

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Pacifica Graduate Institute

Thursday, October 4 – Saturday, October 6, 2018

Team Roster

Mark Schulman, Chair
Former President, Presidio Graduate School

Margaret Bailey, Assistant Chair
Executive Director, Higher Education Strategy and Board Development
Former Vice Provost, Program Development and Accreditation, Point Loma Nazarene University

Loren M. Hill
Department Chair, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, CA

Elizabeth Krewson
Professor, Ashford University, San Diego, CA

Melanie Sauer
Principal Consultant, MSB Management Group

Richard Osborn
Vice President, WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the Institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History, as Relevant
- B. Description of Team’s Review Process
- C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions
- B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees
- D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation
- E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
- F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence
- G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment
- H. Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes
- I. Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

APPENDICES

Federal Compliance Forms

- 1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
- 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
- 3. Student Complaints Review
- 4. Transfer Credit Review

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Pacifica Graduate Institute’s mission is to foster creative learning and research in the fields of psychology and mythological studies, framed in the traditions of depth psychology. Pacifica Graduate Institute (PGI) offers four master’s degrees, three research doctoral degrees, and one professional doctoral degree. These programs are offered at PGI’s two campuses located a few miles south of Santa Barbara, California. The Lambert campus (1989, 7 acres) and the Ladera campus (2005, 35 acres) are three miles apart and approximately a 10-minute drive. PGI’s total enrollment for the 2018 fall semester is 593 (FTE) which includes an overall attrition of 28.5 (FTE). PGI is forecasting spring 2019 enrollment to be 591.5 (FTE). PGI’s annual revenue is projected to be \$20.7 million for FY 2018 and annual expenses is projected to be \$19.9 million (before ESOP payments) with a FY 2018 projected net income of \$461 thousand.

In 1971, the Regents of the University of California provided initial funding for an “Isla Vista Human Relations Center” to meet the mental health needs of the small community immediately adjacent to the University of California Santa Barbara. As demand for the initial Center grew a second location was added on Hollister Avenue in nearby Goleta called the Human Relations Center (HRC). The HRC’s mission expanded to serve the larger Santa Barbara area community. The HRC developed a Peer Counselor Training Program to serve the University as well as State and County government agencies. The Institute’s academic programming began with a Counseling Skills Certificate which formed the foundation of the Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology (1982). In 1986, the Santa Barbara Graduate School was formed and in 1987 the school offered its first doctoral program, in Clinical Psychology. In 1989, PGI moved to one of its two current locations on the Lambert campus. At the time of the move to the Lambert campus the school changed its name to Pacifica Graduate Institute (PGI).

The guiding principles of PGI's academic programs are rooted in depth psychology which includes the ancient storytellers, dramatists and philosophers. The legacies of these early scholars have evolved in multiple academic contexts including the systematic explorations of the unconscious by Freud, Jung, and other theorists of the psychologies. PGI's academic programs include a professional doctorate in Clinical Psychology (2013); research doctorates in Clinical Psychology (1987), Mythological Studies (1994), and Depth Psychology (1995); and master's degrees in Mythological Studies (1994), Depth Psychology (1995), Humanities (2005), and Counseling Psychology (2012).

One of the early supporters of the Institute's development was the late mythologist Joseph Campbell. He offered guidance to the school's founding President, Dr. Stephen Aizenstat, and appeared many times as a guest speaker in the Institute's public conference series. After Dr. Campbell's death (1987) his archives were donated to the school's Center for the Study of Depth Psychology, an independent non-profit organization housed at the PGI campus. The Joseph Campbell Archives and Library, including his 3000-book collection, were installed in the school's seminar building on the Lambert campus.

PGI expanded the curriculum to include a research doctorate and master's programs in Depth Psychology (1995). The Ph.D. program in Depth Psychology began offering classes in 1996. PGI reached another milestone in 2005 with the school's first hybrid residential and online program, a Master of Arts in Engaged Humanities with an emphasis in Depth Psychology. For the hybrid programs students come to the Ladera campus for two extended residential stays each year, and the balance of their course work is completed online. Early in 2006, the school introduced a new specialization in Depth Psychology with an emphasis in Psychotherapy.

By 1999, PGI reached its full capacity at the Lambert campus and began offering additional sections of existing programs at La Casa de Maria's newly-established Ladera Lane Retreat Center (site of a former Jesuit Novitiate). In addition, PGI moved some staff, faculty, and student services to leased

facilities at La Casa-Ladera. In order to manage enrollment growth, as early as 1995 PGI entered negotiations with Santa Barbara County for revisions to the conditional use permit which governed the capacity and operations at Lambert Road. After two years of negotiations, PGI became a two-campus school by purchasing the Ladera Lane center from La Casa de Maria in September of 2005.

In 2002, PGI converted from a non-profit to an employee owned for-profit institution. PGI continues to operate under an Employee Stock Ownership Plan (“ESOP” or “Pacifica Employees’ Retirement Plan”) and is 97% owned by its employees through the ESOP. The board of trustees established the ESOP with three specific goals: to provide for a smooth and fair transition of ownership; to protect and perpetuate the Institute’s mission by transferring ownership to its employees; and to provide retirement benefits to long-term employees. It should be noted that PGI also manages a 401K and employees have an option to invest in either or both the Pacifica ESOP and/or 401K.

According to the PGI self-study, no dividends are paid from PGI “profits.” Instead, all net proceeds are used to fund employees’ retirements under federal statutes and regulations with compliance ensured by annual independent CPA audits subject to supervision by the Department of Labor. As of December 31, 2017, there were 167 shareholders of the ESOP. All shareholders are current employees, retirees or prior employees. This report will go into further detail under the section on financial viability and sustainability.

Accreditation History and Responses to Previous Commission Actions

PGI entered eligibility status with WSCUC in 1991, was granted candidacy in 1994 and received accreditation in 1997. PGI’s last Commission action was reaffirmation in June 2010. The following is a list of the most recent WSCUC filings and actions since the most recent reaffirmation:

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Feb 2012 | Substantive Change Committee Action, 2/16/12: Did not accept the following proposal: Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (new degree program) |
| Mar 2012 | Substantive Change Committee Action, 3/21/12: Grant interim approval of the following proposals: MA and PhD in Depth Psychology (off-campus programs). Final commission approval granted 5/8/12 |

- Apr 2012 Substantive Change Committee Action, 4/25/12: Proceed to a site visit prior to Commission review of the following proposal: Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (new degree program)
- May 2012 Interim Report Committee Action, 5/31/12: Receive the interim report requested in June 2010
- Jun 2012 Substantive Change Site Visit, 6/26/12, to evaluate the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology (new degree program)
- Aug 2012 Structural Change Panel Action, 8/15/12: 1) Approve the Doctor of Psychology as the first professional doctoral degree for Pacifica Graduate Institute, to be implemented within two years; 2) Review progress on the PsyD degree including consideration of the issues identified in the action letter at the time of the next scheduled reaffirmation visit, in spring 2018
- Nov 2013 Staff Substantive Change Action, 11/21/13: Grant approval of the following expedited proposal: Master of Arts in Counseling Psychology with emphasis in depth psychology (new degree program)

The 2010 reaffirmation letter from WSCUC Commission (June 24, 2010) noted three areas of recommendation for further development: (1) a comprehensive institutional assessment plan (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, and 4.3-4.7), (2) diversity initiatives, including diversification of enrollment (CFR 1.5), and (3) centralized student services overseen by a high-level administrator. WSCUC requested an Interim Report due March 1, 2012 to provide an update on these three recommendations. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, and 2.13)

Throughout the current reaffirmation process the review team verified progress in all three of the areas identified in the 2010 reaffirmation Commission letter as recommendations needing further development. These issues will be further addressed in the body of this report. The review team concluded significant progress has been made in the area of assessment planning and some initial progress in the area of diversity and a commitment to address areas where there has been little progress. However, there is still not a centralized student affairs office and these functions are dispersed throughout the campus.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The WSCUC reviewers included Mark Schulman, WSCUC Review Team Chair, Former President, Presidio Graduate School; Margaret Bailey, Assistant Chair, Executive Director, Higher Education Strategy and Board Development; Loren M. Hill, Department Chair, The Chicago School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, CA; Elizabeth Krewson, Professor, Ashford University, San Diego, CA, and Melanie Sauer, Principal Consultant, MSB Management Group, Pasadena, CA. The review team was assisted by Richard Osborn, WSCUC Vice President and Staff Liaison. All participated on the WSCUC Reaffirmation Peer Evaluator training in Oakland, CA on August 15 – 16, 2017.

In preparation for the Offsite Review (OSR) all reviewers completed the OSR worksheet prior to a team conference call on Friday, September 8, 2017. During the team conference call, the WSCUC review team members identified areas of excellence for commendation and areas in which the team wanted to conduct a deeper examination. In addition, the team reviewers agreed on their OSR assignments where the member would focus particular attention. The OSR was held on Tuesday, October 3, 2017 at the Oakland Airport Hilton. During the OSR the team prepared the Lines of Inquiry document where they identified six commendations, nine lines of inquiry and a list of additional documents. The team requested the additional documents be provided on or before Monday, December 18, 2017.

It should be noted that PGI stood in the path of the historic Thomas fire and was required to evacuate the campus during much of December 2017 and again in January 2018 as a result of the debris flooding. The staff and faculty are commended for their extraordinary effort in meeting WSCUC review team deadlines under very difficult circumstances. The WSCUC reviewers stayed in contact with the PGI ALO throughout the crisis and were prepared to make adjustments as needed. The site visit was originally scheduled for February 11 - 14, 2018, but, due to the closure of the campus for the Thomas fire and subsequent debris floods, the site visit was postponed to October 4 - 6, 2018.

The reviewers did extensive preparation in advance of the meeting, including analysis of the evidence made available electronically. The reviewers also examined the PGI websites, catalogs, and other documentation provided to WSCUC. The reviewers worked with PGI staff in preparation for the site visit. The PGI ALO and the WSCUC team developed an agenda for the three-day visit designed to verify institutional compliance with the WSCUC Standards and Criteria for Review (CFRs).

The reviewers met the evening before the site visit in Santa Barbara on Wednesday, October 3, 2018. During this initial meeting the team reviewed the Lines of Inquiry, the visit procedures, the visit itinerary and other organizational and logistical arrangements. During the visit the reviewers were able to meet with all of the key parties and personnel on both campuses in order to explore the issues identified for the visit in the Lines of Inquiry. The visit included meetings with the PGI board, president, executive leadership, students, alumni, faculty, and staff.

The visit hosted by PGI was well organized by the ALO. The meetings offered the opportunity to make a thorough assessment of the WSCUC Standards and CFRs. PGI leadership addressed the issues raised by the WSCUC reviewers, particularly those related in the Lines of Inquiry: governance, strategic planning, financial sustainability, enrollment management, student support services, and faculty. The WSCUC reviewers concluded that the discussions were wide ranging and the reviewers were able to tour both campuses and held candid discussions with faculty, staff and students.

The review team did express concern about the transparency of some of the executive leadership and board (CFR 1.7 and 1.8). Initially, this lack of transparency made it difficult for the review team to acquire an accurate and thorough analysis of PGI's current situation. However, through frank interviews with employees as well as validation by emails received in the WSCUC confidential email site, the team was able to verify their observations. In this report the team believes they present an accurate analysis of the issues they have identified as important for the future success and sustainability of the Institution.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

In general, the PGI reaffirmation self-study and supporting documents provided the information and data requested to support the reaffirmation visit, especially in regard to those areas of interest identified in the Lines of Inquiry document. However, the financial documents were excluded from those submitted by the December 18, 2017 due date and were not received until September 10, 2018, just prior to the October visit. During the visit, the team concluded that the information presented did not fully present the current status of the Institute and the challenges in the areas on governance and leadership. The WSCUC reviewers concluded that the visit provided the team a more accurate understanding of the areas where PGI will need to focus their attention. (CFRs 1.5, 1.7, and 1.8)

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The major issues raised in the prior Commission actions were contained in the June 24, 2010, and August 1, 2012, letters to PGI (see pages 5 - 7). In these two letters (delineated in more detail in the aforementioned section), PGI was asked to address:

- The need for a *Comprehensive Institutional Assessment Plan* (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, and 4.3-4.7);
- The desirability of formalizing *Diversity Initiatives* (CFR 1.5);
- The strategic imperative of developing *Centralized Student Services* (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, and 2.13);
- In addition, mentioned explicitly in the 2010 letter, is “a more transparent decision-making culture that supports the development of a collective vision for the future.” (CFR 1.5, 1.7, 1.8)

The Commission letters, the 2017 Institutional Report and this team report verify that progress is uneven but on an upward trajectory in the first two areas of concern, assessment and diversity, with some increased support for student support services. Student support services are still disbursed throughout the campus and to this date they are not a centralized function or office. However, in light of the tumult of the last several years, including an earlier failed presidential transition and the natural disasters of the last year, progress has been made since 2010 in addressing these three issues.

