at a professional level and a rating of “1” being novice level. (CFRs 2.3 and 2.4)

At various points throughout the curriculum course sequence, faculty determine the level of mastery students must demonstrate to be considered successful in their degree program. Within the curriculum, courses are interdependent and build on each other, but intentionally related to field experience, practicum, internship, residencies, and study abroad opportunities. (CFR 2.2)

As students progress through the program, assessments measure their progress and achievement. TCSPP students progress through coursework with expected outcomes that are: (a) representative of the overarching programmatic competencies, and (b) supported by program learning outcomes strategically imbedded within specific assignments. Evidence of this is shown
by mapping the Basic (B), Intermediate (I), and Advanced (A) levels of learning outcome mastery, which indicate how sequences build skills across the curriculum and end with a “culminating experience” such as capstone assignments, comprehensive exams, thesis and/or dissertation. (CFRs 2.2 and 2.6)

Once the curriculum course sequence is determined and assessment plans are in place, student performance on representative assignments (often referred to as “signature assignments”) designed to assess mastery of the PLO is evaluated by faculty using the PLO rubric. Aggregate scores across sections and courses are reviewed to determine whether or not the curriculum is delivering the desired outcomes. These data are combined with other program effectiveness data and reviewed by the faculty, facilitated by members of the Academic Effectiveness Review Committee (AERC), a standing committee of the Faculty Council. Lastly, some master’s degree programs and all doctoral programs have formal reviews of student progress in attainment of degree level outcomes through comprehensive exams (Attachment IV.L). (CFRs 2.2b, 2.6, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7)

Core Competencies

**Core Competencies in Undergraduate Curriculum**

TCSPP enrolled students in its first bachelor’s degree in fall of 2014, and recently began to offer general education and lower-division courses in spring of 2016. The WSCUC Core Competencies were explicitly incorporated into the Program Learning Outcome structure of undergraduate coursework (Attachments IV.M and IV.N) (CFR 2.2a). Learning outcome assessment data from the first year of operation of the degree program are extracted from the B.A. Program 2015 Annual Assessment Report (Attachment IV.O). Assessment data shown here are from signature assignments. Action plans are included within that report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BA Psychology Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>WSCUC Core Competency</th>
<th>Cohort 1 F1 2014 16 students</th>
<th>Cohort 2 F2 2014 6 students</th>
<th>Cohort 3 S1 2015 6 students</th>
<th>Cohort 4 S2 2015 3 students</th>
<th>Cohort 5 U1 2015 9 students</th>
<th>Cohort 6 U2 2015 2 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Knowledge: Theories and Principles of Psychology</td>
<td>In-depth, Focused, and Sustained Program of Study</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge: Write and Speak Critically Using APA Style Manual</td>
<td>Written and Oral Communication</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analysis: Logical, Evidence-Based Arguments</td>
<td>Critical Analysis of Data and Argument</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analysis: Acquire and Utilize Knowledge Via Library Data Bases</td>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analysis: Design Research Projects (Qualitative and Quantitative Methods)</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Diversity: Individual Differences and Multicultural Competence</td>
<td>Appreciation for Diversity</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Engagement: Participate in Diverse Communities</td>
<td>Ability To Work With Others</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Application: Apply Psychological Theory to Practice</td>
<td>In-depth, Focused, and Sustained Program of Study</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Application: Strong Interpersonal Communication Skills</td>
<td>Ability To Work With Others</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Collaboration: Interact and Collaborate Effectively</td>
<td>Ability To Work With Others</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ethics: Apply the Psychologist's Code of Ethics</td>
<td>Ethical and Civic Responsibility</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ethics: Identify Ethical Issues in the Field</td>
<td>Ethical and Civic Responsibility</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Assessment Data as of January 2016. All PLOs assessed on a scale of 1-4 with 4 being most proficient. No data were collected for Cohort 1 as faculty were not yet trained on data collection using Tk20 at the onset of the program.

This program is scheduled for a self-study at the end of the 2016 Academic Year.

**Core Competencies in Graduate Curricula**

Through a series of workshops and meetings subsequent to the 2001 HLC comprehensive visit, a consensus emerged among faculty members and administrators that the school’s mission requires students to master four broad competency areas. These four areas, now known as the
ILOs (then “Goals”), were added to the institution’s mission documents as a component part of the first statement of philosophy (which has since become TCSSP’s Model of Education, or the Engaged Professional Model). The intention from the outset was that these four goals would frame the PLOs of each new program.

Remaining substantially unchanged since then, the four ILOs provide cross programmatic cohesiveness under the applied *Engaged Professional Model of Education*. The four ILOs are:

- **Scholarship**: Graduates will be able to use scientific research and theory to inform their practices and be able to prepare scholarly work broadly defined.
- **Diversity**: Graduates will be able to apply theoretical and practical knowledge about ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, cultural and religious, age, and disability difference in their professional work.
- **Professional Behavior**: Graduates will be able to function in a professional and ethical manner in classroom, off-site training, and work settings.
- **Professional Practice**: Graduates will be able to conduct assessments, develop appropriate interventions, and implement interventions in their specialty area of professional psychology.

All programs organize PLOs under these four headings, and learning outcomes at the course level are designed to support developing PLO mastery across the curriculum at the basic, intermediate, and advanced levels. Additionally, the WSCUC core competencies are incorporated into graduate degrees through the PLOs (Attachment IV.P). Some programs organize PLOs into “competencies,” where the competencies are higher level learning and broadly stated program outcomes. These serve to organize the more specific and measurable PLOs in a hierarchy that leads directionally from course to ILOs. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, and 2.4)

**Standards of Performance at Graduation**

In addition to the stated coursework and number of credits, students are informed through the admissions process about the specific requirements for degree attainment (e.g., capstone assignment, supervised field experience, comprehensive exams). As part of their graduation requirement, clinical training programs require students to meet the required hours of supervised
practice and are supported in doing so by the Office of Applied Professional Practice staff, faculty, and site supervisors.

All programs identify signature assignments with accompanying PLO rubrics for core courses in the program. The NCADE office supports students in completing written assignments such as applied research projects, theses, dissertations, and general written assignments. Each department has a curriculum map and assessment rubric that aligns the curriculum and maps the scope and sequence of the program. Student learning assessment and evaluation tools include multiple modalities and are designed to provide rich evidence of the PLOs. Every doctoral program culminates in comprehensive examinations and a dissertation, while master’s and bachelor level programs culminate in a final capstone or culminating assignment (Attachment IV.Q) that represents the student’s mastery of the knowledge, skills, and competencies of the field. (CFR 2.2)

The institution has a number of representative groups, including departmental curriculum committees, the ASAC, the AALC, and the Academic Effectiveness Review Committee (AERC) of the Faculty Council that ensure appropriate participation and feedback on academic standards and policies. Specific policies related to graduation requirements such as the credit hour policy can be found in the Student Handbook and Academic Catalog. Criteria for admission and graduation are set by the faculty of each program and listed in the Programs of Study pages in the Student Handbook and Academic Catalog. (CFR 3.10)

Summary of Component 4: Self-reflection

Through Component 4 TCSPP has shown its commitment and responsibility to documenting that students acquire the intellectual skills and knowledge needed to be graduates of TCSPP. The core competencies of undergraduate and graduate programs set solid standards of performance and are measured for success. Our dedication to a systematic method of curriculum
design and evaluation allows us a means to validate institutional quality by ensuring the institution is accountable to its students and sets forth the needed conditions for improvement of learning.
Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Measuring Student Success

TCSPP measures and tracks a wide range of data to determine student success on both a routine and an as-needed basis. Retention, time to completion, and graduation data are collected and reported each year per WSCUC’s annual reporting cycle, and these data are made available to the public on the TCSPP website. TCSPP reports to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and has published an Annual Fact Book based on reported and collected data (Attachment V.A). Additionally, TCSPP tracks clinical training placement data, credentialing test pass rates, and employer ratings of graduates.

