



FIELDING
Graduate University

QUALITY • FLEXIBILITY • COMMUNITY

RE-ACCREDITATION PROPOSAL

FROM

FIELDING GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

TO

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Submitted May 15, 2006

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Institutional Background

Fielding was incorporated as the Fielding Institute, a non-profit educational corporation, on March 11, 1974, and was first authorized to grant degrees under the California Education Code in July 1974. The Institute changed its legal name to Fielding Graduate Institute in July 2001. As a result of growth in the number and nature of its degree programs and the organization of Schools of Psychology, Human & Organization Development (HOD), and Educational Leadership & Change (ELC), Fielding changed its name to Fielding Graduate University in the Fall 2004. The Board of Trustees formally approved each name change after extensive consultation, and WASC was notified in each instance.

The original concept for Fielding arose from the experiences of its three founders (Frederic Hudson, Hallock Hoffman and Renata Tesch) and their colleagues on the first Board (Marie Fielder, Robert Goulding, Jonathan Warren, among others) who saw the need for a place where mid-career and mid-life adults could pursue high-quality graduate education designed for adult learners. The purposes of the founders remain clear in Fielding's current Mission Statement:

Fielding Graduate University prepares its graduates through its innovative doctoral and master's programs, collaborative learning model, and continuing professional education to serve as reflective professionals. Graduates integrate theory, research, and values with high integrity practice and scholarship in Psychology, Human & Organization Development, and Educational Leadership & Change by synthesizing professional and personal growth, promoting diversity, and optimizing the use of appropriate technology.

Fielding's distributed learning educational model allows students to remain in their home communities and workplaces while simultaneously integrating Fielding studies into their daily lives. In addition to disciplinary and professional requirements, faculty are selected in proximity to students and distributed around the country to afford greater opportunities for face-to-face engagement. Administrative and academic support is centralized in the Santa Barbara offices. The model provides numerous opportunities for students, faculty and staff to meet and work together periodically at multiple locations around the country, e.g., through regional clusters and residential sessions of varying sizes and with various purposes.

Each of Fielding's degree programs has an established curricular structure and competency-based goals.

To ensure relevant and high quality learning, doctoral students negotiate individualized learning contracts called Knowledge Areas or KAs with faculty. They use the established curriculum to formulate learning goals unique to each student's needs, interests, and level of competence. Doctoral students complete a required number of tailored Knowledge Areas with many different Fielding faculty. This design provides exposure to multiple role models and to a breadth and depth of knowledge commensurate with doctoral-level work and the applied skills needed for professional careers. Students pursue completion of Knowledge Areas in a variety of formats, ranging from individual study to online or face-to-face group seminars and varied combinations in between. Following completion of the requisite curriculum, including a comprehensive assessment, all doctoral students complete a dissertation; students in the terminal master's programs do capstone projects. Students in the Clinical Psychology program also complete a sequence of rigorous clinical requirements (e.g., training, practicum, and internship) and residency hours.

Dr. Judith L. Kuipers, Fielding's President since August 2000, has devoted substantial effort to the development of an experienced leadership team drawn from both higher education and the business world. Since 2000, she appointed two new Deans, an Executive Vice-President for Institutional Partnerships, a new Chief Financial Officer, a new Chief Development Officer, and a new Vice-President for Human Resources & Administration. She expanded the Associate Provost for Research role to include Chief Learning Officer, now also responsible for information and communication technology functions. Since 1998, the number of Santa Barbara-based academic and administrative staff increased from 75 to over 100 people to better support the growth and diversity of programs. Additional positions include: two Associate Deans for ELC; Program Directors for HOD's and ELC's Master's programs, Psychology's Neuropsychology Certificate Program, and the Media Psychology Program. We also added a Distributed Education Services Librarian; a Director of Marketing & Recruitment; a Director of Communications & Community Relations; an Institutional Review Board Administrator; Advising and Admissions positions; and an Administrative Assistant for Research and Library Services. Importantly, we have also added almost 20 new faculty positions (full and part-time).