However, the fourth area -- the institutional culture and collaborative decision-making -- as discussed later in this report remains exceedingly problematic. The team believes with a sense of urgency that the institution needs to address the consequences of the conflicting roles of a nominal president and the significant operational role of the founder who currently serves as the chancellor with an active role in enrollment management and other operational aspects of institutional life. The board of trustees has failed in its ability to move forward with its plan to empower the new president and create a new role for the founder/chancellor which includes no operational responsibilities.

According to the board of trustees and executive leadership, the most significant institutional change since the last WSCUC visit is the redefinition of the founder’s role as an externally-oriented chancellor and the appointment of a full-fledged, competent, and operationally/strategically-oriented

president and CEO. However, the leadership transition has been more theory than practice with the former president and founder serving an active role in the daily operations and as a strong voice on the board of trustees. It is important to note that, in 2008, the CPR team report urged in strong terms that the Institute address the issue of a culture built around the founder and his supporters:

Executive/President (CFR 3.9). Beginning with discussions in 2004, the Board of Trustees has supported the intention of PGI's President to transition from the role of President to that of a chancellor. Although the process has been protracted the Board's plans for a presidential search and transition are now underway.

Because these changes are either recent or still in process, it remains to be seen how they will allow Pacifica to sustain its enterprise after the founding president's transition, how they will work to decentralize control, and how they will support "greater transparency in decision making and more participation" (CPR report, p. 12) from the broader institutional community. The team does question whether it is realistic to move to a truly shared governance structure when a strong, visionary, founding leader still holds the leadership reins - even with that leader's best intentions to share responsibility.

The current chancellor, Dr. Stephen Aizenstat, was the founder of the Institute and served as president/CEO throughout most of its history. With the exception of a brief period when Dr. Carol Pearson served as president from September 2011 through January 2013 (seventeen months) and a recent sabbatical when Dr. Joseph Cambray was acting president/CEO, Dr. Aizenstat has been president/CEO for most of the institution's history. Dr. Cambray, who came to PGI as provost, was selected and installed by the board as the president effective October 15, 2017. The institution reports that, with the exception of a two-month interim stint after the fires/mudslides, Dr. Aizenstat "currently has no active operational role." It should also be noted that Dr. Cambray has retained the title and responsibilities of provost in conjunction with his presidential duties.

There is always a transition challenge when a founding president relinquishes their leadership of an organization. However, PGI has experienced instability during the protracted transition. To a significant percentage of the PGI community, it appears that the founder still has considerable authority over the day to day operations either directly or indirectly through the new president. While the

founder is to be commended for his vision and ability to establish an institution that has provided an excellent educational experience to over 4,500 alumnae/i, a palpable release of operational authority and strategic control must occur for PGI to step into its future as a full member of academe with total independence. (CFR 1.7, CFR 1.8, CFR 3.6, and WSCUC Governing Board Policy)

The fact that the “protracted process” has gone on for *fourteen years* and continues to impede institutional progress raises serious questions about PGI’s intention and/or competency to make the changes WSCUC has recommended and to which the institution has purportedly made a commitment.

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard One

PGI is a very unique institution, founded on a deep commitment to depth psychology. Its mission statement, institution-wide *meta* goals, core values and program learning outcomes are all consistent with this commitment and are displayed prominently on their website and other approved materials (CFR 1.1). PGI’s staff and faculty are committed to the stated values. These values are woven into the educational objectives of the programs and prominent in rubrics and assessments employed. PGI has a clear and explicit commitment to promoting academic achievement through a formal curriculum that encompasses the mission and is referenced by an articulated commitment by faculty, leadership and the board of trustees to PGI’s unique curriculum.

The institutional report clearly articulated PGI’s mission, core values and motto of “*animae mundi colendae gratia*” (tending the soul of and in the world). The team commends PGI for its unique mission and history and for its strong sense of purpose and identity. The information articulated in the Institutional Report was reinforced throughout key documents (e.g., Student and Faculty Handbooks, course catalogs) made available to the PGI community and to the public via the website (external and student portal) as well as other digital media such as faculty videos that speak to the pedagogy and the PGI experience. There is broad-based and deep support of the mission, in evidence during the visit in

meetings with all constituencies including the board of trustees, administrators, faculty, and students.
(CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 3.9, 4.6)

PGI has a strong assessment function and regularly evaluates and makes available to the public the data on student success. For example, on the Student Learning and Retention page of its website, each program's retention rates, pass rates on state exams (where applicable) and aggregated student performance on comprehensive exams is prominently displayed (CFR 1.2).

PGI has published academic freedom policies. The academic freedom statement appears on page 14 of the 2018/2019 Faculty Handbook (draft) and page 11 of the 2017/2018 Student Handbook. It guarantees the right to academic freedom in research, publication, and in the classroom, which includes online courses. It has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational function by external bodies outside the institution's own governance arrangements. (CFR 1.3)

However, there are areas within Standard One that need further progress. PGI continues to struggle with diversity of executive leadership, students and staff, a fact that the institution openly acknowledges and is actively attempting to address. PGI established the Diversity and Inclusion Council with the mission "to actively support an inclusive, equitable, culturally competent educational community that respectfully welcomes, engages, and supports the richness of diversity (e.g., cultural, racial, gender, sexual orientation, class, geography, religion, learning style, able-bodiedness, age, and appearance)." (PGI Website) The PGI community is aware of the need to make further progress and all indications are they have strong intentions to focus on this area in hiring and programmatic changes.
(CFR 1.4)

The June 10, 2010 letter from the Commission, recognized PGI for its efforts to increase diversity of faculty and students but emphasized the need to build on current efforts to increase the diversity of students as well as to include more diversity of thought beyond Western thought of Depth Psychology. PGI stated in the 2017 Institutional Report that diversity is a high priority and has made progress in the

recent years (Exhibit 7.1 - *Diversity and Inclusion Committee Report 2012-2016*) outlines the number of recommendations from the Committee. The result of the efforts of the Committee in 2016-2017 include such actions as the inclusion of this initiative into key planning documents (e.g., Strategic Plan, the Five-Year Program Review Cycle inventory document and both Student and Faculty Handbooks), a landing page on the Institution's website which describes the role and composition of the Committee and a policy statement issued by the Committee stating that language that is gender-binary will be excluded and replaced in all published documents. (CFR 1.4, CFR 2.3 and CFR 3.1)

In response to the Lines of Inquiry about student data, PGI provided the report *Enrollment Disaggregated by Program, Ethnicity, Gender & Age Fall and Spring 2016-17*. In this report, an overall decline in enrollment of 40 students (-4.3%) occurred fall 2016 to fall 2017 (from 919 to 879). For the same period, the ethnic composition of the student cohort showed 63% of students (557) as Caucasian who accounted for most of the decline in enrollment thereby maintaining the same combined percent of all other ethnicities. The change in gender composition included a decline in the number of students who identify as male from 219 (24%) to 189 (22%), an increasing number of students who were not identified from 40 (4%) to 64 (7%) and students identifying as female were roughly the same at 71% of the total student population. The other notable change is the decline in the number of students who are 50 years or older, from 35% in 2016 to 32% in 2017. For those same years, there was 3% increase in students under 35. (CFR 1.2)

In the Institutional Report, PGI asserts an increase in the diversity of the faculty and staff which was also referenced in the 2010 Team Report; however, only anecdotal support was provided. In a written response from PGI to the LOIs, the board composition was referenced as including three women and two board members of color and recruiting efforts to add another female board member which has subsequently been approved by the board. (CFR 1.4, 2.3, 3.1)

While PGI has made progress, interviews with and feedback from students indicate that students of color do not feel equal in the PGI community. They also noted that the curriculum continues to be Western/European centric, and that they would appreciate seeing more focus on indigenous thinkers and people of color. It should be noted that there has been inclusion of indigenous psychologies/traditions in some programs.

PGI has published policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, the definition of the different types of academic credit, as well as grading. These policies can be found on the website, the course catalog, and the faculty and student handbooks. The institution maintains sufficient operational policies and procedures as evidenced in the aforementioned handbooks, financial aid policies, independent financial audit, and student grievance policies and procedures. (CFR 1.4 and CFR 1.6)

Throughout PGI there were expressed concerns and assumptions about how decisions are made. There does not appear to be healthy collaboration, transparency and accountability which are hallmarks of a shared governance model. For example, academic program reviews are conducted but are not tied to budgets, strategic planning or resourcing. Resourcing commitments are made such as those for Student Support Services but often not funded. This is an area where there is a need for professional development throughout the organization. (CFR 1.6 and 1.7)

PGI has made progress in staffing an Institutional Research Office but the function is in its nascent stage and it will take time to shift the culture from a personality-driven decision making to data-driven decisions. One employee stated, "The staff does not trust the executive team and we do not believe the executive team trusts the staff." Another employee stated, "Staff teams feel good about their small teams but feel like they are functioning in a dysfunctional environment." Collaboration and shared governance are areas that need to be addressed immediately, beginning with full transparency in decision making. The institution has initiated a "morale task force" to address these issues.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard One.

Standard Two

PGI publishes educational objectives at the institutional, program and course levels. The institution publishes retention and graduation rates, pass rates on state exams (where applicable to the program) and completion/average time to completion rates on its website. In PGI's Institutional Report the institution acknowledges that educational objectives should be better communicated and there should be improvements to the availability of student achievement data. In addition, PGI needs to make improvements to the use and transparency of data for continuous improvement of the academic programs and for the planning processes.

The visiting team carefully reviewed PGI's institutional report and its appendices. It reviewed several course syllabi and online classes, and interviewed students, faculty, and staff. In addition, the team reviewed the faculty handbook and other documents. (CFRs 2.1-2.7)

The team noted the passion and commitment of the faculty and staff at PGI. There is a clear dedication to their students' learning experiences and success. The coursework was rigorous and consistent with graduate level programs. Faculty engagement with students and instructive feedback of student work was noted. A review of student work indicated that students are performing at a high level and that faculty grading is appropriate.

However, in several documents (including program review summaries and faculty surveys) and verified in faculty interviews, the team noted that there is concern over the sufficiency of core faculty to fully support those programs. The programs are designed to be labor intensive with mentoring, practica, counseling, and small classes. This design leads to many faculty teaching overloads and

chairing more dissertations than is stipulated in their contracts. Faculty expressed concern that the resources to support their programs have been cut back. Faculty are not included in financial decision-making and the approach to budgeting is not collaborative and there is a lack of transparency which in turn makes it difficult for academic planning. However, the review team’s examination of the data does not indicate that PGI’s core faculty numbers are out of line with higher education standards. The team speculated that the use of faculty and staffing data and external benchmarking are not embedded in the culture. This may be in part due to the fact that the institutional research function is relatively new to the institution. Another contributing factor may be the labor-intensive redesign of the programs that relies heavily on core faculty. This is another example where data and benchmarking would help inform decision making. (CFR 2.8)

PGI Core and Adjunct Faculty Counts 2013-2018

Academic Year	# Core Faculty	# Adjunct Faculty
2013-14	40	99
2014-15	40	97
2015-16	36	105
2016-17	29	112
2017-18	30	114

It is clear from a review of student work and interviews with students and faculty that deep and profound learning is taking place at PGI. Because of the unique nature of the institution and its focus on depth psychology, students do not just glean content from their courses; they are often transformed. Many students indicated that they were drawn to PGI for reasons that they did not understand. One student indicated that she “opened the PGI brochure and burst into tears.” Another student noted that “I came to PGI to find my voice but instead found my soul.” As has been mentioned in other sections of this report, the institution has in place the necessary curricular checks and balances to support learning,

but the team felt that this transformational aspect of learning that takes place at PGI was worthy of mention. (CFRs 2.10 and 2.12).

The institutional report written in 2017 described numerous initiatives towards centralized student services, but it does not appear that much progress has been made in reality. There is not one unifying department that is responsible for the strategic direction and goals for PGI in this area. The model is one of distributed functions by different staff members, and the team had difficulty understanding who is responsible, accountable or has decision making authority. For example, the career services function is not held by one department, but is left to each program. The person in charge of disability services is also a program administrator. The group representing this function in the interview was not able to articulate their model, strategy, goals, or structure. (CFR 2.10. 2.12)

Given there is not a single person accountable for the student services/affairs function, there is the opportunity for this function to be dependent upon the available time and talent of employees to address students' needs. It is clear that the faculty and staff are doing their best to be pro-active but, with no organized structure, they are racing to keep up with the student issues. However, in a team meeting students agreed that, even though this is *ad hoc*, when students raise issues their concerns are addressed and resolved. (CFR 2.13)

They have appropriate data available from the Institutional Learning Office from student surveys, but there is a lack of professional student affairs staff and resources to systematically address student needs leading to the conclusion this will continue to be an area of concern.

It is recommended that PGI create a centralized function to review student support services annually to identify areas needing improvement, analyze student surveys and other data, and then set goals for continuous improvement. Currently data is collected and reviewed, but more effort should be made to use the data to set goals and hold appropriate parties and structures accountable to make progress in closing the assessment loop. (CFR 2.10, 2.11)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard Two.