Annually, data are provided to program faculty by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) (Attachment V.B), with additional customized reports available from OIR when requested. At the program level, these data are utilized as part of the Annual Assessment Review and periodic Programmatic Self-Studies as described in Component 6. These reports provide quantitative indicators that might identify areas for further analysis or improvement in program administration. These data provide faculty with a starting point for review and correction when reviewed in conjunction with SLO data during Annual Assessment Review and APR self-studies as detailed in Component 6.

Retention, Graduation, and Time to Completion

Retention

A retention analysis is presented below for cohorts starting in 2008 through 2014. As the chart below illustrates, first-year student retention for all programs went from a high of 83.9% for the FA10 entering cohort to a low of 75.5% for the FA13 entering cohort, with a five-year average of 80.2%. The FA14 first-year retention of 78.7% shows the pattern moving in the direction of the
average. With little exception, these trends are reflected across locations, degree levels, gender categories, and ethnic categories (see below for plans to address retention).

Analysis of Retention Rates for the 2008 to 2014 Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of May 2016</th>
<th>FA08</th>
<th>FA09</th>
<th>FA10</th>
<th>FA11</th>
<th>FA12</th>
<th>FA13</th>
<th>FA14</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Census Total Student Population</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>4188</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Census Incoming Student Population</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Retention Overall</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Retention: Certificates</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Retention: Master’s</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Retention: Doctoral</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation

An analysis of graduation rates for cohorts starting in 2008 through 2014, is presented in the chart below. As the chart below illustrates, graduation rates for Master’s programs have remained relatively the same, displaying an average overall rate of 67%. Additionally, the six-year Doctoral graduation rate shows an average mean rate of 55.1%. An analysis of graduation rates for students entering between 2006 and 2010 revealed a lower graduation rate for African American students (master’s, 58.1; doctoral, 39.4%). These data, presented to TCSPP leadership in fall of 2014, led to the development of interventions designed to increase student engagement and academic support overall, but most intensely during the high-risk first year. These interventions are described below.
**Analysis of Graduation Rates for the 2008 to 2014 Cohorts***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of May 2016</th>
<th>FA08</th>
<th>FA09</th>
<th>FA10</th>
<th>FA11</th>
<th>FA12</th>
<th>FA13</th>
<th>FA14</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Census Total Student Population</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>4188</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Census Incoming Student Population</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Year Graduation Rate Master’s</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Year Graduation Rate: Doctoral</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recent audits of student records show that some students’ original start date had been altered due to a programming error in CampusVue that affected some students, which may have resulted in some students being incorrectly reclassified into the wrong cohort. These are few and random, and appear to have the negligible impact on graduation rate calculation by inflating the completion rates by a fraction of a percentage point for some cohorts.*

TCSPP monitors longitudinal retention data across all campuses and has found that the highest rate of attrition occurs during the first three semesters of students’ educational careers.

Additionally, most of this occurs in the first semester.

**Analysis of Withdrawals for the 2008 to 2014 Cohorts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As of May 2016</th>
<th>FA08</th>
<th>FA09</th>
<th>FA10</th>
<th>FA11</th>
<th>FA12</th>
<th>FA13</th>
<th>FA14</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Census Total Student Population</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>4188</td>
<td>4350</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic Year Incoming Student Population</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>2066</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Voluntary Withdrawal Rate:</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Voluntary Withdrawal Rate:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Voluntary SAP (Withdrew)*</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Voluntary SAP (Withdrew)*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Involuntary SAP (Dismissed)</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Student Affairs Dismissals</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Involuntary SAP (Dismissed)</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Student Affairs Dismissal</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These students either withdrew while in "warning" status or did not apply for reinstatement when in "probation" status. Note: SAP (Satisfactory Academic Progress) Policy changed in FA11*

A further investigation of voluntary attrition by type and by program will be undertaken during the next program review cycle to learn reasons for attrition by program and location and to determine what interventions might improve retention early on. For example, many of the recorded reasons appear to be increasing year over year (i.e., “Academic,” “Did not return from
LOA,” “Non-attendance,” “Other,” and “Registration inactivity”). While these withdrawals are occurring earlier in the student’s tenure, which explains why the graduation rate remains stable while the first-year retention numbers change, there is not sufficient information provided by the record itself to inform any kind of intervention or policy change.

First-Year Attrition as a Percentage of Overall by Cohort and Reason

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Academic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Billing Hold</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Did not return from LOA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Financial</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Non-attendance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Personal/Family</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Registration inactivity</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/D - Transfer Out</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First year as a proportion of overall: 0% 40.1% 54.0% 56.9% 63.3% 68.0% 76.0%

Clinical Training Outcome Data

As an institution that requires practicum training for most programs, TCSPP must have enough sites to place students prior to enrollment. The Campus Directors Clinical Training report clinical placement data annually by location, as shown in the chart below. Although TCSPP ensures sufficiency of appropriate training placement opportunities for students enrolled, initial placement rates are typically less than 100%. This reflects additional variables—beyond supply sufficiency—that affect these rates, such as achievement of the satisfactory academic progress required to engage in training. In certain cases, students must engage in faculty-supported remediation prior to receiving approval to be placed at available sites. In the majority of cases, these students meet remediation goals and are subsequently placed at training sites, bringing the
placement rate per cohort to 100%. Placement and clinical data are reported regularly to both internal and external entities. Data are reported by campus location and program with respect to how many students were eligible to be placed and type of setting in which they were placed (e.g., hospital, community mental health center, Veterans Affairs, residential setting). Clinical training and placement are built into the academic process. Data presented in the table below show a specific snapshot for students initially placed. (Attachments V.C.1, V.C.2 and V.C.3)

Initial Placement Rates for Practicum and Internship Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>96% placed</td>
<td>95% placed</td>
<td>97% placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles and Irvine</td>
<td>97% placed</td>
<td>93% placed</td>
<td>97% placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>No programs with training sites</td>
<td>No programs with training sites</td>
<td>92% placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>100% placed</td>
<td>86% placed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site evaluations of student performance and student experience of the site are conducted and TCSPPP faculty review the evaluations that the site supervisors and the seminar leaders complete to determine if the students are meeting the expected performance on the professional domains (generally reported by PLO), as established by the department on the evaluation. All placement data are available and incorporated into the Academic Program Review cycle in both annual assessment reviews and periodic self-studies.

Faculty also routinely review training site supervisor ratings of student proficiency. The Deans are currently working with the training data to begin to making it more uniform and consistent across programs. Some examples from the last Annual Assessment Report cycle of the use of this data are:

- PsyD Clinical Psychology (Los Angeles) found site supervisor ratings of student proficiency to be a strength for the program, while finding opportunity for
Improvement in effective case management and application of ethical standards to client interaction, as evidenced by performance on comprehensive exams. This resulted in a re-evaluation of instructor assignments.

- MS Applied Behavior Analysis improved training for site supervisors as a result of the review of supervisor ratings of students’ clinical performance.
- MA Counseling Psychology found a deficit in site supervisor assessment of students’ proficiency in research skills. This prompted a curriculum revision to strengthen the research curriculum.

Credentialing Test Pass Rates

Many of TCSPP programs prepare students for licensure, and as can be seen by the data presented in the table below, the majority of TCSPP students pass credentialing exams on the first attempt. Note that only first attempt test takers are collected.