In recognition of Fielding's increasing academic diversity and complexity, in the Summer 2001, Fielding reorganized as three schools, each headed by its own dean. Previously, each dean headed only his/her respective doctoral program (that is, Psychology, Human & Organization Development, and Educational Leadership & Change). Deans are now responsible for doctoral and master's programs as well as certificate and continuing education programs in their respective fields. Since

the implementation of the three schools, Deans have created new programs, initiatives, and related centers. For example, the Dean of the School of Psychology oversees a pioneering doctoral program in Media Psychology and the Alonso Center for Psychodynamic Studies. The Dean of the School of Human & Organization Development initiated a Center for Innovation in the Nonprofit Sector with a grant from the Irvine Foundation as well as several Certificate and Lifelong Learning programs, engaged the entire HOD community in a futuring study to ensure a strategic and relevant approach to adult learning in the 21st century, and supports a Creative Longevity and Wisdom initiative focused on aging well. Congruent with Fielding's commitment to being attuned to student and community needs, the Dean of the School of Educational Leadership & Change is championing a Master's program in Collaborative Educational Leadership and expanding doctoral concentrations in Community College Leadership, Media Studies, and Grounded Theory/Grounded Action, as well as a professional development program for "Teaching in the Virtual Classroom."

Strengths and Challenges

To date, Dr. Kuipers has led the successful implementation of two strategic plans with the recurring theme "Transforming Graduate Education and Research to Improve Society." Evidence about the extent to which the goals of these plans have been met is documented in a variety of sources including financial information, institutional and school growth information, faculty profile and compensation, and results from the Preliminary Self-Review for the General Standards.

In the Preliminary Self-Review, institutional reflection and planning for strategic position (CFR 4.1) were perceived to be strengths university-wide. Increasing numbers and quality of student applicants provide evidence of enhanced institutional reputation and prestige. Further evidence can be found in the results of the Self-Review which revealed strengths related to graduate program purpose, professionalism, nomenclature, and curricula (CFR 2.2). Our demographic statistics and our status as one of the leading institutions graduating doctorates in education among Native American and African-American communities demonstrate success in increasing diversity among the faculty, students, and within curricula (CFR 1.5). An initiative exploring the utilization of non-western epistemologies as core components of doctoral study is well underway.

We have identified support of the work of scholar-practitioners (CFR 2.8, CFR 2.9) as a strength in the Self-Review. New institutional policies, resources for and expectations of student learning and attainment (CFR 2.3) support this claim. Successful new programs (e.g., Media Psychology) have been developed building on existing programmatic models and in coordination and articulation with

current degree programs (e.g., Certificate Program in Evidence-Based Coaching). We have also created specialties within degree programs (the charter school concentration within the MA in Collaborative Educational Leadership) (Standard 4).

Our technological capability has increased at the same time that a comprehensive audit of our technology infrastructure and a survey of the user community have led to an ambitious plan for the future (CFR 3.7). Library services have improved through increases in the numbers and quality of databases available to students as well as staff resources needed to support their effective use by students and faculty (CFR 2.13).

Through sound fiscal management Fielding has surpassed the U.S. Department of Education financial responsibility requirements, and financial reserve growth targets have been exceeded for each of the past two years. With the leadership of a cross-university Academic Human Resources Committee, we have established appropriate benchmarks for faculty compensation and made considerable progress in meeting them. Our campaign to raise \$3,000,000 for endowment, scholarships and program development has also been successful (CFR 3.5).

Fielding is currently engaged in a university-wide process to develop a 3-year strategic plan for consideration by the Board of Trustees at its October, 2006 meeting. Three areas have emerged as strategic priorities. The first is *academic excellence* which includes: further development of cultural competence and understanding of diversity across the curriculum; enhancing the research culture through the continuing development of the scholar-practitioner model; encouraging and supporting relevant faculty training and development; delivering our academic programs in ways that insure design efficiency and cost effectiveness for the student. Our second strategic priority is *learning community effectiveness* which includes: building capacity through improved infrastructure and organizational processes; improving morale at all levels and increasing alumni engagement in the life of the institution. The third strategic priority is *institutional development* including: working within and across university disciplines; collaborating with external partners; promoting and branding our identity and reputation as a uniquely effective learning organization.