Standard 3

PGI is located in the mountains of an exceptionally beautiful area of the California coastline. The smaller Lambert campus close to the ocean front was once a stately home spread over seven acres. The property includes offices, classrooms, a small dining facility, the Joseph Campbell collections library, vegetable and floral gardens. The larger Ladera Lane campus is thirty-five acres with a library, auditorium, large dining facility, residence hall, offices, bookstore, classrooms, and boardroom. PGI physical facilities are excellent with no apparent deferred maintenance. Both the larger Ladera campus were cut off for several weeks – Ladera longer than Lambert -- in spring 2018 as a result of road closures due to the debris floods. During the Thomas fire the Ladera campus served as the staging ground for fire fighters. The campus has worked quickly with the institution's insurance company to deal with smoke and flood damage and the physical plant has rebounded well from the historic disaster. (CFR 3.4)

The review team noted that many policies and procedures were either updated or created during the past academic year. In interviews with staff and faculty they were often unaware of new policies and procedures or had not implemented the changes. One employee noted, "There are no written policies and procedures, so when long time employees leave there is a huge loss of the brain trust and institutional knowledge." Faculty, when asked about the faculty handbook or policies related to faculty governance, seemed to have knowledge of the policies but many had not been implemented or were only loosely followed. (CFR 3.2)

There was not a clear relationship between the authority of faculty committees and the faculty senate. There did not appear to be formal processes in place to follow through with faculty votes or decisions that impact resources. Even when faculty make decisions, they stated their sense that their work could be overturned without clear explanation or collaboration. It is recommended that PGI

faculty, administration and staff explore best practices for their respective areas and adopt policies and implement practices that bring the institution in alignment with best practices. (CFR 3.3)

The business office has made significant changes in recent months to improve the business operations. The office has recently experienced total turnover of staff who left to pursue other employment opportunities and has replaced the former staff with experienced CPAs. The consultant serving as the interim CFO is very knowledgeable and with many years of experience with corporate finance and Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOPs). She was able to negotiate a refinance and consolidation of PGI's debt at a rate and terms that will save PGI over a million dollars per annum. PGI does not have a fulltime permanent CFO so there is concern that a change of personnel in this key position makes the PGI's business operations fragile. (CFR 3.1 and CFR 3.8)

The review team met with the auditor because the audit reports noted consecutive years of concerns with internal controls including separation of duties and the monthly close of accounts. The auditors met with the board in 2013-14 and 2014-15 to highlight the issues around internal controls. In the team's interviews with the auditors it was noted that the audit firm has no other higher education clients and lacks experience in this market segment. The board was questioned about the last formal request for proposal (RFP) to review auditors and responded that two years ago the board addressed this and concluded, "Nasif, Hicks, Harris & Co., LLP performed all three audits (Financial Statements, 401k and ESOP) at that time (and still does). Management and the Committee believed there were efficiencies of scale from one firm doing all three, and that it would be difficult as well as costly to bring in a new firm and train them. Also, the preference was for a major local firm, with expertise and good reputation, because that was thought to be the most cost-effective." While this is understandable best practices indicate that a formal RFP should be conducted every three and not more than five years. The auditors were very transparent in their interview with the team and answered all of the reviewers' questions. (CFR 3.4 and 3.6)

The high cost of living was a consistent theme throughout the meetings with staff and faculty. The low wages of employees and tight employment market have contributed to the high turnover and low morale. The consultant serving as the interim CFO noted that the Institute has budgeted an employee pay raise each year for the next five years. The CEO and CFO indicated that they are now examining the spending priorities for the Institute. However, they noted that the high ESOP pay-outs for the next two years will continue to constrain spending. The CEO is slowing down new initiatives until there is appropriate due diligence including a full business plan developed with the financial implications, benefits and risks. There were several initiatives mentioned that have been either denied or slowed in recent years because of high risk, low margins, and administrative energy required for start-ups. The president stated that the focus over the coming year will be on building enrollment and revenue diversification. (CFR 3.4 and 3.7)

Full-time faculty members are provided with modest (\$1000/year) financial support for professional development in their disciplines (e.g., to present their research and attend conferences) and they can apply for a research or professional sabbatical every 3-4 years. However, the team did not see a clearly articulated policy linking scholarship, teaching, assessment and service. In fact, faculty indicated that service was not part of their contract, and for that reason, many faculty are reluctant to join committees or take on other service related activities above their teaching workload. Throughout the Institute there was a lack of formalized policies and procedures that guide an institution in its decision making. (CFR 2.9 and CFR 3.3)

Faculty committee work at PGI is minimal and not organized under the structure of the faculty senate. Committees are often led by administrators, and the senate itself has only a minimal role in the decision-making processes at the institution. In fact, the senate only meets three quarters of the year. In interviews with faculty who are members of the senate, they provided examples of initiatives that were supported by the senate but indicated that the response from administration to those initiatives

was usually negative. For example, over the past five years the faculty have asked to have some kind of visibility and voice with the board, but the Board's response was that it was not possible because of the fiduciary aspect of the board. Also, there is no official representation of the faculty on the Institutional Management Council (IMC). The president of the senate is allowed to attend all meetings though excluded from the executive sessions. It should be noted that the founder's wife (who is the corporate secretary and an adjunct faculty member but has no full-time role at the institution) is a core member of the council. The faculty are expected to participate in marketing events but have no voice in how their programs are marketed. It is recommended that the institute review and increase the role of the faculty's role in shared governance to include them in decision-making that is pertinent to their work. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.7 and 3.10)

Another issue that came up frequently was the turnover of the staff. Several indicated this was due to low wages and poor morale. Within the past year, PGI has experienced significant turnover in admissions, business office, registrar's office, guest services, marketing, operations office, reception, and the bookstore and others indicated they are looking for other employment options. In addition to high turnover, some employees indicated that personnel were moved around to new work assignments without having the requisite skills and experience. From their past experience, employees indicated that some of these changes seemed arbitrary without an appropriate hiring or review process. Such significant turnover and reassignment are troubling and should be carefully investigated by management for underlying causes. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3)

PGI STAFF TERMINATION RATES 2013-2018

From payroll data and ADP reports, the following represent voluntary and involuntary termination rates. This report does not include faculty.

2013 – 6 staff out of 92 terminated	6% of employees
2014 – 18 staff out of 97 terminated	18% of employees
2015 – 11 staff out of 111 terminated	10% of employees
2016 – 32 staff out of 131 terminated	24% of employees

2017 – 20 staff out of 123 terminated	16% of employees
2018 – 25 staff out of 124 terminated	19% of employees

Average terminations of staff 2013-2018: 16.5%

PGI has made progress over the past year in the financial management of the Institute but there is much more that needs to be improved. One area that needs immediate attention is the formalization of operating policies and procedures to guide and professionalize the operations. Another area is a review of personnel policies as they relate to assignments, formal selection, due process in termination, etc. A complete review of personnel practices, wages, benefits, and policies should be conducted to better understand the causes and sources of the high turnover and low morale of the employees. (CFRs 3.2 and 3.7)

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has demonstrated sufficient evidence of compliance with Standard Three.

Standard 4

PGI has made progress in the area of institutional research and evidence-based decision-making in achieving its educational objectives since the last WSCUC visit and is to be commended for those efforts. The Institutional Learning Office (ILO) is staffed with talented, competent statisticians who provide the institution with current and valuable information to make effective decisions about academic programs and curriculum. According to the Institutional Report, “PGI has policies in place to monitor the quality of the institute and its programs. Data is collected for evaluation, decision-making, and planning. The ILO coordinates an annual academic program review and more recently has become involved in assessment in non-academic offices.” Furthermore, the “ILO conducts and disseminates a wide variety of data collection and analysis measures, including capstone courses, course evaluations, student demographics, and alumni, faculty, staff, and student surveys.” (CFRs 4.1, 4.2)

According to the institutional report, the ILO also assists programs in their annual program reviews, curriculum mapping reviews and conducts and disseminates institutional research in the following areas:

- Assessment of program goals via capstone data (distributed annually to faculty and chairs);
- Course evaluations (distributed quarterly to faculty and chairs);
- Clinical and counseling licensing exam pass rates and licensure (distributed annually to faculty and chairs and updated on the PGI website);
- Alumni, faculty, and student surveys (distributed upon request);
- Retention and graduation rates disaggregated by student demographics (distributed annually to program chairs).

The ILO provides rich data to many PGI constituents that supports their decision-making processes. Faculty and staff use these data to make not only curricular changes, but also to address operational issues that are identified by students. However, there were many such planned initiatives noted in the original institutional report written in 2017 that have not yet been implemented. When faculty and staff were asked about this during the visit, they indicated this was due to a lack of resources and that they were not involved with the planning and resource allocation processes that would support the implementation of initiatives and a culture of continuous improvement. Further, it did not appear that there was any consistent, coordinated response to the changing higher educational environment that was data driven, and all decisions in these areas were consolidated with executive leadership. (CFR 4.7) Staff indicated in interviews that “we are just doing the same thing we have been doing since the 70s.” The institutional research function is in early stages of development and PGI has not fully embraced a culture of data-driven decision making. (CFR 4.6)

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard Four.

Inventory of Institutional Effectiveness Indicators

PGI completed the Review of WSCUC Standards worksheet and the Inventory of Institutional Effectiveness Indicators. PGI indicated that 34 institutional stakeholders participated in the review

(which was facilitated by the Intuitional Learning Office). Participants in the process included, “executive management, middle management, program chairs, core faculty, the student services office, the registrar’s office, the financial aid office, the admissions office, the business office, guest services, IT, and the board of trustees (institutional report p. 15). PGI’s responses were thoughtful and candid. In fact, the team was impressed with the faculty’s transparency, self-reflection, and eagerness to improve throughout the review process. They provided data on student feedback, even if that data included comments that were not always complementary to the institution. Stakeholders at PGI were open and honest with the team during interviews, sharing not only what is good about PGI, but revealing some of the severe underlying problems that are occurring at the institution.

Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees

Pacifica’s institutional report clearly addresses the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degrees. Evidence of Pacifica’s educational uniqueness can be seen in the commitment to the integration of experiential teaching and learning of depth psychology. Specifically, this is demonstrated in the school motto, “*For the Sake of Tending Soul In and Of the World*” which means living in more conscious alignment with the self, others and the environment. PGI’s uniqueness is also found in the six core values: Logos, Eros, Consciousness, Integrity, Service, and Stewardship, which undergird the meaning, quality and integrity of all degrees offered at Pacifica. (CFR 2.2)

Learning based on the core values occurs in the classes, clinics, consulting rooms, and symposia. Learning activities are aligned with the course and program learning outcomes founded on core competencies that are embedded throughout course and clinical work. Ongoing assessment includes many practices, instruments and other sources of information. A rigorous annual review occurs at the program level during which core competencies and learning outcomes are assessed based on student,

faculty and department chair feedback. Pacifica's competencies and outcomes are published on the website and catalog. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

Pacifica's institutional mission, "to foster creative learning and research in the fields of psychology and mythical studies, framed in the tradition of depth psychology" in an environment of free and open inquiry--can be seen in Pacifica's degree quality and integrity. Performance expectations are clearly stated in program goals, course objectives and curriculum maps. Program expectations are reflected in its promotional literature, in its catalog and the structure of its programs (CFR 4.2).

The visiting team notes PGI's commitment to understanding of the importance of addressing the meaning, quality and integrity of their degrees. (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Component 4: Educational Quality, Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Pacifica's focus on educational quality in the students' learning both in and out of the classroom is apparent. The overarching framework of depth psychology is reflected in the institution's values and woven throughout PGI's programs and practices. PGI has clearly articulated core values that reflect the institution's emphasis on the integration of contemporary academic exploration and wisdom traditions, what they refer to as solar thinking (reason) and lunar reflection (dream and imagination). In addition, PGI has institute-wide *meta* goals and learning competencies that are consistent with their mission and appropriate to graduate level learning. (CFR 2.2)

While not measured separately, the *meta* goals and learning competencies have been mapped to program learning outcomes that are measured in PGI's learning assessment program. PGI is to be commended on its commitment to the institution-wide *meta* goals; however, some of the goals are not easily measured. For example, *meta* goal #5 states that students will "attend to the creative inner life of the human psyche and to the soul of the world." While each program's requirements for personal therapy is appropriate to their program, this implies that the student is attending to the creative inner

life of the soul. The institution might want to look at wording goals that are more easily measured and assessed. Program learning outcomes are also written in complex and compound wording that is difficult to measure but, in conversations with the faculty, the team discovered they are well aware of this and are working on remediation.