First Time Pass Rates for Licensing or Credentialing Examinations by Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Credential</th>
<th>Pass Rate 2013</th>
<th>Pass Rate 2014</th>
<th>Pass Rate 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Clinical Psychology, Marital and Family Therapy Specialization</td>
<td>LMFT California Clinical Examinations</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>86% written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100% vignette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>National Counselor’s Exam (NCE)</td>
<td>April 2013 – 100%</td>
<td>April 2014 – 100%</td>
<td>April 2015 – 98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Applied Behavior Analysis and Graduate Certificate</td>
<td>BCBA® Exam</td>
<td>TCSP: No data</td>
<td>TCSP: 52%</td>
<td>TCSP: 69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National % of all test takers: 58%</td>
<td>National % of all test takers: 60%</td>
<td>National % of all test takers: 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdS School Psychology</td>
<td>Praxis II School Psychologist Examination</td>
<td>Praxis II – 89%</td>
<td>Praxis II – 92%</td>
<td>Praxis II – 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Clinical Psychology Doctoral programs        | Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology (EPPP) | On 8/26/2015, TCSPP was informed by Dr. Matt Turner, Director of Examination Services at the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards that the most recent EPPP data available is from 2012. These programs have been polling graduates to evaluate licensing outcomes after completion of post-doctoral studies required by the licensing boards. This data, however, is dependent upon response rates, and therefore inconclusive at this time.
Employer Ratings of Graduates

While high practicum and internship placement rates and strong performance by students on credentialing exams are important markers of student success, ratings by employers in the field are a critical indicator of how well TCSPP programs properly prepare students for their careers. TCSPP’s Annual Employer Survey asks supervisors to rate the preparedness of TCSPP alumni-employees across the Institutional Learning Outcomes on a scale of 1 to 5 (with 5 being the highest rating). The table below summarizes these data, demonstrating that TCSPP prepares students well for their professional roles. This summary was presented at the President’s Council (PC) and, while there is currently one year of data available, discussions with the PC and NAERC determined that these data would be made a part of the formal APR moving forward. As mentioned in Component 3, nearly 83% of respondents to the Annual Alumni Survey report being employed in their field of study.

**Employer Ratings of TCSPP Alumni Preparedness 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Professional Behavior</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
<th>Diversity</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Employer Survey April 2015</td>
<td>• Teamwork (4.0/5)</td>
<td>• Organization (3.84/5)</td>
<td>• Diversity (4.08/5 and 4.5/5)</td>
<td>• Problem Solving (3.84/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Ratings</td>
<td>• Work Ethic (3.96/5)</td>
<td>• Planning (3.80/5)</td>
<td>• Apply theory to practice (4.45/5)</td>
<td>• Apply theory to practice (4.45/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpersonal Skills (3.80/5)</td>
<td>• Oral Communication (3.80/5)</td>
<td>• Critical Thinking (4.35/5)</td>
<td>• Critical Thinking (4.35/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional Behavior (4.29/5)</td>
<td>• Written Communication (3.80/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership Skills (3.72/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Client Management (4.33/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project Management (4.24/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consulting Skills (4.06/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proposal Development/Grant Writing (3.90/5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that this is a sample (n=25) from a survey sent to 369 employers.
Student Support for Retention and Graduation

Even though overall retention and graduation rates (Attachment V.D) have remained favorable relative to external benchmarks and trends, TCSPP continues to have favorable comparative rates. This can be validated based on the report published by The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS, 2008) on baseline data specific to Ph.D. completion (*Ph.D. Completion and Attrition: Analysis of Baseline Program Data from the Ph.D. Completion Project*). This report shows that in the Social Sciences, the average six-year completion rate for Ph.D. degrees in Psychology was 65%, second only to Communications (67%) at year ten of the program. The average six-year completion rate for private institutions is reported at 38%. The Council of Graduate Schools also published a master’s degree completion and attrition study in 2013 (*Completion and Attrition in STEM Masters Programs: Pilot Study Findings*) and reported that within three years after the start of a master’s program, 60% of all STEM students completed their degrees. By year four, this percentage increased to 66%. Psychology was included in the broad category of social and behavioral sciences, though the completion rates were similar across disciplines. Additionally, TCSPP provides high levels of support to students and faculty in order to continually monitor and improve these outcomes.

For TCSPP what has been changed in recent retention plans is how TCSPP resources and organizes its services to fit a national and distance learning structure. Beginning in 2011, TCSPP focused on building student support services that would align with students’ greatest needs, scale with institutional expansion, be delivered in concert with enhanced technology support, and be implemented in a geographically dispersed environment. The components of this expanded support model are as follows:
• Bolster engagement and support services in the students’ earliest experiences with the school and through the first year when it is known that students are at the greatest risk for attrition.
• Improve access to and utilization of student services through implementing new and improved processes and technologies.
• Provide student services organized by student need versus location to enable a national approach to delivering services.
• Balance national support with a local presence to ensure a heightened level of access to and customization of services.
• Ensure proactive and timely identification of and intervention with at-risk students.
• Implement an admissions process that ensures the right fit for a student while setting proper expectations and thoroughly preparing students for success through a robust orientation process.

Enhanced Support for First-Year Student Success
TCSPP’s greatest strides relative to retention and graduation have been made in enhancing support through the students’ first year of study when attrition is known to be at its highest. Doing so is a cross-departmental and multi-faceted effort to provide support designed to address changing student needs. In collaboration with students’ academic departments, the Student Affairs team assists students with administrative needs, understanding campus logistics, acclimating to a new culture (on-campus and off-campus), and gaining access to academic support services. Students can also obtain assistance with time management and self-care, as well as disabilities, immigration, technology, financial, and career services. Assistance is best encapsulated by reviewing the comprehensive list of Early Connect Webinars. The Early Connect Program is designed for students who wish to access this information as their needs dictate.

To help ensure that new students are prepared to begin their program of study, TCSPP has implemented and enhanced a highly effective student orientation that has developed over the years (Attachment V.E). The central features of TCSPP’s orientation include helping newly admitted students learn about the institution’s support services, make connections with fellow students, engage with program faculty, navigate financial aid processes, and learn about
community resources and amenities surrounding the campus. The orientation was revised in 2014 to focus even more intentionally on first-year student needs.

Once a student has matriculated, TCSPP works to support them through a combination of national and local services and resources. By re-organizing support structures by need as opposed to physical location, the institution is better able to leverage its resources and scale them to its expanded scope. The strategy of organizing support by need and then providing balance with a local presence is best understood by examining the Student Affairs department organizational chart (Attachment V.F). Each location has a student affairs coordinator that serves as an in-person link to the supports and services offered by the institution. This local presence is then complemented by departments within Student Affairs organized by distinct student needs. Specifically, the department has an Office of the Registrar staffed to cater to students’ registration, reporting, and administrative needs. Other student needs are supported through the department’s disabilities services access coordinator, student success specialist, international programs and services department, new student coordinator, and career services department. Academic and professional development needs are met through local and national academic affairs departments. Online students have additional support in the form of a Student Services Manager (Attachment V.G).

TCSPP has also focused on increasing awareness, accessibility, and use of its student support services. Launched in 2013, an intranet website student portal, my.theChicagoSchool.edu, provides a comprehensive index of TCSPP’s various student services with direct links to those resources. The Student Success Specialist integrates and coordinates student access to resources (Attachment V.H). An expanded 800-number dialing system was also added to direct students to the appropriate resource. The effectiveness of these efforts to shape its student support model to
fit its new geographically dispersed structure can be seen in the most recent first-year retention
data results (presented in the table above), with increases being seen across locations, programs,
and student populations. Support for student success continues beyond the first year. TCSPPP
provides academic and career support (Attachment V.1) as well as important non-academic
services (Attachment V.1) for students at all stages of program completion.

Learning Communities and Student Success Plans as Additional First-Year Support for
Undergraduates

Learning Communities

Learning Communities (LCs) for B.A. students are associated with the three first-term
General Education courses: English Composition I, Basic College Mathematics, and Algebra. LCs
are hubs for doing homework with the assistance of an embedded Facilitator/Teaching Assistant
(TA) and the mutual support of the members of the LCs. The supported activities include
understanding the course material, building and internalizing knowledge, applying knowledge to
complete course assignments, and explaining newly learned concepts to other members of the
community.

The LC space is a separate Canvas course area with study resources (including time
management, learning skills, critical reading and thinking skills, academic writing, videos, etc.) and
three separate virtual spaces (discussions)—one for each course, where students interact with
each other and with the Facilitator/TA. Special effort in the design is made to support different
modes of learning (text, image, audio, video, and games). Engagement between the Facilitator and
students is provided in synchronous (via GoToMeeting) and asynchronous (via discussion boards)
modalities. Synchronous meetings are scheduled as agreed upon by members of the Community.

LCs are related to, but separate from, the associated courses. The LCs resources are
developed with the class material in mind. The facilitators have access to the courses (as TAs) but
are not grading to ensure that students feel free to ask questions throughout the learning process.
LCs facilitators preserve earlier interactions (discussions), thus accumulating community knowledge that newer LC members can use. Upon successful completion of their course, students can opt out of a particular LC or choose to stay in it.