Current State of Approaches to Identifying and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes Across the Institution

After a site visit in Fall, 1998, in March, 1999, the Senior Commission reaffirmed Fielding's accreditation and requested a Special Visit in 2003 to follow up on improvements in research culture,

faculty evaluation, and educational effectiveness as well as to address a set of issues concerning institutional alignment and financial stability.

In addition to noting significant progress in other areas, the WASC Site Team of 2003 observed that Fielding had made major strides in establishing indicators of educational effectiveness:

Fielding continues its excellent and consistent student and graduate assessment through a rich variety of data collection: certificates of completion, program competencies, knowledge assessments, session evaluations, learning programs, comprehensive exams, portfolio reviews, and alumni and student surveys. The Schools have each developed and deepened assessment and collection of evidence regarding program educational effectiveness and several aspects of Institutional effectiveness. Overall, Fielding has begun taking steps to institutionalize comprehensive data collection and collection of evidence on a broader enterprise level. However, when a collection of Institutional and School/Program goals were extracted from a variety of Fielding materials, e.g., websites, strategic plans, brochures, and other documents, there was not a consistent, clear, and cross-organizational alignment of evidence.

Achieving the desired level of consistency, clarity and alignment of our educational effectiveness remains an ongoing challenge. However, each program has put in place a number of processes that have had initial success in creating greater institutional coherence. In addition to the Clinical Psychology's extensive program review in combination with the American Psychological Association reaccreditation process, the ELC doctoral program has engaged in a comprehensive program review in conjunction with the 10-year anniversary of its founding. The online master's program in HOD has undertaken an intensive program review which is well-documented in online archives. Finally, Fielding has strengthened the role of its university governance body--the Fielding Council--especially as a venue for university-wide communication.

More specifically, we have implemented an online Certificate of Completion (COC)--a web-based tool for assessing student work on Knowledge Areas by evaluating papers and deliverables using a set of doctoral competencies as the standard. The COC is not only a vehicle for aligning faculty assessment of student work with programmatic and university learning objectives, but it will also serve as the template for new evaluation tools to assist internal and external dissertation review. These web-based dissertation evaluation tools will be in place by the end of 2007. These efforts when reviewed alongside the overall strategic planning effort and the targeted assessments of information technology, student satisfaction and regional accreditation form a solid foundation for the additional analyses and actions described below.

Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Involvement

In December, 2004, the Provost convened a WASC Steering Committee (SC) consisting of six faculty members, three members from staff, the Associate Provost for Research, and the faculty co-chair of the Fielding Council. SC members attended the WASC Proposal Review meeting in Pomona in January 2005. In February 2005, the SC held a teleconference meeting, followed in May by its first SC face-to-face meeting.

During the May meeting, the SC decided to engage the entire Fielding community in the process of self-evaluation, self-reflection, and dialogue, including ongoing updates to, consultation with, and feedback from management and governance bodies (e.g., the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board, the President's Leadership Team, the Fielding Council, programmatic governance retreats, the Academic Council, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee). In June 2005, a WASC folder was created on the online Fielding Community Wide forum, and the SC sent the WASC worksheets to the community-at-large for completion. In July 2005, the Provost and Associate Provost met with faculty at program governance retreats to discuss the WASC process and to elicit further participation.

In August, 2005, the SC held a teleconference followed by a face-to-face meeting in September. Between July and September, we conducted another round of data collection based on the WASC worksheets. In addition, the SC solicited feedback to determine how best to communicate with various constituencies in the future (i.e., email, online forum, face-to-face cluster meetings and sessions, teleconferences). During October and November, 2005, the SC and its Data Work subgroup finalized descriptions of currently available data. During this time, the data from the WASC worksheet as well as feedback from subsequent inquiries were analyzed.

The original self-review, based on the WASC Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards, queried all constituencies at Fielding about their perceptions of institutional strengths. It asked them to identify priorities for institutional review, assessment, evaluation, and further action. Fifty-seven respondents, representing all Fielding constituencies, completed the worksheet. Frequencies within each category were compiled to determine the percentage of respondents rating each Standard or CFR as a Strength or as a Priority. In addition to examining the ratings, all comments were listed and common and/or repetitive themes were identified. A summary of the findings from this inquiry is attached in Appendix 14. The faculty had an opportunity to review and discuss the findings at their governance retreats in July, 2005. The faculty recommended that a

shorter summary be written in “plain[er] English” and that an electronic version be distributed to all members of the community in order to obtain additional clarification about the intent and meaning of respondents’ comments. Subsequent to the distribution of a shorter summary, two rounds of follow up yielded more input from an expanding number of community members. At the governance retreats in January and February, 2006, faculty and students received summaries of identified themes and a final appeal for additional input or clarification. All told, the Steering Committee received written comments from 87 individual faculty, as well as 165 staff, alumni, and students.