Admissions criteria to PGI's programs are clearly articulated on its website. Admission to PGI requires the official transcripts from all accredited or state-approved universities, include a personal statement, a resume or CV, a ten-page writing sample, and three letters of recommendation. As noted in the institutional report, "beyond these requirements, PGI seeks applicants who are psychologically-minded and demonstrate evidence of emotional resilience, cultural awareness, and commitment to scholarly questioning necessary for work with diverse individuals and communities. Applicants are interviewed by program faculty, usually a core faculty member. "(CFR 2.2b)

PGI has a learning assessment program that employs several direct and indirect measures of student learning. Some of these measures include evaluation of course assignments, comprehensive exams, capstone projects, licensing rates, and career satisfaction (measured through alumni/ae surveys).

Learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by the faculty who manage the programs. A faculty member in each program is designated as the assessment liaison, a role that is rotated among faculty that provides unit release. Faculty meet quarterly to discuss outcomes and student performance. According to the institutional report, "faculty members routinely discuss and evaluate student learning outcomes at multiple levels: meta-goals of the Institute, goals of the programs, and objectives in courses and related competencies. Annually, transition points such as comprehensive exams and capstone projects, including theses and dissertations, provide opportunities for detailed progressive student feedback on progress and achievement (CFRs 2.4, 2.6). Faculty

members compare aggregate results to previous years and review course content in areas where improvement may be indicated.” Onsite discussions with PGI faculty during the visit support this claim.

Degree programs are well calibrated, thoughtfully created, and stay true to the institution’s core values and its focus on depth psychology. Each program has a document entitled *Program Assessment Plan and Outcomes* that outlines the program goals and learning outcomes. These goals are mapped to the institution-wide *meta* goals and the goals for each course in the program. They are also mapped to the major program assessments (i.e. comprehensive exams, concept papers, dissertation proposal, etc.). PGI tracks student success in these assessments at both the individual and aggregate level.

Evidence of the quality of PGI’s programs is the success rates on licensure exams. According to documentation provided for the team, “Pacifica graduates’ performance on the CPSE/CPLÉE during 2014-2016 exceeds the statewide pass rates in each of those years. Overall, 42 of the 45 Pacifica graduates who took the CPSE/CPLÉE in 2014-2016 passed the examination for a three-year pass rate equaling 93%. Pacifica graduates’ performance on the EPPP during the years 2014-2016 equaled or exceeded the statewide averages in each of those years. Overall, 38 of the 59 Pacifica graduates who took the EPPP in 2014-2016 passed the examination for a three-year pass rate equaling 64%.”

(Institutional Report, Exhibit 3.6) (CFR 2.6)

A review of the online portions of the hybrid courses showed a highly qualified and engaged faculty. Online coursework is well designed to support the in-class seminars. Discussions with the online faculty during the visit validated this observation. The students in one of the hybrid courses were on site during the visit, and their feedback on the programs was very positive.

“Graduation requirements also reflect a high degree of academic rigor. They include mastery of coursework, high scores on comprehensive exams, and quality research projects (thesis or dissertation); some programs also require community fieldwork, personal therapy hours, and practicum/internship

hours. Across programs, students must maintain a cumulative grade-point average of 3.0.” (Institutional Report) (CFR 2.6)

Rubrics for the evaluation of comprehensive exams, concept papers, and dissertations are standardized and thorough. Scores on these rubrics are tracked and analyzed by the institution. For example, PGI reported that the 18 students who completed the second-year comprehensive exam for the MA/PhD Mythological Studies Program, the average score was 95% on questions 1 and 3 and 92% on question 2. The team was able to examine some of the student work in this cohort and confirmed that the assessments were reasonable and accurate.

The team was especially impressed with the institution’s commitment to the students’ personal psychological journeys as evidenced by the requirement for some type of personal therapy. “The Clinical Programs (PhD and PsyD) require 60 hours of personal therapy; the Counseling Psychology Program requires 50 hours. The DPT specialization requires 50 hours of depth-oriented therapy, counseling, analysis, or an engaged self-reflective process with a provider in the student’s field of study. The Somatic Studies specialization requires 50 hours of depth transformative practices (CFR 2.2b). The providers document the hours.” (Institutional Report).

**PGI PERCENTAGE OF COURSES TAUGHT BY CORE AND ADJUNCT FACULTY
FALL 2015 TO SUMMER 2018**

TERM	# COURSES	# COURSES TAUGHT BY CORE FACULTY	# COURSES TAUGHT BY ADJUNCT FACULTY	% OF COURSES TAUGHT BY CORE FACULTY	% OF COURSES TAUGHT BY ADJUNCT FACULTY
Fall 2015	153	59	94	39%	61%
Winter 2016	165	65	100	39%	61%
Spring 2016	138	62	76	45%	55%
Summer 2016	115	49	66	43%	57%
Fall 2016	161	53	108	33%	67%
Winter 2017	174	62	112	36%	64%
Spring 2017	148	66	82	45%	55%
Summer 2017	117	39	78	33%	67%

Fall 2017	163	58	105	36%	64%
Winter 2018	168	60	108	36%	64%
Spring 2018	142	63	79	44%	56%
Summer 2018	103	34	69	33%	67%
TOTAL	1747	670	1077	38%	62%

Adjunct faculty teach over sixty percent of the courses at PGI. While this in and of itself is not a problem, it is important for the institution to thoughtfully create processes and procedures to train and support its adjunct faculty. At present, it appears that each program has its own way of engaging adjunct faculty, but, outside of the hybrid program, there is no centralized system to assure that classes taught by adjunct faculty are of consistent quality. (CFR 2.4, 2.5)

Student feedback from the survey data provided in the review materials, and in the confidential emails indicate that there is an inconsistency among the adjunct instructors; often adjuncts are not familiar with the materials and are teaching from other faculty’s notes, and there is a lack of classroom management skills among the adjuncts. For example, a number of students in a focus group in the spring of 2017 mentioned this issue, noting that “professors do not manage the classroom well and ‘problem’ students become even larger problems in the cohort. Most agreed that the classroom dynamic is the hardest part of their Pacifica experience.”

PGI does not have an adjunct faculty handbook and the team could find no evidence of specific training or support beyond what is provided by the program chair. If PGI is going to continue to rely primarily on adjunct faculty to teach its classes, then there needs to be a concerted effort to create processes that support those faculty, including consistent intake training for new adjuncts in university policy, instructional design (as they are required to create their own syllabi), grading and assessment, classroom management, conflict resolution, and pedagogy.

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

Pacifica defines student success in terms that are reflective of its mission, values and character. This can be seen in the academic, transformative, and social components. Academic success is when students achieve their learning goals on time, from admission to graduation, while mastering the skills and insights specified in the curricula and taught by instructors. Transformative success is exemplified in graduates who leave Pacifica with a freshly enlivened worldview, a deeper relationship to themselves and to others, a more fluid access to the deeper layers of the psyche, improved emotional expression and management, and an enhanced sense of their uniqueness. Social success refers to a broadened and more refined sense of how the personal intersects the cultural, with a keener awareness of social justice issues and the need to appreciate diversity. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 2.13)

Pacifica's institutional report included a comprehensive plan for student success that included retention and graduation rates, clinical program licensure pass rates, and student supportive service plans. Pacifica analyzed the patterns for retention rates across all programs. Retention rates have held steady at around 63% for the 2007-2013 cohorts. The retention rates are even greater for the matriculation years 2014 through 2016 since more recent cohorts need time for their retention rates to stabilize. According to the data provided, Pacifica's graduation rates stabilize to around 60% after enough time has passed for those still in a program to either graduate or leave the program (CFR 2.10).

The report states that between academic years 2009-10 and 2016-17 (inclusive) 72% of Pacifica students enrolled were female, 24% male, and 4% unspecified, proportions that have not changed substantially during these eight years except for a slight rise in the "unspecified" category. Sixty-six percent of students who enrolled were White, 12% unspecified, 11% Hispanic, 3% Black, 3% Asian, and 5% of blended ethnicity, proportions that have not changed substantially during these eight years. As of July 5, 2017, there are 1096 students still in programs at Pacifica. Of these, 65% classified themselves as White, 13.6% were undeclared, and 21.4% classified themselves as Hispanic, Black, Asian, Native American, and Pacific Islander or blended.

The institutional report shared, and team interviews highlighted, that Pacifica has identified diversity as an area for improvement. Pacifica's Diversity Inclusion Council has created a recruitment plan to reach out to diverse populations of prospective students and is working with faculty and staff to support current diverse students as they matriculate (CFR 1.4, 2.13)

Pacifica notes that roughly 25% of attrition takes place during the first quarter. From 2007 until 2017, the age group with the highest attrition was 61-70, and the second-highest was 51-60, with the lowest 21-30. The focus groups conducted by the Institutional Learning Office in spring 2017 shed light on first-quarter attrition by underscoring student concerns about being accompanied consistently throughout their program. Based on feedback received, Pacifica took steps to work with program chairs, began developing an improved student services model, and piloted a new set of prospective student interview questions for admission to help screen out applicants not suited to PGI programs.

Pacifica's institutional report included tables for additional measures of student success. Credential test pass rates are high (CFR 2.7). The Examination for Professional Practice of Psychology (EPPP) and the California Psychology Laws and Ethics Examination (CPLEE) are the examinations used for licensing clinical psychologists in California. Pacifica graduates' performance on the EPPP during the years 2014-2016 equaled or exceeded the statewide averages in each of those years. Overall, 38 of the 59 Pacifica graduates who took the EPPP in 2014-2016 passed the examination for a three-year pass rate equaling 64%. On July 1, 2015, the California Psychology Supplemental Examination (CPSE) was retired and replaced by the CPLEE. Pacifica graduates' performance on the CPSE/CPLEE during 2014-2016 exceeds the statewide pass rates in each of those years. Overall, 42 of the 45 Pacifica graduates who took the CPSE/CPLEE in 2014-2016 passed the examination for a three-year pass rate equaling 93%.

PGI has demonstrated excellence in its academic programs. Students indicated in interviews with the visiting team that they believe they receive a rigorous and excellent education that prepares them professionally to pursue their career objectives.

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

PGI has a well-established student learning outcomes assessment process that is based on a Regenerative Cycle of Inquiry beginning with Explore, Examine, Review, Reflect, Plan, and completing the cycle are (Re)Vision and (Re)Focus. This process of closing the loop through the collection and analysis of assessment data provides evidence for an established culture of continuous improvement among faculty for the educational programs. The assessment artifacts and evidence were provided to the visiting team both electronically and in hard copy in the team room. Each academic program has a designated faculty member responsible for program assessment who serves as the liaison between the program faculty and the Institutional Learning Office and various other committees.

Assessment at PGI occurs in all areas of the curriculum and the evidence is used to inform the program review process and is provided as supporting evidence for curricular changes. Assessment results are transparent to faculty and academic leadership and are available in the PGI digital files. Assessment evidence is also used to inform key stakeholders about the academic quality of PGI's programs and facilitate discussions about the continuous improvement of the curriculum, program offerings, professional development opportunities, services, and the overall educational experience.

PGI's academic assessment program is based on a five-year assessment cycle leading up to a comprehensive program review, during which time the program faculty assess all Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs). The program's core faculty and chair review the assessment plans, learning outcomes, and data for the program. Program faculty are ultimately responsible for the assessment of their respective academic programs and using their assessment findings to improve the student's educational

experience. At the end of each academic year, faculty compile their assessment data and reflect on what they have learned through their assessment activities and how this will lead to program and student learning improvements. The faculty and program-specific professional standards set both institutional and program expectations for program improvement and support the academic unit's faculty in their continuous improvement responsibility and informs the program review process.

It appears in both the report and supporting documentation that PGI references two program review processes, one that occurs annually and a comprehensive review that occurs every five-years. The most recent comprehensive program reviews require the faculty to engage an external reviewer. Both the annual and five-year program review processes deal almost exclusive with the assessment of student learning and indicate that the program review does not look beyond academic assessment and curriculum revision. There appears to be some confusion among the faculty regarding the program review and annual assessment processes:

The PGI Institutional Self-study (page 57) states, "Every Pacifica program conducts a thorough program review every year to evaluate its learning outcomes, examine evidence, consider benchmarking results, reflect on the assessment, and move its assessment plan forward. Results are reported to the program's faculty, program chairs, and the IMC. Some programs bring in outside consultants for expert feedback. At Pacifica, program reviews focus on the relationship between learning outcomes, core competencies, and transparency of expectations to students via in-class instructions and exercises, course syllabi, and catalogs and other publications" (CFR 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7).

Comprehensive Assessment Plan (page 5) states, "Every five years: The detailed annual assessments of learning outcomes, as well as any selected topic foci, are consolidated for the 5-year Comprehensive Program Review by program faculty in collaboration with the provost and ILO. The results from institute-wide student and alumni/ae surveys and focus groups are combined with many other sources of information that contribute to faculty knowledge and understanding to compare patterns with strengths and needs for improvements. Occasionally, the five-year cycle is superseded by particular professional accrediting requirements, such as increased credit hours or particular curriculum changes."