**Student Success Plans**
Undergraduate students matriculating to TCSPP start participating in the Student Success Seminar, a six-week online workshop facilitated by their academic advisor, during which they receive orientation to the school, library, and learning management system (LMS). Additionally, they take two assessments (*SmarterMeasure* and *Success Navigator*), and the outcomes of those assessments are used to create a Student Success Plan and academic schedule. The student meets with an advisor at least once each semester to follow up on action items agreed to in the Success Plan and receive whatever additional support the student needs, either directly or in partnership with other Chicago School support departments.

**Ongoing Improvements to Support for Student Success**
Looking forward, the institution continues to build on these efforts and position itself for future student support success. Central to these future plans are creating an integrated student advisement model that supports strategic enrollment management, continuing to focus on student engagement, enhancing support for international students and a more diverse student body, and creating a more effective admission process.

**Improving Data Management**
TCSPP is improving the degree to which its data are meaningful and actionable by developing a data warehouse. Through this, TCSPP will be better equipped to track and monitor student success data. Equally important is having the student support structures in place to maximize the use of data. To this end, TCSPP is in the process of developing a revised student advisement model that will serve several purposes. The plan, as currently conceived, entails creating a new student advisor position and populating campuses with teams of these advisors in
proportion to the size of each campus’s student population. The new structure additionally proposes to employ a “one-stop shop” and “concierge” approach to the delivery of student support services. TCSPP’s current process will ensure that every student will be assigned an advisor who proactively engages the student from matriculation to graduation, and who becomes the liaison to all support services across departments.

Facilitate Student Engagement
As TCSPP’s understanding of retention and graduation evolves, so too does the understanding of its drivers, the strongest of which is student engagement. While measuring student satisfaction may be helpful, it may not always serve as a useful way to understand progress toward degree completion. Often, a more useful gauge is student experience and engagement. For that reason, in spring of 2015, TCSPP made a change from a student satisfaction survey to a student experience survey. The before and after products can be seen in the engagement trend document (Attachment V.K). This shift acknowledges that factors related to student satisfaction are not necessarily the same factors that keep students progressing through degree attainment.

Enhanced Support for International Students
TCSPP has a dedicated Office of International Programs and Services that offers a myriad of services to support international students. In an effort to provide equal access for international students across all ground campuses, TCSPP applied for and was granted authorization to sponsor the F-1 student visa for all on-ground campuses, including Chicago, Los Angeles, Irvine, and Washington, DC. To better support the growing F-1 international population, the school introduced “International Impact Scholarship” where international students share the story of their journey from their home country to The Chicago School and how their education will help them impact the field of psychology on a global scale. This is the first such award at TCSPP.
To support international student engagement, TCSPP invites all international students to participate in the “First Friends” mentorship program that pairs new international students with veteran students in an effort to assist with transitional and acculturation issues. For example, on the Chicago campus, an international peer group called Transcending the Borders – A Peer Group hosts monthly gatherings in Chicago, where most international students are located, on every second Thursday of the month as a way to pull together international students and offer the opportunity for them to meet and greet to have sense of community and peer support by sharing ideas and experiences.

As part of the newly constituted student advisement model (Attachment V.L) and forecasts of sustained growth in international student populations, TCSPP is planning to add support resources to assist international students with immigration-related counseling, general advisement, facilitating transition to life in the U.S., and creating a culturally sensitive learning environment by promoting international educational exchanges. Additionally, as support needs for an increasingly diverse student population grow and change, TCSPP has established a Diversity Advisory Board (DAB) to provide recommendations for nurturing the type of culture and climate that are fundamental to the matriculation, retention, engagement, and persistence toward degree completion of its evolving student body.

*Develop a More Effective Admission Process*
TCSPP believes that students succeed when there is a match of their interests and skills with the program in which they enroll. To this end, TCSPP thoroughly trains its admissions teams to advise and support applicants to enroll in a program that is the best fit for their interests and skills. This is a two-pronged process that begins with training admissions teams how to elicit and understand applicants’ skills and interests and ensures that students have a clear and deep understanding of the programs, services, and community resources. While the core training and
development of counselors has remained essentially unchanged since initial accreditation in 2011, TCSPP did roll out a new Customer Relationship Management (CRM) in 2014 to help facilitate the work of the admissions team. With the new CRM enhanced ability to manage workflows. The CRM also allowed for greater insight into admissions team activity, allowing campuses to ensure consistency of applicant engagement and support across teams.

This effort began as part of the TCSPP 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. Strategic Imperative II: Strengthen the Efficiency of our Operations to Support our Expanded Scope and Size, tasked TCSPP leadership with reviewing every aspect of the admission process. The President appointed teams to review a number of specific critical areas (Attachment V.M). A status report on this ongoing admissions review is provided (Attachment V.N), along with the institutional Position and Philosophy on Admissions (Attachment V.O). An important component of the review was the two validation studies on admission requirements undertaken in 2014 (Attachment V.P and Attachment V.Q). These studies sought to validate admission requirements as predictors of success (defined as graduation, not on-time graduation, or time to completion) and have guided the development and implementation of retention initiatives that focus on first-year success, such as the Early Connect Program described above.

Summary of Component 5: Self-reflection

This component addressed the learning and personal development dimensions of student success at TCSPP. Both aggregate and disaggregated data are used in many ways to help understand student success. The data used goes beyond demographic characteristics, and incorporates multiple variables to understand the students at TCSPP. Because student success is at the core of our mission and is the responsibility of the entire institution, TCSPP will continue to refine and develop its infrastructure to collect and analyze key data and to base decisions on these data.
Component 6. Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence

Formal Process and Structure for Academic Program Review
The Academic Program Review (APR) process is the formalized method by which TCSPP assesses, examines, and increases the strength and quality of our academic programs (Attachment VI.A). The institution does so by evaluating student learning and the effectiveness of the program with a focus on ensuring the achievement of stated outcomes for every student. Academic support services are available throughout the students’ program and to assist in the attainment of their professional career goals. (CFRs 2.7 and 4.1)

The Academic Program Review Process

The APR process has two components: (1) periodic self-studies and (2) Annual Assessment Reports. The process is further described later in this Component. During the years between programmatic self-studies, program review components are reported in the APR “Annual Reports.”
Assessment Report” (Attachment VI.B). The Annual Assessment Report emphasizes the faculty’s review, appraisal, and analysis of learning outcomes at the programmatic level.

Programs are also provided with a summary of results of program effectiveness data, referred to as Program Maintenance Outcomes (PMOs). These PMOs are first listed in the Annual Reports and then described in further detail using the same narrative reporting structure as the PLOs (i.e., assessment methods, summary of findings, and action strategies).

A key segment of the Annual Assessment Report requires a narrative section with action plans pertaining to the results of individual learning outcomes and PMOs. An analysis and synthesis of the program action plans identify themes and priorities that are budgeted for and acted upon the following year at both the campus and institutional levels. These reports are then combined with additional data that are used for the programmatic self-study (Attachment VI.C).

(CFRs 2.6, 2.10, & 4.1)

Assessment of Student Learning

Central to the effectiveness of the APR is the faculty’s understanding of, and emphasis on, systematic assessment of student learning that facilitates evidence-based decision making, action plans, and curriculum improvement. Assessment of student learning is viewed at TCSPP as a continuous source of knowledge that naturally leads to academic and institutional improvement, and is therefore held as the centerpiece of programmatic quality assurance. The Annual Assessment Review process includes three primary components: (1) Systematic alignment of PLOs with ILOs, (2) Identification of formative and summative measures of student progress over the duration of the academic program, (3) Annual program review of SLOs and program effectiveness for the purposes of strategic planning to ensure continued academic excellence. (CFR 4.1)
In each program, faculty members collectively establish formative and summative measures of student assessment. Each program measures mastery of program-specific competencies and learning outcomes. Typically, formative data are collected from representative assignments (often referred to as “signature assignments”) that are designed to assess student progress through the curriculum. Summative data are collected from culminating experiences such as dissertations, theses, applied research projects, comprehensive examinations, and supervisor evaluation of practicum and internship work.