In January, 2006, the SC met in Santa Barbara to review findings. Later that month, the Provost and Associate Provost met with faculty at governance retreats to review progress to date and to elicit further participation and data. Based on the survey findings, the Provost briefed and obtained feedback from the Fielding Council. By the February teleconference meeting of the SC, members had contacted their constituencies for further definition of issues and reported the responses. Also, during February, the Provost was designated as liaison from the SC to the Fielding-wide Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). In March, the Provost briefed the Academic Affairs committee of the Board and the full Board about the SC’s activities and undertakings. In April, the Board Academic Affairs Committee, President’s Leadership Team, Fielding Council, School Leadership, and SPSC reviewed drafts of the institutional proposal. Finally, in May, 2006, the penultimate proposal draft was presented to the full Board at its semi-annual meeting.

Preliminary Self-review Under Standards – Key Issues

The results of the Preliminary Self-Review for the General Standards showed that Standards 1 and 2 were Strengths while Standards 3 and 4 were Priorities for action. Nevertheless, within each Standard, there were specific areas that merited further exploration and attention.

The strongest priorities for attention, as stated in WASC terms in Standard 3, were: sufficiency of numbers of personnel (CFR 3.1), the alignment of fiscal and physical resources with institutional purposes (CFR 3.5), and sufficient support and coordination of information technology (CFR 3.7). In Standard 4, the key issue involved evaluating institutional, programmatic and educational effectiveness (CFR 4.4). Data for Standard 1 suggest performance, responsibility, and accountability of leadership requires some focus (CFR1.3). Institutional indicators of educational objectives throughout the institution (CFR1.2), and diversity (CFR1.5) were also mentioned. Finally for Standard 2, appropriateness, quality, and sufficiency of program content, standards, and faculty

(CFR2.1) were highlighted along with shared development and review of expectations for learning and student attainment (CFR2.4).

Using the findings above as well as written comments and verbal feedback, two additional cycles of queries/surveys were conducted with faculty, staff, students, and alumni to clarify the meaning of key issues. As a result, specific priorities for improvement and evaluation of concrete outcomes were identified in the areas of alignment, infrastructure, and effectiveness:

- Alignment: leadership and leadership systems; faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive and evaluation practices; and coordination of information technology resources.
- Infrastructure: levels of human, fiscal, physical and technology resources as well as institutional reflection and planning processes needed to support current and future programs.
- Effectiveness: the use of information technology to support key academic purposes; the implementation of our strategic plans; university-wide indicators of educational objectives; the shared expectations of faculty for student work; and quality assurance processes.

These priorities serve as the foundation for and will be further described in the sections below on the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews.

FRAMING THE REVIEW PROCESS TO CONNECT THE CAPACITY AND EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEWS

Overview and Goals for the Accreditation Review Process

Capacity and effectiveness are clearly interrelated in the issues that surfaced in the self-review. Organizational structures, technological processes, faculty and staff support, and leadership accountability must not only be addressed as stand alone items, but also in relation to each other in order to maximize organizational capacity. Success at Fielding has often been achieved despite inefficiencies that have grown incrementally as the institution has increased in size and complexity. Making capacity improvements will enhance the university's ability to monitor and document institutional effectiveness and success in achieving educational outcomes.