In the comprehensive program review, faculty do not examine institutional issues such as financial sustainability, resourcing, enrollment planning, strategic priorities, market analysis, etc., which

is the hallmark of a thorough program review process. PGI does not have a set of program review guidelines that incorporate these institutional issues and the faculty action plans are not informed by data to assist them in this process. For example, the program review findings included an increase in faculty numbers, new resources for professional development, and an increase in enrollment but this is not accompanied by an analysis of relevant data including benchmarking and best practices. It is also unclear how the program review process is linked to budgeting and strategic planning processes. It was noted that resource planning does occur annually but not how these processes are informed by the assessment of student learning, program review and faculty.

The Institutional Management Council (President/Provost, Associate Provost, Corporate Secretary, Chief Financial Officer, Counsel, and Academic Senate President) reviews progress, plans strategically, and allocates resources weekly. The president and executive management develop the goals, reviewing and revising them quarterly based on progress reports at IMC meetings, and enlist the staff directors and other involved parties to devise and carry out action steps. (PGI Comprehensive Assessment Plan, page 4)

During the review visit the president noted that the current curricular design is not financially sustainable and requires a curricular redesign. These larger curriculum design and sustainability issues are most often addressed in the program review process and led by faculty in collaboration with administrative leadership. While there is strong evidence that the faculty and academic programs have a culture of using assessment for continuous improvement, this same culture is not evident in other aspects of the institution.

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

Adequacy of Financial Resources

Along with its study of its financial situation in the 2017 Institutional Report, the team reviewed PGI's (1) audited financial reports showing financial position as of August 31, 2017, August 31, 2016 and August 31, 2015 and accompanying management letters, (2) a preliminary income statement for the

year ending August 31, 2018, (3) a draft of FY 2019 budget, and (5) the 2017 Strategic Plan. Three team members conducted a conversation with PGI’s independent auditors during the site visit.

The institution has shown a history of living within its financial means even with the recent challenges of the Thomas Fire and subsequent debris flow in late 2017 and early 2018. The ability to balance a budget is an important metric in achieving financial sustainability and stability. Given the challenges of being 81% tuition-dependent, this is a commendable achievement for PGI. The challenges of being tuition-dependent were mentioned in the Institutional Report and noted that efforts have been made to diversify non-tuition revenue through increased auxiliary revenue and Pacifica events with recent efforts to increase donations that support scholarships through the alumni/ae foundation, an independent 501(c)(3). This table summarizes the institution’s Income Statement and Balance Sheet for each fiscal year since FY2015. (CFR 3.4)

	<u>8/31/2015</u>	<u>8/31/2016</u>	<u>8/31/2017</u>
	<u>FY Actual</u>	<u>FY Actual</u>	<u>FY Actual</u>
	<u>Audited</u>	<u>Audited</u>	<u>Audited</u>
<u>Financial Summary</u>			
<u>REVENUE</u>			
<u>Tuition and Fee Revenues</u>	<u>17,290,271</u>	<u>17,184,094</u>	<u>17,553,270</u>
<u>Auxiliary Revenues</u>	<u>3,324,021</u>	<u>3,381,420</u>	<u>3,433,945</u>
<u>Pacifica Events</u>	<u>454,844</u>	<u>465,702</u>	<u>346,140</u>
<u>Other Income</u>			<u>170,133</u>
<u>Total Revenue</u>	<u>21,069,136</u>	<u>21,031,216</u>	<u>21,503,488</u>
<u>EXPENSES</u>			
<u>Total Expenses</u>	<u>19,990,932</u>	<u>20,354,456</u>	<u>20,331,828</u>
<u>Income from Operations</u>	<u>1,078,204</u>	<u>676,760</u>	<u>1,171,660</u>
<u>Other Expenses</u>	<u>580,777</u>	<u>173,789</u>	<u>656,202</u>
<u>Net Income Before Taxes</u>	<u>497,427</u>	<u>502,971</u>	<u>515,458</u>
<u>Income Tax Expenses:</u>	<u>8,988</u>	<u>8,257</u>	<u>-85,208</u>
<u>Net Income</u>	<u>488,439</u>	<u>494,714</u>	<u>600,666</u>
<u>Margin</u>	<u>2.3%</u>	<u>2.4%</u>	<u>2.8%</u>
<u>Assets</u>	<u>19,943,944</u>	<u>20,165,696</u>	<u>19,665,604</u>
<u>Liabilities</u>	<u>16,790,371</u>	<u>16,321,358</u>	<u>15,755,189</u>
<u>Stockholders' Equity</u>	<u>3,153,573</u>	<u>3,844,338</u>	<u>3,910,415</u>
<u>Total Liabilities & Stockholders' Equity</u>	<u>19,943,944</u>	<u>20,165,696</u>	<u>19,665,604</u>

As of August 31, 2017, PGI's assets equaled \$19.7 million and included \$1.0 million in Cash and Cash Equivalents, \$1.0 million in Accounts Receivables, and \$14.9 million in Net Property and Equipment. Current Liabilities and Long-term Liabilities stood at \$2.6 million and \$13.1 million, respectively. Stockholders' Equity was \$3.9 million.

The institution is located on two separate campuses, an upper campus (Ladera) and a lower campus (Lambert). Ladera sits on 35 acres in the hills of Montecito, California and is owned by PGI. This is significant asset that can be leveraged as needed. The Lambert campus, as noted in the audited financials for the year ending August 31, 2017, is leased from a limited liability company (the Lessor) for \$846,574 per year and is wholly owned by the Chancellor (then the President) and Corporate Secretary of Santa Barbara Graduate School (dba PGI) and expires in April 2027. While the facilities sustained minimal damage from fires and debris flow, there was additional borrowing required for minor repairs.

During the review team's visit, the reviewers learned that PGI's \$13.0 million in outstanding loans were refinanced and the CFO reported cash savings of \$0.7 million per year in annual loan payments as well as an increase in the line of credit to \$1.5 million. As shown on the statement of cash flow year ending August 31, 2017, the year ended with \$1 million of available cash. At that time, annual payments of interest totaled \$0.7 million thereby presenting a significant demand on cash. Based upon the documents provided and conversation with the CEO and CFO, PGI appears to use debt as a means of funding strategic initiatives and capital investment. It is understood that sound fiscal management necessitates the need for liquid capital and long-term planning of cash needs to avoid saddling the institution with excessive debt service. It is recommended that the integration of strategic planning and resource allocation be examined closely and that reserves be built to support the institution's priorities and future deferred maintenance. (CFR 3.4)

In the fiscal year ending August 31, 2017, the institution had operating revenues of \$21.5 million, up from \$21.0 million in 2016 while total expenses decline slightly, from \$20.4 million in 2016 to \$20.3 million in 2017. PGI's maintained positive Income from Operations of \$1.2 million in 2017 as compared to \$0.7 million in 2016 and total Net Income of \$0.6 million and \$0.5 million respectively. The significant difference between operating income and net income is mostly due to a large sum of interest payments totaling of \$0.7 million in both 2016 and 2017. (CFR 3.4)

Based on the unaudited income statement for the year ending August 31, 2018, actual operating revenue of \$20.7 million and operating expenses of \$19.9 million maintaining a positive net income of \$0.4 million. As noted in the Institution's document update to their WSCUC Institutional Report (2017) dated July 25, 2018, the loss of revenue is directly related to the impact of the Thomas Fire in December 2017 and then subsequent debris flow in January 2018. This disaster impacted both campuses with multiple evacuations and campus closures. It should be noted that the administration, faculty, and staff continued with classes through the use of online technology (i.e., Zoom) with residencies located in a local hotel.

Pacifica was spared significant fire damage to the facilities and had been able to resume full operations at the time of the site visit. PGI administration, faculty, staff, and alumni/ae should be commended not only for maintaining operations during an extraordinarily difficult time but for their contributions to the local community. While insurance may cover the damages and classes have resumed, the lasting impact on the PGI and local communities will be felt for some time. It was observed at the site visit that the facilities are fully functioning and continue to provide a significant experience for students and conferences. (CFR 3.5)

As a result of the OSR, the team requested a multi-year long-range financial plan and year-to-date financials. The institution provided preliminary results for the year ending August 31, 2018, and the unapproved budget for the fiscal year 2019 in advance of the visit. While revenue declined in

FY2018, PGI prepares and adheres to an annual operating budget that is approved by the IMC and the BOT with input from multiple constituents of the faculty and staff. The team did not receive the long-range plan but it was referenced during the site visit. The recent turnover in business office personnel, the natural disasters in the past academic year, a new interim CFO (4 months) and CEO (18 months), and a major restructuring of the debt all have contributed to the uncertainty for long range financial planning.

The projected FY2019 operating revenues of \$22.0 million and net income of \$0.6 million was based upon a conservative approach to forecasting enrollment for fall 2018. The enrollment forecast for FY2019 and FY2020 is the basis for the long range and was provided to the team during the site visit. PGI’s leadership is optimistic about tuition revenue for FY2019 with an estimated growth rate of 6.1% when compared to FY 2018. This may appear to be aggressive, but when compared to FY 2017 it is an increase of 2%. PGI acknowledges the challenges of addressing affordability for students at the same time of the need to address faculty and staff compensations and the rising cost of delivering a high-quality graduate education. The team encourages PGI to continue to develop robust scholarship programs to address affordability issues and to explore non-tuition income opportunities to meet 15% target for non-tuition revenue that is indicated in the Strategic Plan (2017). (CFR 3.4)

ENROLLMENT ACTUAL AND PROJECTED 2018-2019

<u>Fall 2018</u>				Fall 2019
<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Inc / (Decr)</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>Budget</u>
<u>223.0</u>	<u>223.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>227.0</u>
<u>390.5</u>	<u>387.5</u>	<u>-3.0</u>	<u>-0.8%</u>	<u>394.5</u>
<u>613.5</u>	<u>610.5</u>	<u>-3.0</u>	<u>-0.5%</u>	<u>621.5</u>

The measure of financial adequacy used by the U.S. Department of Education is the Financial Responsibility Index. PGI has maintained a low but acceptable Department of Education Financial

Responsibility Composite Score of 1.7 in 2015 and 2016 and most recently a 1.6 in 2017. With the recent restructuring of debt, it is anticipated that the composite score will increase to 2.0. (CFR 1.7, 3.4)

PGI has operated under an Employee Stock Ownership Plan (“ESOP” or “Pacifica Employees’ Retirement Plan”) since 2002. Today, PGI is 97% owned by its employees through the ESOP. The board of trustees established the ESOP with three specific goals: to provide for a smooth and fair transition of ownership; to protect and perpetuate the Institute’s mission by transferring ownership to its employees and to provide meaningful retirement benefits to long-term employees. Proceeds from net operating income are used to fund employees’ retirements under strict federal statutes and regulations with compliance ensured by annual independent CPA audits subject to supervision by the Department of Labor. As of December 31, 2017, there were 167 shareholders of the ESOP. All shareholders are current employees, retirees, or prior employees. As owners through the ESOP, employees are stakeholders in the success of PGI and thus benefits from the success of the students and the Institution.

▪ 12/31/2015	165 ESOP shareholders	\$ 757,509 payments
▪ 12/31/2016	163 ESOP shareholders	\$ 770,699 payments
▪ 12/31/2017	167 ESOP shareholders	\$ 1,319,910 payments

Allocating Resources in Alignment with Institutional Priorities

It is important for an educational institution to appropriately align its resources to support student learning and success as well as the overall health of the organization. An important part of allocating resources is a robust strategic planning process that is aligned with the budget and long-range financial plans. The Strategic Plan (2017) is a five-year plan that includes many significant initiatives such as addressing faculty workloads and compensation, growing auxiliary revenues through public events at the Retreat Center, improving assessment, expansion into global markets, contemporizing the curriculum to include more diverse voices, updating the technological infrastructure and intensifying the succession planning efforts -- just to name a few. While the team commends PGI for its optimistic outlook and ambitious plan, we offer caution and encourage PGI to put rigor around timelines and

prioritization. Furthermore, it appears that resource allocation needs to be carefully reviewed with the goal of attaining appropriate resources to support operations. Primarily based upon the preliminary budget for fiscal year 2019, it is observed that the additional investment needed to support initiatives in the strategic plan are not clearly defined and alignment with the two processes were not a tight connection. (CFRs 3.4 and 4.3)

PGI's has a commitment to strengthen academic programs and related student support services by hiring several new faculty members and a continuous improvement approach to program reviews. Additionally, an IT manager was hired to better address the need for technology upgrades and support. A significant measure of that commitment is the level of financial resources allocated to instruction and instruction-related functions. If PGI is to continue offering online education, it will need to build the online infrastructure and faculty development to support distance education. Recent financial data shows that approximately 73% of the budget was allocated for the areas of instruction, academic support, student services, facilities, and auxiliary enterprises. The total resources allocated directly and indirectly to the overall student experience suggests an institution in pursuit of student success and educational effectiveness. (CFRs 2.13, 3.4, 3.5)

Evaluating the Changing Higher Education Landscape and Anticipating Potential Changes