The AERC representatives support the collection and presentation of annual SLO data from the measures developed by the faculty (Attachment VI.D). Faculty review and evaluate these outcomes and propose additions or changes to improve student learning. These additions/changes are operationalized into action items and submitted within the annual reports or self-study presentations across the institution. When enhancements are required, approved changes are submitted for budget and resource allocation. Action items are monitored for progress and effectiveness, and the results are reported in the following year’s Annual Assessment Report. (CFR 2.4)

Evaluation of Program Effectiveness

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) supplies each program with a variety of program-related information including enrollment data (collected annually and term by term), student retention and completion rates, grade point averages (GPAs), student experience ratings, and alumni ratings (Attachment VI.E). The data are incorporated in the APR process, both in the Annual Assessment Review and in the Periodic Self-Studies. The data, reviews, and self-studies are used to monitor outcomes and to assess the effectiveness of initiatives or action plans developed by the program during these reviews. (CFRs 2.10 and 4.2)
During the Annual Assessment Review, program effectiveness may include review and input from additional stakeholders, such as the departments of admissions (for enrollment data) and student affairs (about student satisfaction). Larger components of the institution are provided to the academic departments by Marketing, Registrar, NCADE (academic support), and OIR regarding student progress and achievement. These data are integrated into the self-studies and used to supplement or clarify issues found in the Annual Assessment Report. As the data are examined by faculty, support staff for these contributing departments may be called in for consultation to help explain patterns in the data. Those offices may include Student Affairs, Admissions, Library Services, Community Partnerships, and co-curricular centers (Center for Multicultural and Diversity Studies, Center for Latino/a Mental Health). Feedback about data and recommendations for action plans is solicited from the staff in these departments during the Annual Program Review Cycle. (CFR 4.3)

**Engagement in the Academic Program Review Process**

Each campus (and online program) has an AERC and its local chair is a member of the NAERC. These committees are charter committees of the Faculty Council and are faculty led. The AERC meets bi-monthly to provide administrative oversight to the student learning assessment process at that location or modality. One faculty member from each program is designated to participate in AERC, which ensures faculty engagement, provides consultation, lends a campus-wide perspective, supports improvement in student learning assessment, and ensures good participation in the program review process. The NAERC supports and coordinates the assessment process to support consistency within programs, across locations, and among modalities. Planning, proposals, and national decisions are brought back by the NAERC to the local AERCs for review and further planning. Feedback from faculty members in the AERCs is provided
back to the national committee to advance decision making and assure participation of faculty across programs, locations, and modalities. (CFRs 4.4 and 4.5)

Assessing the Program Review Process

*The Development of the Academic Program Review Process at TCSPP*

TCSPP has conducted formal Annual Assessment Reviews since 2003 through a process that includes review of both SLO assessment and key performance indicators of program effectiveness. This process is formally evaluated by the faculty and administration each year, leading to modifications and improvements in the following year in the form of Program Modification Requests (Attachment VI.F). As our programs have matured, programmatic self-studies have emerged and are now systematically conducted. (CFR 4.1)

TCSPP’s commitment to the assessment of student learning is evidenced through the comprehensive institutional effectiveness review, implemented in 2008, which provides for Academic and Non-Academic Program Review with oversight by committees for both academic and non-academic program review and annual events for report out to the TCSPP community. (CFRs 4.1 and 4.3)

In its Commission Action Letter of November 21, 2011, WSCUC commended TCSPP’s commitment to the assessment of student learning and the use of assessment data to improve the quality of the academic enterprise. At the same time, the Commission urged TCSPP to review the program review cycle and to consider conducting periodic comprehensive reviews less frequently. As a response to this recommendation, TCSPP has modified the APR process to be more structured and efficient. Highlights of the development of the current process are listed in the table below.
### Academic Year | Modification | Outcome
--- | --- | ---
2012 – 2013 | Last annual program review under old format | Schedule proposed for periodic self-studies (every three years for programs not doing programmatic accreditation self-studies)
 | Introduced standardized templates for annual reviews | Facilitated comparisons across locations and modalities as well as identification of common themes at the institutional level.

2013 – 2014 | “Rapid Review” (Annual Assessment Review) instituted; pared down the annual report template | Reduced annual reporting burden while continuing to monitor learning outcomes and effectiveness indicators. Scheduled first set of periodic self-studies to be completed in January 2017
 | Established Office of Educational Effectiveness | Director assigned stewardship of the APR process
 | Established Office of Program Development and Review | Integrated program development, program review, and program modification process.

2014-2015 | Standardized program review process to include action plans and assessment of prior year’s action plan effectiveness
 | Well-structured, standardized review process in place with Annual Assessment Reports and periodic self-studies.
 | Transitions “learning objectives” to “learning outcomes.” | Created focus on student learning outcomes.

Annual academic program reviews similar to the current Annual Assessment Review continued through the 2013 cycle (2012-2013 AY) and Academic Affairs working with the NAERC, instituted annual “rapid review” (Annual Assessment Review) with a proposed triennial self-study due following the 2015-2016 Academic Year (Attachment VI.G). After discussion with faculty, consideration of the occurrence of self-studies completed for programmatic accreditation, and the maturity of the program, the faculty determined that a new program would be reviewed at the end of the third year of operation, then every five years thereafter. Programs conducting self-studies for programmatic accreditation would use those in lieu of the prescribed form, on the schedule.
determined by the accrediting body. These reports are intended to cover everything that is expected in a comprehensive standalone program review. The first wave of these self-studies will be completed and filed for the first time in January 2017 (Attachment VI.H).

This new program review system has been embraced across all programs and campuses, and the much-desired continuity in the program review process has finally been achieved. Program faculty now examine a more limited number of PLOs each year as part of the annual outcome assessment, allowing more thorough examination over a multiple-year period. The implementation of the periodic self-studies (coordinated with programmatic accreditation) and the integration of program modifications into the annual outcome assessment cycle have resulted in a more consistent and systematic approach to program review.

The Periodic Programmatic Self-Studies
While the format and content of the programmatic self-studies has been determined and is detailed in the TCSPP Student Learning Assessment and Program Effectiveness Handbook (refer to Attachment VI.A above), there are more steps to take prior to final implementation in the 2016-2017 Academic Year:

- The periodicity of reports, initially determined to be three years, will begin in 2016. Programs that prepare self-studies for the purpose of programmatic accreditation, for example, for APA, CACREP, and the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABAI) would most naturally schedule the institutional self-study to coincide with programmatic self-studies and follow the schedule awarded by that accreditor.
- Training for these reports begins in the spring 2016 semester and will continue throughout the year. This will include creating the “State of the Discipline Reports” called for in our 2015-2020 Strategic Plan. (CFR 4.7)
- Finalization of programmatic Assessment Plans.

The implementation of this final stage of the APR Process will ensure:

- Faculty involvement with TCSPP community of administrators, students, alumni, and employers;
• TCSPP’s Mission, Strategic Plan, and institutional and program learning outcomes guide the APR;
• Assessment of educational effectiveness using learning outcomes that describe what the student will be able to know and do, under what conditions, with identified measurable results or products attained;
• Multiple assessment methods with quantitative and qualitative data collected and reviewed to determine students are learning;
• Longitudinal evaluation of annual report data into the periodic programmatic self-study.
• Review and analyses of trends in academic data to assess progress toward achievement of learning and to inform decision making.
• Review and analysis of trends in institutional data to inform decision making;
• Data-based recommendations and action plans;
• Follow up and follow through on action plans.

Although the program review cycle is presented as discrete events, faculty members continually assess student learning and make adjustments in the regular course of business. This is reflected in the monthly meetings held by the local AERCs that hold discussion and training, which is communicated back to program faculty on topics including curricula revisions, rubric development, and other assessment-related topics.