To determine what might lie ahead for PGI with the changing higher education environment, PGI must embrace a culture of using data throughout the institution. Based upon the data provided and the site visit, it is clear that PGI is in the early stages of developing a culture of institutional assessment, in particular the use of data to make informed decisions, to evaluate initiatives for efficacy and to work data-driven results more fully into resource allocation and decision making. With a strong institutional research team, PGI should create institute-wide assessment processes using available data in all aspects of institutional planning. The current strategic plan recognizes the need for revenue diversification,

enrollment opportunities to welcome a more diverse student population and the need for modernizing the curriculum to include more diverse thought. (CFRs 4.3, 4.7)

The team recommends that PGI continue to aggressively explore all of the ramifications involved in fulfilling the institution's mission and chart a course for a sustainable future, particularly given the following: 1) the rising cost of higher education; 2) increasing socio-economic diversity in California; 3) the competitive employment market in California and in the local area; and 4) the relatively high-cost of attendance at PGI. It is recommended that the institution continue to explore multiple strategies to address these matters and to not solely rely on an increasing tuition revenue solution. (CFR 3.4)

Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes

PGI did not include a specific theme in the comprehensive review

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

The reflection essay provided by PGI for this component was a reminiscence framed as a "Coming of Age/Turning Forty" narrative. The team found it to be a cogent, focused, reflective commentary, discussing both what was known and reinforced in the reporting process and the new learnings which the institution came upon. The team agreed it was a solid scaffolding for a strategic framework to move the institution forward. PGI began the essay with a summary of Institute strengths that the review team verified during the visit as consistent with their findings:

- Exemplary faculty
- Friendly and helpful staff
- Small class sizes overall
- Plentiful tools for deep self-exploration
- Growing emphasis on application of studies
- Courses that link inner with outer, self with world
- Schedule-friendly curriculum
- Social justice orientation in some programs
- Beautiful campuses lovingly tended
- Culture of ongoing academic assessment and reflection

PGI also noted some areas needing improvement that the team agrees require attention:

- Enrollment growth
- Attrition management
- IT upgrades, especially for online coursework
- Need for a dean or director of student affairs
- Need for an on-campus crisis team
- Faculty hiring and workload
- Shared decision-making involving faculty and staff
- Diversification of upper management, faculty, and curriculum

Additional requests from students include:

- Faculty development for classroom management
- Centralized and better student support services
- Enrollment management
- More core faculty
- Academic program revision
- Teaching and research assistant opportunities for students
- Ongoing engagement of the alumni

PGI noted it faces many of the same challenges as other higher education institutions and the need to be proactive in addressing these issues. The report noted changes include the emerging patterns of student enrollment, regulatory pressures especially for for-profit institutions, the need to engage the local community in the life of the Institute, rising costs of administration and operations, diversification of students, environmental trauma including global warming, and changes in technology. In addition to these issues identified in the report, the board and executive leadership mentioned the challenges and opportunities with the globalization of higher education. The review team also asked the board and leadership about the sustainability of a higher education institute with a very narrow niche focus of depth psychology. They clearly believe PGI's reputation and prominence in the field will provide adequate opportunities for growth. This will be a challenge for PGI and they will need to continue their work on revenue diversification and creating a very rigorous process of due diligence for examining new initiatives.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the campus visit and a review of PGI’s accreditation history, Institutional Report and supporting documents the team has developed the following commendations and recommendations.

Commendations

The Commission commends PGI in particular for the following

1. Exemplary crisis management during the historic Thomas fire and following debris flow. Administration, faculty and staff were commendable in providing students an uninterrupted academic experience in temporary alternative facilities during the extended closure of the campuses.
2. Strategic innovation regarding PGI’s challenges and opportunities including revenue diversification, planned research center, retreat center, and collaboration with Chinese colleagues.
3. Reported student satisfaction and high licensure exam pass rates demonstrate the academic quality and educational effectiveness of PGI’s academic programs.
4. A strong commitment of PGI’s community to the mission and philosophy of the institution.
5. A collaborative, dedicated, and qualified faculty and staff, who have supported the Institute as it has experienced financial stresses and have energetically sustained the heritage and ethos of the mission, vision and values of the institution.
6. The refinancing of long-term debt with cost savings and highly favorable terms.
7. Substantial improvement in the institutional research function at PGI since the last visit has facilitated the use of data to inform program improvement.

Recommendations

The Commission requires the institution to respond to the following issues

1. Presidential transition requires the board and president to define explicitly and evaluate performance of the roles of the president and the founder/chancellor. The president is to have decision-making authority and oversight particularly as it relates to strategic, financial, operational, and external profile and partnerships. (CFRs 3.7 and 3.8)
2. The board is required to develop and implement a clear short-term plan of succession to avoid confusion among administration, faculty, and staff between the role of the founder who serves as Chancellor and the President. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, and 4.6)
3. Board and administration must focus attention on improving the integration of staff in decision-making in order to address morale issues which have resulted in high turnover of staff in key

areas impacting campus effectiveness and basic services such as finance, student support services, admissions, and academic administration. (CFRs 3. 10 and 4.5)

4. Strengthen shared governance, including consultation in the area of faculty hiring, academic budgeting, and academic strategic planning. The faculty senate needs to be more integrated into the decision-making process of the institution. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.10, and 4.5)
5. Board and administration are required to develop a plan for hiring a Provost which would help reduce the load of the President who currently carries both responsibilities and would be in line with WSCUC best practice of separating the presidential and academic leadership roles. (CFRs 3.6, 3.8 and 3.10)
6. The institution should develop and implement a diversity plan that is aligned with PGI's core mission to serve diverse students and underscores the institution's commitment to diversity as a value. The diversity plan, under the institution's comprehensive strategic plan, should guide the institution's 1) recruitment of diverse students, including those from international settings; 2) prioritization on enhanced student support services to improve student success, retention, and graduation rates, particularly for underrepresented and international students; 3) recruitment, and promotion of diverse faculty, staff and administrators with particular attention given to diversity in executive leadership. (CFRs 1.4, 2.10 and 3.1)
7. Financial staff have made progress on internal controls, data reporting and financial transparency but will need to make further advances on staff development, technology integration and financial best practices. (CFRs 3.3, 3.5 and 4.3)
8. The institution has made progress on improving liquidity and should continue to address both demands on cash as well as under-capitalization of the strategic initiatives and implementation. (CFRs 3.4 and 3.8)
9. Hybrid support services and learning theory need to be a focus on resourcing and instructional development to build the infrastructure for hybrid pedagogy. (CFRs 2.8, 2.13 and 3.5)
10. Student support services office that is a centralized and distinct department focusing on student success. (CFRs 2.11, 2.13, 3.1, and 3.2)

APPENDICES

The report includes the following appendices:

Federal Compliance Forms

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
3. Student Complaints Review
4. Transfer Credit Review

Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying **strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention**. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for **evaluation as evidence for Component 2** of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are **Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard**. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four forms that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the cited federal requirements. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

Review under WSCUC Standards

<p>Provide the institution’s consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comment on evidence.</p> <p><u>Self-Review Rating</u> 1= We do this well; area of strength for us 2= Aspects of this need our attention 3= This item needs significant development 0= Does not apply</p> <p><u>Importance to address at this time</u> A= High priority B= Medium priority C= Lower priority 0= Does not apply</p>	<p>Institutional Information</p> <p>Institution: <u>Pacifica Graduate Institute</u></p> <p>Type of Review: X Comprehensive for Reaffirmation</p> <p>Date of Submission: 07/21/2017 <small>Mo DayYear</small></p> <p>Institutional Contact: Craig Chalquist, Associate Provost</p>
---	--

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution’s formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution’s purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	1	C	Pacifica has its mission and core value statements published on the PGI website and in Faculty and Staff Handbooks.	https://www.pacifica.edu/about-pacifica/ . Faculty Handbook Student Handbook	
1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2		1	C	Course objectives and student learning outcomes are included in course syllabi. Program goals are assessed via capstone course. Graduation rates, retention rates, measures of student learning, professional licensure, and GE information is tracked by Institutional	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 5: <i>Student Success</i> . Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.	

				Learning Office, provided to program chairs, and made available at the school website: https://www.pacifica.edu/about-pacifica/student-learning/ and: https://www.pacifica.edu/about-pacifica/consumer-information/		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	Faculty Senate updated its Academic Freedom Statement in June 2017. Pacifica's Mission Statement refers to academic freedom as a core commitment. The Student and Faculty Handbook also contain an Academic Freedom Statement.	https://www.pacifica.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Academic-freedom.pdf https://www.pacifica.edu/about-pacifica/. Faculty Handbook Student Handbook	
1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.	2	B	Diversity-minded hiring is ongoing (as evidenced by faculty and staff hiring in 2016-2017), and the Diversity and Inclusion Council has overseen a number of important changes in how diversity is honored at Pacifica (discussed in Chapter 7).	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.	The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.	1	C	Does not apply.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

X 3.6 – 3.10						
<p>1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12</p>	<p>The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.</p>	1	C	<p>Grievance, appeal, and refund information are published on the Pacifica website:</p> <p>https://www.pacifica.edu/student-services/student-grievance-policies-procedures/ - also - https://www.pacifica.edu/financial-aid/financial-aid-recipients-withdrawing/</p> <p>These statements are also published in the Student Handbook and Catalog. Transcripts specify course titles and the kinds of degree credit awarded. Syllabi include specifics on student grading and evaluation.</p> <p>Students may also consult the Student Relations Liaison and appeal to Education Council.</p> <p>PGI adheres to its credit hour policy for all credit-bearing courses and does not issue non-degree credits.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p> <p>Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its		1	C	Transparency and	Audits submitted with	

<p>operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7</p>				<p>integrity is addressed at many levels of the Institution, as indicated in Chapter 3. Finances are audited regularly and independently (see Chapter 7). Grievance information is published online and in Handbooks (https://www.pacifica.edu/student-services/student-grievance-policies-procedures/); a confidential phone number for student grievances is maintained by the Student Relations Liaison.</p>	<p>Annual Report. Annually and for many years, audits have been conducted by the Santa Barbara firm Nasif Hicks Harris, LLP.</p>	
<p>1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.</p>		1	C	<p>Pacifica has maintained an ongoing and responsive conversation with WSCUC. Substantive change policies have been followed (most recently by the Counseling Psychology program in 2013).</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: <i>Introduction</i>.</p> <p>Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

CFR 1.4 emerged as an area needing attention. Progress will continue with diversity training for personnel search committees and a budget for the Diversity and Inclusion Council will be assessed.

One important discovery that emerged that the confidential phone number for the Student Relations Liaison did not tell the caller whom they reached on the voicemail. In response to this discovery, the voice message has been updated.

In review of the published policies and student data information, it was discovered that the Student Learning page on the PGI website needs updating. This is now in progress.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

PGI has a clear mission statement that integrates its traditions in depth psychology with program goals, curriculum, and the overall student experience. A culture of assessment links learning objectives to program goals and tracks data with surveys, capstone evaluation, course evaluation, retention rate reports, graduation rate reports, full transparency on fees and other consumer data, a clear grievance policy in the traditions of restorative justice, and a good relationship with WSCUC.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

Since the last visit by WSCUC, PGI has made substantial gains in diversifying the personnel, student body, and curriculum at Pacifica. There is more to do. With the approval of the provost / acting president, the associate provost and director of human resources are working with the Diversity and Inclusiveness Council to create a diversity hiring handbook for program chairs and to implement initiatives that diversify senior administration.

At its March 8, 2017 meeting, the Institutional Management Committee agreed on a policy of including the appropriate staff and faculty before making decisions with systemic impact. The Institutional Strategic Plan has been updated with this in mind. Implementation is ongoing.