Support for Student Assessment Data Collection
Academic programs collect, archive, and analyze results of their respective PLOs on an annual basis to document SLOs. Tk20 (third-party data collection and reporting software, overlaid on the Canvas LMS) is one mechanism by which programs collect and manage their student learning data. This system allows programs to collect their results digitally and allows administrators to design custom reports of student learning that are used by faculty to present their results and report them annually and in a more comprehensive manner in the programmatic self-study.

Additionally, academic programs collect SLO data manually from formative and summative capstones such as comprehensive exams, dissertations, action research projects, and clinical training reports, and assess student learning against PLOs using the PLO Rubrics. For programs
leading to licensure or certification, external standards are established by state and regional licensure boards. Regional licensure bodies include accreditation bodies of California, the District of Columbia, and Illinois. State licensure boards include those for Psychologists, Marriage and Family Therapists, Licensed Professional Counselors, and Behavior Analyst Certification Board (BACB®). In programs leading to licensure/certification, these external agencies provide standardized measurements of graduate success (Attachment VI.I).

Use of Data and Evidence

Systematic Data Collection

Data on the assessment of PLOs and the evaluation of program effectiveness are aggregated into longitudinal data and included in the periodic programmatic self-study over the period listed in the APR Schedule (refer to Attachment VI.H above). In this proposed schedule, newer programs are evaluated more frequently than established programs. Beyond the aggregate data from the Annual Assessment Reports, additional data for the self-study come from a variety of places:

- Marketing support from TCS ES.
- Financial performance provided by the budget and operations procedure.

Support for Program Effectiveness Data Collection

The Office of Institutional Research, Vice President of Student Affairs, Applied Professional Practice department, Information Technology (IT) department, and Finance departments provide program effectiveness data for each program in addition to student achievement data reported in the WSCUC Annual Report extracted from our student information system CampusVue. These data sets may include but are not limited to admissions and enrollment data, graduation rates, incoming GPA, demographics, retention rates, and financial performance. Also included are results of the annual alumni survey, student engagement survey, and external data (detailed below). Programs may require different types of data to fulfill the requirements of their professional
credentialing bodies. External data, such as licensure exam pass rates and alumni employment statistics, are compiled in a joint effort by the Office of Career Services and the Office of Alumni Relations.

As part of the 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, a “State of the Discipline” report will accompany each of the programmatic self-study reports in 2017, outlining the future directions of the discipline and opportunities or anticipated obstacles to the program’s sustainability. Added to that will be what has been called “Vital Signs,” a type of scorecard conceived of in 2008 to identify programs that may need additional support (Attachments VI.J and VI.K). The Institutional Effectiveness Review Committee (IERC, see below) is in the process of updating the Vital Signs criteria to include a set of criteria for non-academic programs.

Program modification requests also have a review and implementation process (refer to Attachment VI.F above). TCSPP now requires that program modifications be linked to APR (Attachment VI.L). The entire cycle is now coordinated with the annual budget cycle to accommodate timely submission of budget requests to support program modifications. This way, the effectiveness of program modifications can be evaluated in the self-study process.

Non-Academic Program Review

The IERC was inaugurated in 2008 to include formal non-academic program review with academic program review. The existing AERC is a component of the IERC as conceptualized, with the non-academic review committee having a parallel process as shown in diagram below. From 2008 to 2010, TCSPP collected data from the various non-academic programs arranged around the institution’s values (Education, Innovation, Community, and Service) concurrently with Academic Program Review. Included in 2009 and 2010 were “Vital Signs” quantitative assessments of each program that were designed to be indicators of continued program viability. In 2015, a renewed effort was begun to reestablish a more consistent process with the
modification that, rather than the Four Values, the ILOs would frame the non-academic reviews in the same manner that the PLOs frame the academic programs.

This is not to say that non-academic programs have not engaged in quality assurance efforts. In fact, over the years, each department has reported to the President’s Council without a formal annual review process. Each report was presented to the President’s Council and generally included a summary of achievements, a self-evaluation, and a strategy or action plan for continuous improvement.

In fall of 2015, the CFO and the Associate Provost for Program Development, Review, and Online Synergy were tasked with reinstituting the IERC at the institutional level with both component parts—the AERC (currently operating effectively as a chartered committee of the Faculty Council), and the Administrative (or Non-Academic/Co-Curricular) Effectiveness Review Committee, which was to be reactivated. A steering committee was created with the task of writing the charter and populating the two committees by fall 2016.

The first step taken was to audit what self-studies or effectiveness reviews existed for each of the departments, and then to interview the department leads to see how these could be aligned with the ILOs of Professional Behavior, Professional Practice, Diversity, and Scholarship. The results of that review, and the action plans to improve the measurement of learning outcomes are
summarized in the table below. A few areas report to academics and are not included (Attachment VI.M).

Once the IERC is in effect, the non-academic program review will be taken over and run by the Non-Academic Program Review Committee. This group will establish a process and templates to collect and review learning outcome and effectiveness data in an annual assessment report and periodic self-studies.

Summary of Component 6: Self-reflection
At TCSPP quality improvement efforts are participatory, iterative, and evidence-based. TCSPP uses data to drive decisions, inform program review, and assist in co-curricular assessments. This component discusses quality improvement approaches at TCSPP and how they are aligned with academic program reviews and non-academic annual reviews. Assessment at all levels is a priority for TCSPP as the collection, analyses, and integration of student data allows for refining the meaning of our degrees; the quality of learning students receive; adherence to the core competencies, and ensuring assessment of the standards of student performance, retention, graduation, and overall student success. It is through the commitment to student success and the mission of TCSPP that program review influences the quality of the educational experience. While the non-academic assurance process did not function as planned for the past few years, it has now been reinstated.
Component 7: Financial Viability; Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Financial Position Update and Long-Term Viability

TCSPP has worked diligently to strengthen its financial position and long-term stability. TCSPP has grown institutional net assets from $18.7M in FY11 to $68.0M in FY15, which represents 263% growth over that period of time. TCSPP has accomplished this through thoughtful long-term planning and budgeting and having appropriate processes, procedures, and controls in place to ensure that the organization has a way to quantify the resources it needs based on operational metrics. These metrics enable TCSPP to plan for and scale up (and down as needed) resources to support programs. TCSPP’s growing financial stability is reflected in its Department of Education (ED) composite score history over the course of the past five years. TCSPP has taken strides to improve the strength of its balance sheet and those results are clearly demonstrated in the achievement of composite scores of 3.0 for the past three consecutive years.

(CFR 3.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Population

Over the course of the past five years, TCSPP has also grown its student population from 3,563 total students in FY11 to 4,256 FY15 (Fall Census as the point of comparison) which represents total growth of 19% or a compounded annual growth rate of ~5%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>4,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While TCSPP saw its total student population grow over the past five years, it has not been immune to the changes experienced in higher education. As a result, TCSPP did experience year-
over-year declines in new student enrollment following its high water mark of FY12. Through its program offerings and focus on quality that attract students relative to our competition and implementation of more effective enrollment management strategies that provide prospective students with a level of service above that of the competition, TCSPP was able to weather the decline of new students and has returned to new student growth in FY 2015.

The effectiveness of the institution’s enrollment management is demonstrated in high rates of conversion of inquiries to applications. Because inquiries are on the rise, TCSPP is confident that new student enrollment will continue to grow (Attachment VII.A).