The newsletter *Communitas* maintained by the associate director of academic affairs does a good job of keeping Pacifica staff, faculty, and administrators informed of news at the school. To further increase transparency, the associate provost asked all administrators and program chairs to send around an email whenever a significant change occurred in their department or program. This includes changes of personnel.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

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

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Teaching and Learning						
<p>2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1</p>	<p>The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.</p>	2	B	<p>Pacifica upholds content, rigor, clarity, and performance standards well. PGI's credit policy is met in all courses. Program reviews are ongoing (see Chapter 6), and many invite external peer reviewers. The Clinical and Counseling Programs adhere strictly to appropriate regulatory standards. PGI has qualified faculty, but needs to hire additional core faculty members. For 2018, PGI's plan is to hire two core faculty members above replacement levels.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist".</p>	
<p>2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4</p>		1	C	<p>Entry-level requirements are specified on the Admissions web page.</p> <p>Graduation requirements are published on the website and in the Catalog.</p> <p>Program descriptions are published in the Course Catalog and on the PGI website. The Curriculum</p>	<p>https://www.pacifica.edu/admissions/admission-requirements/</p> <p>https://www.pacifica.edu/student-services/course-catalogs/</p> <p>Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Chapter 3: Degree Programs and Chapter 4: Educational Quality.</p>	

				<p>Review Committee meets annually and on an as-needed basis to review curriculum changes.</p> <p>Expectations for standards of performance are published in syllabi and course assignments. Institutional Learning Office (see Chapter 5) performs program assessment functions. Curriculum maps are included in each program's PAPO (Program Assessment Plan and Outcomes document).</p>		
<p>2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).</p>	N/A	N/A	<p>Pacifica does not offer undergraduate programs.</p>	N/A	
Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice.</p>	<p>Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the</p>	1	C	<p>Doctoral programs at Pacifica have PhD faculty and masters programs have MA or PhD faculty, all with extensive academic expertise in the</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> and Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>.</p>	

<p>Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3</p>	<p>development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.</p>			<p>areas they teach. For 2018, PGI has plans to hire two additional core faculty members above replacement levels.</p> <p>The ILO offers guidance to all programs about program reviews which assess whether PGI's standards are being met.</p> <p>All entering students have at least a baccalaureate; many already have masters.</p>		
<p>2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5</p>	<p>The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.</p>	1	C	<p>SLOs, course objectives and other standards are listed in syllabi, grading rubrics, and the PGI website, and are reviewed annually by program faculty. Outcomes and standards are used to assess performance (see Chapter 4 and Chapter 5).</p> <p>Out-of-class learning activities for credit – primarily independent studies – are subject to credit hour policy and appropriate oversight.</p> <p>There are adequate resources for Clinical Training office (staff, info, guidance, career development sequence) in both Counseling and Clinical programs. Fieldwork experience for CLE and Somatics is</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>.</p>	

				guided by a faculty mentor.		
2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4	Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.	1	C	Student learning outcomes and course objectives are reflected in course syllabi. Faculty regularly evaluate course and program learning outcomes which appear in syllabi and online. All programs engage in ongoing assessment as well as a 5-year Regenerative Cycle of Inquiry. See Chapter 6 for details as well as the "Student Success" component of the Institutional Strategic Plan .	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> , Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i> , and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4		1	C	Programs involve students in planning and assessment (e.g., the Spring 2017 focus groups involving all cohorts). Course evaluations administered and distributed by ILO quarterly. Capstone assessment in all programs ensures that all performance standards are met. All programs have their own assessed practice component. See Chapter 5 .	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

		Self-Review	Importance		Evidence	Team/Staff
--	--	--------------------	-------------------	--	-----------------	-------------------

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Rating (3)	to Address (4)	Comments (5)	(Un-shaded only) (6)	Verification (7)
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4	The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.	1	C	<p>Program goals are assessed via capstones. For examples of student success and performance, see Chapter 5.</p> <p>Student Learning outcomes and course objectives are included in syllabi and reviewed annually by program.</p> <p>Achievement of outcomes and performance standards are evaluated through in-class exercises, assignments, exams, papers, master’s projects, fieldwork, and dissertations.</p>	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i> , Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i> , and Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program’s learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6		1	C	<p>Programs are reviewed annually. Programs are comprehensively reviewed every 5 years. These reviews often include external reviewers brought in from other academic institutions. Counseling was reviewed extensively for an application to COAMFTE. See Chapter 6.</p> <p>Program goal analysis, disaggregated graduation, retention and attrition rates, and licensure examination results are provided by Institutional Learning Office.</p>	<p>Example of Capstone report</p> <p>Example of graduation/retention rate data report</p> <p>Example of licensure report</p> <p>Alumni Survey 2014</p> <p>Example of program review calendar</p> <p>Example of 5-year program review</p> <p>Also addressed during review through Chapter 3: Degree Programs, Chapter 4: Educational Quality, Chapter 5: Student Success, and</p>	

				Alumni surveys collect data about graduates' professional outcome.	Chapter 6: Quality Assurance.		
Scholarship and Creative Activity							
2.8	The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2	Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	2	B	<p>Faculty are typically reviewed every one to three years. Faculty are reviewed in the following areas: teaching; scholarship and professional development; program, institutional, and community service.</p> <p>Faculty are eligible for sabbatical and receive a modest annual research stipend. The provost also has a budget line dedicated to supporting faculty research and scholarship.</p> <p>Faculty publications, lectures, and presentations receive widespread announcement (via <i>Pacifica Post</i>- the online blog, <i>Communitas</i> newsletter, social media outlets).</p>	<p>Faculty handbook</p> <p>Student handbook</p> <p>Faculty publication announcement in Communitas.</p> <p>Faculty development support</p>	
2.9	The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. X 3.2		1	C	Pacifica does not offer tenure, however, many core faculty members have taught at PGI for ten plus years. Core and associate core faculty are evaluated by the Faculty	<p>Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure included in Faculty Handbook.</p> <p>Faculty Contract Designations</p>	

				<p>Review Committee, typically every one to three years.</p> <p>Core and associate core faculty are given a modest annual research stipend and are eligible for sabbatical.</p> <p>Course evaluations are administered and distributed quarterly.</p>		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	1	C	ILO issues annual reports to the programs encompassing assessment of program goals (via capstone activities), licensure rates (for the applicable programs) and graduation/attrition/retention rates disaggregated by ethnicity, gender and age. ILO manages and disseminates student course evaluations. ILO assists programs in running surveys.	Included in Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> .	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		1	C	Co-curricular activities include the Personal Therapy requirement in Clinical Psychology and Counseling Psychology and the Depth Transformative Practices in DJA, Somatics, and	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

				<p>Mythological Studies. Practicum and Internship hours are required by the Clinical and Counseling programs and are monitored by the programs.</p> <p>These activities are monitored and evaluated by the program.</p>		
<p>2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6</p>	<p>Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.</p>	1	C	<p>Degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs are published on the website. Admissions and marketing materials truthfully portray PGI. Each program has faculty advisors and program administrators to dispense current program information and learning expectations. Program requirements and consumer information are also presented on the PGI website.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.</p>	
<p>2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1</p>		2	B	<p>Tutoring and ESL, financial aid counseling, residency, and disability services are all provided; clinical programs provide some career counseling and assistance with professional placement.</p> <p>PGI Student Services</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
----------------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------------

<p>2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process.</p> <p>X 1.6</p>	<p>Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>C</p>	<p>Transfer credit policies and agreements were updated in March 2017, with online information updated at the PGI website. Admissions counselors are familiar with these policies.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: <i>Student Success</i>. Also documented in “Transfer Credit Policy Checklist.”</p>	
--	--	----------	----------	--	--	--

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

CFRs 2.1, 2.8, 2.13 emerged as needing attention. The following need to be considered:

- Increase faculty hiring
- More professional development opportunities for students and faculty
- Need for a career counseling component at PGI. In response, two career consultants have been contacted to conduct pilot studies.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

PGI gathers data from surveys, capstone performance analyses, course evaluations, retention reports, and other forms of evaluation. A culture of assessment and consistent faculty involvement of its importance has been created. Learning outcomes are clearly conveyed (via course syllabi and capstone rubrics) and discussed. PGI consistently performs program review, with chairs aware of how other programs conduct theirs. Curriculum review and faculty review are functional and effective committees that meet annually and on an as-needed basis.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

The review showed that PGI's mapping document (PAPO) needs further review and evaluation. While the information and curricular mapping in the PAPOs is accurate, the document could be streamlined and better integrated in an effort to be more useful and effective. Program goals need further operationalizing with assessment in mind. Some programs need to shift to measuring program goals directly (rather than indirectly via capstone student learning outcomes).

Another important issue to address is grade inflation which continues to be a problem on occasion; this seems to be a faculty training issue, especially among new adjunct faculty.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
<p>3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b</p>	<p>The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.</p>	2	B	<p>Pacifica faculty, staff, and administrators are highly committed to the institution. The BOT has approved the provost's plan to hire more core faculty. Hiring will be guided by HR and by advice from the Diversity and Inclusion Council. Hiring is also part of the Institutional Strategic Plan.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review.</p>	
<p>3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4</p>		2	B	<p>The Faculty Review Council evaluates core and associate core faculty, including emeritus status recommendations. Staff will now receive regular performance appraisals coordinated through HR.</p> <p>All Employees receive a Handbook (Employee/Faculty) that emphasizes the mission, core values, and expectations.</p> <p>HR conducted a workload and job description review of all staff</p>	<p>Faculty Handbook</p>	

				positions in spring 2017.		
3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4	The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	2	B	Adjunct faculty are invited to faculty council meetings and are actively involved in assessment, program review, and faculty development. Generally, department budgets allocate resources for staff development. Faculty participate actively in ongoing assessment and in the annual and 5-year program review cycle. OPUS Research Center and Archives offers research and presentation opportunities to faculty.	Faculty development support	
Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources						
3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7	The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.	1	C	Pacifica does not have an operational deficit and has not for the past 3 years. An updated enrollment plan is part of the Institutional Strategic Plan . Program chairs and department directors are involved in budget planning. Resources are aligned with the institute's educational purposes and objectives. Retreat Center income helps diversify revenue sources.	Audits submitted with Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i> .	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.</p> <p>X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2</p>	<p>The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.</p>	2	B	<p>PGI utilizes technology to achieve its educational objectives. The online learning platform, D2L, has been utilized for years and has 1-2 dedicated staff members to support faculty, students, and staff with it. Training is available on an as-needed basis. Tutorials are readily available.</p> <p>Student Services is launching a new Academic Enhancement Portal to provide additional resources for incoming students.</p>	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
<p>3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.</p>		1	C	<p>The president and provost report regularly to the BOT and share these reports and many key decisions with the Institutional Management Committee, the Senate Leadership Committee, the Academic Senate, Operations Team, and weekly in the Circle of Chairs.</p>	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
<p>3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational</p>	<p>The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.</p>	1	C	<p>The Institutional Management Committee recently updated the</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

effectiveness.				school's organizational chart and Institutional Strategic Plan with input from several stakeholders including faculty, staff, and students.		
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		2	B	The president, interim CFO, and associate provost administratively oversee Pacifica and are voting members of the IMC. Other non-voting members of the IMC include the dean of academic affairs, academic senate president, and senior director of student support services. Two senior staff directors serve jointly in the capacity of COO.	CEO/President position description CFO position description	
3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7	The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	1	C	The BOT is an independent governing board that oversees key administrative and financial decisions.	Board of Trustees of Pacifica ; Board committees and members ; Board bylaws ; CEO evaluation process .	
3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.	1	C	Chairs meet every week to discuss academic quality, purpose, and procedure. Faculty Governance Committees include Academic Senate, Senate Leadership Committee (SLC), and the Faculty Well-Being Committee. The Senate Leadership Committee meets once a month and the Academic Senate once a quarter. Several committees meet	Bylaws of the Academic Senate Faculty Contract Designations Faculty Well-Being Committee	

				every week or every other (e.g., Education Council). See Chapter 7 .		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Several CFRs appeared as needing our attention, but were also identified as a medium priority, including CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.8. Some specifics include:

- the need for an updated organizational chart (approved by the Board of Trustees in May 2017).
- more staff in IT and training available for faculty, staff, and students

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

PGI has avoided being in a financial deficit and its stability and reputation is strong enough to warrant expansion into areas which may provide new sources of revenue (ie the Retreat). At all levels, Pacifica employees remain extremely loyal to the mission and vision of the school.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

Cross-training IT personnel, upgrading equipment, and offering more training and development to faculty and staff are important priorities.

Increase in the number of core faculty.

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
<p>4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10</p>		1	C	<p>Every program undergoes annual program review and 5-year review; annual review includes review of curriculum and PLO's; The Curriculum Review Committee all curricular changes. Several surveys have explored student learning and satisfaction. Student focus groups are now ongoing on an annual basis. Student learning is monitored regularly. Capstone analyses are used to ensure the achievement of program goals.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10</p>		1	C	<p>The ILO regularly provides chairs with assessment review data as well as disaggregated retention and graduation data. PGI maintains a reports webpage as a tool for analyzing demographics, graduation rates, retention/attrition, etc. Board and Institutional Management Committee decisions are data-driven (see Chapter 8).</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>.</p>	

Institutional Learning and Improvement

<p>4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.</p>	1	C	<p>Institutional Management Committee, SLC, the Academic Senate, the Directors, and the Chairs make policy decisions based on continual inquiry and research data. Institutional Management Committee oversees significant changes and makes recommendations to the BOT.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: <i>Degree Programs</i>, Component 4: <i>Educational Quality</i>, Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i>, and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
---	---	---	---	--	---	--

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
<p>4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6</p>	<p>Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.</p>	1	C	<p>Chairs meet weekly and discuss performance standards and teaching practices. All classes require student evaluation of instruction and class content and process. Survey data inform curricular changes. See Chapter 5. An institute-wide grading policy is in place.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7</p>		1	C	<p>Surveys and focus groups regularly gather student and alumni feedback on a variety of issues. External reviewers involve peers in 5-year program reviews. Faculty and chairs consult regularly with peers about best educational practices.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence.</p>		1	C	<p>Pacifica has updated its Board-approved Institutional Strategic</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and</p>	

<p>These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3</p>				<p>Plan with feedback from all levels of the school as coordinated by the Institutional Learning Office.</p>	<p>Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	
<p>4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.</p>		1	C	<p>Institutional Management Committee, faculty, and the Board are in continual discussion about how to adapt to ongoing changes. See Chapter 8 for a summary.</p>	<p>Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: <i>Quality Assurance</i> and Component 7: <i>Sustainability</i>.</p>	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

All of the CFRs in this Standard were identified as a high priority. Some specifics:

- Everyone needs to be involved at every level in updating the Strategic Plan. This is being carried out under Institutional Learning Office oversight.
- Institutional Learning Office has received feedback from chairs about the need for better access to demographic and other data from Admissions. This was implemented June 2017.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

Much data has been gathered and analyzed over the years from multiple surveys, course evaluations and focus groups among many constituents at all levels. Chairs and the majority of faculty are highly cooperative and educated about ongoing assessment and work well with Institutional Learning Office and Institutional Management Committee. The Institutional Learning Office has an assessment model for evaluating program goals via capstones and provides the results – along with disaggregated graduation, retention and attrition rates – to the programs.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

Chair access to Admissions data (achieved June 2017).

Completion of update of Strategic Plan, including adaptation to ongoing changes and allocation of resources over the next five years (completed and approved by the Board in June 2017).

The curricular mapping documents (PAPO's) need to be streamlined to be more transparent and useful including the need for some programs need to assess program goals more directly.

Summative Questions

1. Who participated in preparing this self-inventory? What approach was used in completing the worksheet?

Weekly meetings of Institutional Learning Office and Liaisons led the process (11 members), with input from Institutional Management Committee and the Operations Council. A diverse group including representatives of faculty, staff, administrators, and board members, were surveyed for a total of 25 respondents with a 77% response rate. The mode for the Self-Review Rating and Importance to Address columns was reported as the consensus for the campus. Student focus groups for each program were run to provide more detailed information about student perceptions of PGI's strengths and weaknesses.

2. What areas emerged as institutional strengths that could be highlighted in the institutional report?

PGI has a clear mission statement that links its traditions in depth psychology to what is offered to students; a culture of assessment throughout the school that links learning objectives to academic offerings and tracks data with surveys and ongoing evaluation; full transparency on fees, curriculum, retention, and other consumer data; a clear grievance policy in the traditions of restorative justice; and a good relationship with WSCUC.

The Institutional Learning Office gathers data from surveys and other forms of evaluation. Learning outcomes are clearly conveyed in course syllabi and capstone rubrics and are reviewed regularly by programs. Program review is ongoing with chairs aware of how all programs conduct theirs.

3. What areas were identified as issues or concerns to be addressed before the review?

The need for core faculty hiring, staff performance reviews, continuation of diversity awareness in hiring, career resources for students, were identified as areas of growth.

4. What are the next steps in preparing for the review?

Close the loop by sharing these results with the Institutional Management Committee, Program Chairs, and Operations Council. Task forces were created to address outstanding issues raised by the Review Under WASC Standards survey. Meetings with the ILO and Liaisons were held on a weekly basis, versus quarterly basis, to prepare for the review. Feedback was collected from the Board, IMC, Liaisons, and Operations Council to incorporate into the 2017 Institutional Report and Strategic Plan.

FEDERAL COMPLIANCE FORMS

OVERVIEW

There are four forms that WSCUC uses to address institutional compliance with some of the federal requirements affecting institutions and accrediting agencies:

- 1 – Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form
- 2 – Marketing and Recruitment Review Form
- 3 – Student Complaints Review Form
- 4 – Transfer Credit Policy Review Form

Teams complete these four forms and add them as appendices to the team report. They are included here in order for the institution to provide the necessary information for the team. Teams are not required to include a narrative about any of these matters in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings, Commendations, and Recommendations section of the team report.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Credit Hour - §602.24(f)

The accrediting agency, as part of its review of an institution for renewal of accreditation, must conduct an effective review and evaluation of the reliability and accuracy of the institution's assignment of credit hours.

(1) The accrediting agency meets this requirement if-

(i) It reviews the institution's-

(A) Policies and procedures for determining the credit hours, as defined in 34 CFR 600.2, that the institution awards for courses and programs; and

(B) The application of the institution's policies and procedures to its programs and coursework; and

(ii) Makes a reasonable determination of whether the institution's assignment of credit hours conforms to commonly accepted practice in higher education.

(2) In reviewing and evaluating an institution's policies and procedures for determining credit hour assignments, an accrediting agency may use sampling or other methods in the evaluation.

Credit hour is defined by the Department of Education as follows:

A credit hour is an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutionally established equivalency that reasonably approximates not less than—

(1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or

(2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Credit Hour Policy.

Program Length - §602.16(a)(1)(viii)

Program length may be seen as one of several measures of quality and as a proxy measure for scope of the objectives of degrees or credentials offered. Traditionally offered degree programs are generally approximately 120 semester credit hours for a bachelor's degree, and 30 semester credit hours for a master's degree; there is greater variation at the doctoral level depending on the type of program. For programs offered in non-traditional formats, for which program length is not a relevant and/or reliable quality measure, reviewers should ensure that available information clearly defines desired program outcomes and graduation requirements, that institutions are ensuring that program outcomes are achieved, and that there is a reasonable correlation between the scope of these outcomes and requirements and those typically found in traditionally offered degrees or programs tied to program length.

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? YES
	If so, where is the policy located? PGI Student Handbook , page 18
	Comments: At Pacifica, since we are on a ten- to twelve-week quarterly system, one credit hour equals ten hours in the residential classroom and in the online environment; the latter includes listening to or viewing the faculty online presentations and participating in the related discussion boards, plus a minimum of three hours of out-of-class student work for each week of the quarter, which represents a 1:3 ratio between instruction and independent work.
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? YES
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? YES
	Comments: The new course approval procedure and review of credit hour assignments is conducted by the Curriculum Review Committee.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? YES
	Comments: The contact hours for each course is included in the curriculum overview for each program. Examples: Depth Psychology Therapy/Psychotherapy specialization , Mythological Studies , Clinical PhD . Session schedules contain the actual times the courses meet on-ground. Examples: Depth Psychology Therapy/Psychotherapy specialization , Mythological Studies , Clinical PhD . The session schedules are posted on public bulletin boards located in the places students assemble.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 15
	Type of courses reviewed: hybrid
	What degree level(s)? MA & Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Humanities, Jungian Psychology and Archetypal Studies specialization (DJA)
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? YES
	Comments: Example of Hybrid (Depth Psychology specialization DJA) syllabus , Example of Hybrid (Humanities Program) syllabus , Example of Hybrid (Depth Psychology specialization DJA) session schedule , Example of Hybrid (Depth Psychology specialization DJA and Humanities) curriculum overview

<p>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)</p> <p><i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i></p>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 15
	What kinds of courses? Independent study
	What degree level(s)? MA & Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology, Depth Psychology, Humanities, Mythological Studies
	Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? YES
	Comments: Independent studies are granted by a program only for courses required for a degree. Programs typically use existing syllabi to guide the independent study.
<p>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</p>	How many programs were reviewed? 9
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Clinical Psychology Phd, Clinical Psychology PsyD, Mythological Studies, Counseling Psychology, Humanities, Depth Psychology
	What degree level(s)? MA & Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Clinical Psychology Phd, Mythological Studies, Counseling Psychology, Humanities, Depth Psychology
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of an acceptable length? YES

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
**Federal Requirements	Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: We do not offer an incentive to employees and they are not rewarded for their success in enrolling students.
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: This information can be found in our Gainful Employment sections on our website. The cost of attendance can also be found in our Financial Aid section. Humanities: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/engaged-humanities/gainful-employment-engaged-humanities/ Clinical: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/ph-d-clinical-psychology/gainful-employment-clinical-psychology/ Mythology: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/mythological-studies/gainful-employment-mythological-studies/ Counseling: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/masters-counseling-psychology/gainful-employment-counseling-psychology/ Depth Psychology: https://www.pacifica.edu/depth-psychology-gainful-employment/ Cost of Attendance: https://www.pacifica.edu/financial-aid/cost-attendance-2017-2018/
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: All of this information can be found in our Gainful Employment section on our website as well as the Degree Programs pages. Humanities: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/engaged-humanities/gainful-employment-engaged-humanities/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/engaged-humanities/ Clinical: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/ph-d-clinical-psychology/gainful-employment-clinical-psychology/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/ph-d-clinical-psychology/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/psy-d-clinical-psychology/

	<p>Mythology: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/mythological-studies/gainful-employment-mythological-studies/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/mythological-studies/</p> <p>Counseling: https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/masters-counseling-psychology/gainful-employment-counseling-psychology/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/masters-counseling-psychology/</p> <p>Depth Psychology: https://www.pacifica.edu/depth-psychology-gainful-employment/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/community-liberation-ecopsychology/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/integrative-therapy-healing-practices/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/jungian-psychology-archetypal-studies/ https://www.pacifica.edu/degree-program/somatic-studies/</p>
--	---

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

3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

(See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? YES
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? YES If so, where? Student Handbook pages 47-50 https://wascsenior.box.com/s/xfausqvndda69jnel71dpx3ytsz4w7a1
	Comments: The Student Handbook describes the policy and procedures for student grievances.
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? YES If so, please describe briefly</p> <p>Procedure for Resolving Academic and Administrative Complaints:</p> <p>Students are encouraged to first discuss complaints with the person(s) who is (are) directly involved in the complaint in an effort to come to a satisfactory, informal resolution. If these informal direct discussions are not successful, the student may pursue further informal avenues as defined within each academic program. The Program Chair, Student Affairs representative, or Student Relations Liaison may be involved in discussing possible resolutions or can be of assistance in directing a student to the appropriate person. If the matter relates to the student's financial account, it may be referred to the Student Accounts Committee.</p> <p>Before filing a formal grievance, Pacifica encourages students to use established program procedures for addressing and resolving complaints whenever possible. In some cases, students or faculty may be directed to the Ethics Committee for consultation or to the Educational Council for consideration of exceptions to academic policies. If it is determined that the student complaint is appropriate for consideration by the Education Council, the Education Council will review the matter in accordance with its procedures and its decision will be final, subject to review by the Provost as described in Education Council procedures. When Education Council review is not appropriate, or where other specific and separate grievance procedures are not applicable, students may file a formal grievance according to the procedures described below. When an Education Council review is conducted, there will not be a duplicative grievance procedure.</p>

	<p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? YES</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>The Student Relations Liaison position is intended as an additional support for students who are seeking information and mediation regarding the grievance processes related to policies described in the Student Handbook. One of the key responsibilities of the Liaison is to create communication between students and their faculty, staff, and administration regarding creation of fair and positive solutions that uphold Pacifica's standards and values as well as to address student's questions and concerns. The Student Relations Liaison can be reached at a confidential phone line.</p>
Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? YES If so, where? Academic complaints are adjudicated by the Education Council. Records of Education Council decisions are saved by the Registrar in the student files. Non-academic complaints are registered with the Student Liaison Officer for each program, who maintains a digital record of the complaints.</p> <p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? YES If so, please describe briefly: Academic complaints are adjudicated by the Education Council. Records of Education Council decisions are saved by the Registrar in the student files. Non-academic complaints are registered with the Student Liaison Officer for each program, who maintains a digital record of the complaints.</p> <p>Comments:</p>

4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM

Under federal requirements*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting, transfer, and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? YES
	If so, is the policy publicly available? YES If so, where? Online: https://www.pacifica.edu/admissions/#transfer and in Student Handbook, page 15 https://wascsenior.box.com/s/xfausqyndda69jnel71dxdp3ytsz4w7a1
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? YES
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Effective fall 2017, up to 16 quarter units in transfer credit may be accepted at both the master's and doctoral levels-from external regionally accredited institutions or their foreign equivalent, and up to 16 quarter units in transfer credit may be accepted from another Pacifica Graduate Institute program, unless there is an approved Transfer Credit Agreement between programs that specifies an alternate number of units. Please consult an admissions advisor regarding Transfer Credit Agreements.</p> <p>Due to Pacifica's emphasis in depth psychology, course content from other institutions may not be equivalent. Transfer credit requests will be reviewed by Pacifica faculty whose credentials lie in the discipline of the course request for transfer. The request will be approved or denied and the applicant will be notified of the decision. The decision will be final and is not subject to appeal. Partial unit credit will not be approved.</p> <p>All transferable courses must have been completed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. at an outside institution no more than four years prior to matriculation at Pacifica Graduate Institute. • b. at Pacifica Graduate Institute no more than five years prior to matriculation for courses transferred from a master's program at Pacifica Graduate Institute. • c. at Pacifica Graduate Institute no more than eight years prior to matriculation for courses transferred from a doctoral program at Pacifica Graduate Institute. <p>The process of selecting courses for transfer credit requests and completion of documentation is the responsibility of the applicant/student, as well as converting semester units into quarter units. Transfer Credit Request Forms and all accompanying documentation must be submitted to the Office of Admissions during the application period, at least 6 weeks prior to the start of the program to allow time for transfer credit requests to be reviewed and approved.</p>

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

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

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

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission's Transfer of Credit Policy.