Revenue and Net Income Growth

Over the same period of time, TCSPP saw total revenue grow from $71.9M in FY11 to $94.3M in FY15, representing total growth of 31% or a compounded annual growth rate of 7%, which demonstrates that TCSPP is effectively enrolling and graduating its student population.
Over the same period of time, total annual net surplus has grown from $3.7M in FY11 to $9.5M in FY15, a 154% increase and a compounded annual growth rate of 26%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$71,862,543</td>
<td>$97,263,187</td>
<td>$103,285,871</td>
<td>$104,572,113</td>
<td>$94,346,938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCSSP's net income and net income ratio also reflect improvement over the course of the past five years and progress toward a highly respectable and sustainable level of net income for a non-profit institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income</strong></td>
<td>$3,742,025</td>
<td>$6,993,264</td>
<td>$19,203,073</td>
<td>$11,661,358</td>
<td>$9,504,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the three-year decrease in new student enrollment (now reversed), TCSPP has consistently maintained a very healthy operating income ratio, a direct result of operational contingency plans, financial controls, and budgetary discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Income Ratio</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While TCSPP has managed necessary changes in the student population, it has consistently demonstrated its commitment to students by investing and allocating resources to improve the student learning experience and learning outcomes. This commitment can be seen in the historical trend of instructional expenses per student which increased 13% or ~3% per year over the last five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Count – Fall Census</strong></td>
<td>3,563</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,504</td>
<td>4,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Expense per Student</strong></td>
<td>$10,119</td>
<td>$10,192</td>
<td>$10,828</td>
<td>$11,033</td>
<td>$11,428</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the same time frame, with no tuition increases for the year, TCSPP realized an increase in net tuition per student of 3% per year, which is in line with the increases in instructional expense.
per student and reflects the alignment of changes in student population, changes in tuition
revenue, and increases in student-related academic support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Count – Fall Census</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Tuition per Student</td>
<td>$17,423</td>
<td>$21,175</td>
<td>$21,581</td>
<td>$20,787</td>
<td>$19,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance Sheet Strength**

As a result of TCSPP’s strong enrollment and fiscal management, it has been able to
strengthen its balance sheet by growing its net assets from $18.7M in FY11 to $68.0M at fiscal
year-end in FY15, a 263% increase over the five-year period and a compounded annual growth
rate of 38%. These results are a direct reflection of the fiscal responsibility and financial
stewardship of the institution, ensuring that growth has been done in a very thoughtful, strategic
way that does not impair the ability to manage ongoing operational expenses. (CFRs 3.4 and 4.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Assets</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,732,825</td>
<td>$27,105,907</td>
<td>$46,571,904</td>
<td>$58,377,098</td>
<td>$67,974,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, TCSPP has successfully managed the balance sheet liabilities of the institution and
reduced long-term debt over the same time frame from $15.3M to $9.1M as of May 31, 2015,
which resulted in a very strong debt/equity ratio of 0.1. As of March, 2016, the institution has now
paid off the remaining balance of the outstanding bond debt and is now completely debt-free.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt/Equity Ratio</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a return-on-net-asset perspective, the following chart demonstrates that the institution is
investing and leveraging its assets in a way that is providing solid investment returns, which
continue to pay dividends on a year-over-year basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return on Net Assets</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advancement, Fundraising, and Grant Activities

Although TCSPP’s primary source of revenue is tuition, substantial resources are being devoted to the pursuit of growing and developing advancement and fundraising capacity. The following chart provides a summary of the result of our restricted, unrestricted, and percent-of-revenue results over the FY11 to FY15 timeframe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Giving</td>
<td>$700,529</td>
<td>$843,618</td>
<td>$127,942</td>
<td>$59,598</td>
<td>$88,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Giving</td>
<td>$237,393</td>
<td>$22,542</td>
<td>$408,698</td>
<td>$747,698</td>
<td>$910,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$937,922</td>
<td>$866,160</td>
<td>$536,640</td>
<td>$807,296</td>
<td>$998,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Revenue</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to growing advancement and fundraising, TCSPP has significantly increased the number of grants received over the same time period, as shown below. Grants have come in many different forms and amounts, but the level of support from grants clearly demonstrates TCSPP’s commitment to continuous growth and diversification of revenue streams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12*</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14*</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants Requested</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Awarded - %</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grants Awarded - $</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$1,895,610</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$1,974,667</td>
<td>$232,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Revenue</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes a multi-year award

Fiscal and Financial Controls

TCSPP manages its operational and financial results very carefully. These activities are supported by periodic reporting, assessment, and adjustments to ensure that TCSPP remains aligned with its annual goals, annual surplus commitment, and the strategic and long-range plans (these two plans are detailed below). These reporting and assessment activities include a monthly Campus Profit and Loss (P&L) Review Meeting where each Campus Dean reports on the campus-level financial performance for the prior month and year to date (YTD). Each month the Campus Deans, Deans of Academic Affairs, and Business Leads prepare an analysis and “Road Map” that
identifies any risks and opportunities that the campus has encountered on a year-to-date (YTD) basis or that are anticipated for the balance of the fiscal year. The “Road Map” (Attachment VII.B) document is each campus’s plan for managing to its respective goals and budget.

In addition to the monthly P&L review process, twice yearly TCSPP engages in a full Reforecast Process whereby YTD enrollment and financial results are compared to the budget and adjustments relative to any variances are made. In this way there is a continuous focus on monitoring and managing all levels of institutional operations with a diligent focus on maintaining the appropriate levels of support for the students, faculty, and staff. (CFR 3.7)

Long-Range Plan

As a critical component of TCSPP’s forward-looking and long-term strategic planning, the organization engages in a process of reviewing and updating its Long-Range Plan (LRP) on an annual basis. The LRP itself is the result of a comprehensive process that assesses the institution’s current position from an enrollment and financial perspective and identifies the organizational resources that are needed to support the execution of the Institution’s Strategic Plan. The LRP process includes planning for the sustainability of existing programs and identifying institutional structures and resources to support the ever-changing needs and expansion plans of the organization. To support the LRP process, TCSPP utilizes Academic Budget Guidelines (ABG) (Attachment VII.C) that provide comprehensive guidelines and metrics for key areas of our operations including the following:

- Faculty FTE Ratios
- Compensation Guidelines
- Faculty Workload Guidelines
- Class Size Parameters
- Faculty Recognition and Promotion Guidelines
- Faculty and Staff Professional Development Funding Guidelines
The ABG also provide for the development of contingency plans to guide program and campus teams when changes in student enrollment occur to ensure that the appropriate levels of student support are available to support student learning. (CFRs 3.1 and 3.3)

The LRP development process serves to guide and inform the annual budget development cycle, in that the LRP details enrollment and expense projections for the next five years of the institution, the first year of which serves as the basis for the enrollment, revenue, and surplus goals for the following year. In that respect, much of the planning for the budget process is encapsulated and completed during the LRP process each year.

The formal LRP process is also an opportunity for the institution to evaluate all current program offerings to ensure that they continue to be relevant for students and to provide them with the education they need to succeed in their respective fields. It is also the process used to evaluate and plan for new program opportunities, to identify the institutional resources needed to evaluate, develop, and launch those new programs, and subsequently to allocate the appropriate resources for the five-year planning window. The LRP was integrated with existing quality assurance process on the academic side through program review, and the results and recommendations from program review help guide and inform the LRP. This process ensures that TCSPP is setting realistic and achievable goals for itself. The LRP process takes a comprehensive look at enrollment trends by program and uses historical trend data and current performance to project and estimate enrollment goals going forward. Enrollment goals are thereby based on empirical data and budgets are built and based on realistic and achievable goals for the future. In this way TCSPP is not planning for, staffing to, or spending at levels that cannot be sustained or put it at risk financially if the goals and projections are not achieved.
From a timing perspective, the LRP process begins in the fall of each year, immediately following the fall enrollment cycle, and is completed in the spring of the following year in advance of the start of the budget planning cycle for the following fiscal year. The current 2016 LRP development cycle began in November of 2015 and was finished by the end of spring 2016. A review process with TCSPP Leadership Team and TCS ES Marketing was completed and resulted in collaborative planning whereby all parties involved are in agreement on the final enrollment goals. The LRP guides the annual budget process detailed in Attachment VII.D. (CFRs 3.4, 4.6, and 4.7)

Institutional Goals and Initiatives

As part of the LRP and annual budget process, TCSPP identifies the key initiatives and goals for the five-year planning window that each year’s LRP process entails. An output from that process is a detailed budget (or pro forma) for the resources needed to develop and implement those plans, based on a “Year Zero” budget. The “Year Zero” budget represents the resources (financial and otherwise) needed to invest at the outset of the project or initiative. Each new program has a pro forma that serves as the basis for resources allocated during the budget process.

Given that the LRP and budget process are guided by the ABG and other metrics employed by the institution to quantify and allocate resources, a necessary by-product of that process are contingency plans for each campus team, which provide a strong framework for how the campus will adjust, reallocate, and reduce as needed. This is particularly critical if student enrollment drops. That same framework is employed when we see increases in enrollment trends at the macro level, enabling TCSPP to scale up and scale down as needed. From a fiscal control perspective, TCSPP has a number of policies and procedures in place to ensure that proper oversight is in place. (CFR 4.7)
**Key Investments**

TCSPP invests in student learning in a number of ways including the use of technology and learning support services. As the online student population has continued to grow, moving to a Learning Management System (LMS) that could scale became critical. Not only has the online campus population grown substantially (from 1,039 in fall of FY11 to 1,232 in the fall of FY15, a 19% increase), so too has the percentage of on-ground students who are taking courses on the online learning platform with the growing number of courses and programs using a hybrid on-ground/online delivery model. To support this growing need, in 2014 TCSPP migrated its LMS platform (Pearson’s eCollege) to Instructure’s Canvas, a system that improved the usability and efficacy for students. Another technology feature that accompanied that migration was the implementation of the learning assessment technology, as Tk20 seamlessly integrates into Canvas and gives faculty the capabilities to assess learning outcomes efficiently and to enhance teaching methods.

**Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment**

A dimension of sustainability is TCSPP’s ability to read the evolving higher education landscape and anticipate ways in which the institution itself may need to change. New technologies, economic pressures, public concern about the quality of learning, demographic shifts, student preparation for college, new skills and knowledge needed for success, and alternatives to traditional degrees—all these shifts and many others are rapidly transforming the social, economic, and political environment in which higher education functions. Therefore, TCSPP, through discussions and planning, has developed a vision of our role in 21st century higher education that will also contribute to TCSPP’s long-term success and focus on new programs and locations to help balance projected declines in previous mass-appeal programs.
Summary of Component 7: Self-reflection

TCSPP has evaluated and described its current status as a viable and sustainable organization. TCSPP is poised not only to survive but to thrive, based on current financial and resource trends. Future plans include new programs, additional standalone locations, and collaborations that align with our mission and support our strategic and long-range plans. These plans will guide TCSPP and further define its role in the years to come as a mission-driven, student-centered, and success-focused institution.
Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

Then and Now
TCSSPP has grown over the past five years to become a more mature and complex institution that is thriving in a culture of assessment, making data-driven decisions, employing synergistic leadership, engaging in effective shared governance, disseminating internal and external communications, delivering excellent support for students, and operating with greatly improved financial sustainability and plans. TCSSPP now serves 4,256 students in Chicago, Los Angeles, Irvine, Washington, D.C., and through online programs. The programs currently offered at TCSSPP have grown to 25 degree programs, including 12 doctoral programs, one educational specialist program, 11 master’s degree programs, and a bachelor’s degree. TCSSPP offers 15 degree programs online, with online operations and academics configured as a virtual “campus” led by a campus dean. A national leader in professional psychology and emerging leader in behavioral health and health sciences, TCSSPP has tripled reserves, reduced its debt to zero, and lowered its student loan default rates. Additionally, TCSSPP has worked at a national level to address and advance a mission-consistent public good agenda specifically related to mental health through national press club events, women’s conferences, veteran’s events, health senate committee testimony, social media including blogs, and its mental health report. The changes seen between “then and now” demonstrate the solid commitment TCSSPP has to its students and the future of the institution within higher education and the communities it serves.

Assessment of the Impact of the Self-Study
This is an exciting time for TCSSPP, with a focus and commitment to its mission, a solid strategic plan, a culture of assessment, and an atmosphere of change and innovation. TCSSPP will continue on its path to lead in the psychology and related behavioral and health sciences arenas. Through the process of self-reflection, the TCSSPP community has been able to affirm the very
purposeful decisions that have been made over the years. It is evident that TCSPP has been an institution that has remained focused on two things—the mission and student success. Everything that has been done has been for the sole purpose of advancing these two things from hiring faculty, to the program review process, to the enhancements to the curriculum, to faculty scholarship, to new programs, to new locations, to community service, to more robust processes and to working strategically toward being a leading institution. TCSPP has been focused on strengthening who we are and what we have, thereby helping us mature and emerge as an institution of influence.

TCSPP has been successful in establishing a clear structure for assessment of student learning with regular review, reporting, and feedback mechanisms. Faculty, staff and administration have also enhanced student success through the expansion of support services and ongoing work to improve learning and graduation and retention rates. TCSPP has shown a strong commitment to strategic planning and to aligning its policies and procedures with allWSCUC standards. Additionally, TCSPP continues to demonstrate a strong and increasing commitment to diversity and inclusion on each campus. TCSPP has promoted sustainability through a strategy of supporting new programs, knowing that other programs may be less viable over time. Enrollment is growing and the financial position of TCSPP is strong. As we have grown the student body, we have developed our resources to support their success—our faculty and staff are larger and more engaged, our technology has been enhanced, our program offerings have grown, and our students are successful (see graduation and alumni data in Component 5).

Future Plans

TCSPP has committed to three strategic goals, which define why we are doing what we are doing and keep TCSPP focused on continuous improvement in every respect.

1. *We want to be the best at what we do, and we want people to know it.*
2. We want to be proactive about changes in the environment that affect what we do so that we can remain relevant and viable.
3. We want to take full advantage of technologies and best practices so we function in optimal ways across the functions of our institution.

Like any lofty goal, the path to achievement starts with operationalizing and charting its fundamental steps. To be the best at what we do we intend to:

1. Work with our existing students and our alumni base to make them successful and then publicize those successes.
2. Work with our faculty to advance their good work and make their contributions known.
3. With the help of our marketing team, continue to increase our visibility in the communities we serve.

To be proactive regarding changes in our environment we have chosen to focus on:

1. Integrated health and the behavioral health sciences. The interconnectedness of health issues and their interventions is a major theme in healthcare today, and we intend to focus on psychology’s role in that evolution as we branch into the health sciences.
2. The demand for undergraduate degrees that prepare professionals. This is an area that continues to grow and we are positioning ourselves relative to it by working to roll out additional Bachelors level degrees.

To optimize our technology and operations initiatives, we have chosen to focus on:

1. Keeping up with advances in classroom technology.
2. Creating an organizational structure and procedures that support our expansion and growth.

As TCSPP achieve these aims, it is becoming a leader in psychology and related behavioral and health sciences domains and continues to graduate successful, competent, diverse students.

Key Areas of Exemplary Performance

The last several months of self-study and reflection have, quite appropriately, required us to assess our assessment, assess our culture, and assess the changes that TCSPP has made since the previous WSCUC self-study and review. As we have surveyed and critiqued our program review protocols in recent years, we can point to the establishment of a better infrastructure and a more disciplined, consistent schedule of appraisals at the program level. The assessment process has matured, and programs are developing critical questions for their periodic reviews, questions
that reflect central concerns for their programs, and programs are engaging collaboratively in developing post-review action plans that are measurable and manageable. Additionally, strategic, long-term, and financial planning have proven key to success and sustainability. The road forward will require us to sustain and enrich our process of reviews as generative, engaging, and team-building dimensions of program planning and pursuit of quality.

One task requiring further refinement will be the practice of building co-curricular reviews that align more closely with annual academic program assessment and assist in providing data needed for decisions in student support areas. Interdisciplinary reviews will inevitably require the focused work of essential committees, and the results will continue to shape campus-wide conversations. Additionally, keeping conversations rich and meaningful will remain an important commitment through the current shared governance structures. Of all of the priorities explored during the self-assessment and strategic planning processes, perhaps none is more important than continuing on the current path and building TCSPP as an institution that demonstrates that our students not only gain greater vision and aspiration as a result of their studies, but also that they are competent and engaged in the community.

**Final Conclusion**

TCSPP continues to embrace its mission and commitment to student success by consistently valuing diversity and the communities we serve, and facing the ever-changing landscape of higher education with wisdom and care. A TCSPP experience provides students a fuller understanding of psychology and related behavioral and health sciences and their role in the community. Graduates leave TCSPP ready to undertake a wide range of journeys and to establish their own commitment to the richness of our mission by helping others.
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