Specific outcomes for the entire accrediting process will be:

- Clarification of the roles and responsibilities of management and governance bodies and key individuals; delineation of accountability mechanisms for each
- Improvements in and ongoing evaluation of information technology capacities, especially in supporting Fielding as a learning organization

- Documentation of the outcomes and efficacy of Fielding’s Strategic Plan especially as it contributes to educational effectiveness
- Improvement in evaluative processes to ensure faculty consistency in assessing the quality of academic work within programs as well as university-wide, especially regarding dissertations
- Better understanding of impact of a Fielding education in the lives and careers of alumni

Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review

We see the CPR as an opportunity to address the overarching question: What must Fielding do to enhance requisite capacity for growth while remaining true to its mission of offering premier distributed education programs for scholar-practitioners? Monitored by the various committees of the Board, the President’s Leadership Team (PLT) will take central responsibility for addressing these issues in consultation with the Fielding Council. The PLT’s membership includes: the President, Provost, Deans, CFO, Chief Learning Officer, VP for HR & Administration, Chief Development Officer, and Executive VP for Institutional Partnerships. Implementation of the strategic plan will guide most of the specific activities undertaken in this area.

Some examples of the work already undertaken in this regard are:

- Evaluation of our Mission, Vision & Values and the formulation of strategic priorities (i.e., academic excellence, learning community effectiveness, and institutional development) by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee [SPSC]
- IT audit and survey that will include a multi-year project plan
- Comprehensive evaluation of the Board and President conducted by a consultant from the Association of Governing Boards
- Implementation of a diversity action plan
- Implementation of a 30 Year Anniversary Campaign
- Funding of university-wide faculty/student teams to conduct institutional research projects

Most relevant to the Educational Effectiveness Review are the following capacity-related projects:

- 1) refinements to the program review process;
- 2) responding to the results of a student satisfaction survey;
- 3) technological initiatives that enable faculty and external reviewers to provide feedback and evaluation of student learning products through internet-based web pages into our enterprise resources database; and
- 4) reformulation of the institution’s relationship with its alumni.

In sum, in the CPR we will evaluate whether all the necessary pieces of the infrastructure are present and best organized to achieve desired goals (CFR 3.5, CFR 1.3, CFR 1.5). In particular, we will examine the extent to which there is alignment among leadership, faculty, programs, processes and stated goals and objectives so as to promote greater institutional effectiveness (CFR 3.1) supported by optimum use of technology (CFR 3.7).

Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The framing question for the EER is: How do we mature as an educationally effective, coherent graduate university of scholar-practitioners while honoring programmatic differences and our commitment to the individual adult student? To answer this question, we will address variations within as well as across programs regarding standards and outcomes and their consistency with our overall institutional purposes. The Academic Council, including its standing committees and school-based governance committees, will take primary responsibility for these issues with oversight and monitoring by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board. Members of the Academic Council include: the Provost, Deans, Associate Provost for Research & Learning, Registrar, Director of Academic Resources, and Director of Marketing & Recruitment. The faculty will participate in this effort primarily through institutional and programmatic governance teams.

Specific work to be undertaken includes:

- Assess the impact of program review on improvement of educational outcomes
- Building on existing Knowledge Area evaluation systems, create web-based process for dissertation evaluation; use of both processes for program improvement
- Evaluate alumni data obtained through an enhanced web interface as well as systematic alumni engagement.

In sum, the EER will evaluate whether our processes for evaluating institutional, programmatic and educational effectiveness (CFR 4.4 and 1.2) are resulting in the kind consistency in faculty standards and institutional quality we desire and claim (CFR 2.1 and CFR 2/4).

DEMONSTRATING A FEASIBLE PLAN OF WORK AND ENGAGEMENT OF KEY CONSTITUENCIES

Work Plan and Milestones

Because of our relatively small size and limitations in resources, Fielding has developed an approach to engaging in WASC-related undertakings that fits our institutional character. Institutional research of two types is coordinated by Fielding's Office of Research. In addition to institutionally managed evaluation research, we engaged faculty, students, and alumni to design and complete research projects which satisfy institutional research objectives. The primary goal is to obtain research outcomes that can be used in the process of ongoing institutional improvement. A secondary goal is to create ongoing processes to provide the foundation for ongoing institutional research.

The work proposed here is conducted in four parallel and ongoing streams of activities that will become a model for ongoing institutional evaluation and improvement:

Stream 1 – Community Engagement. The Provost meets with the faculty from each school face-to-face twice per year; engages faculty, students, alumni in our online forums on an ongoing basis; and meets with all governance bodies on a regular basis. The Associate Provost for Research & Learning directs the Office of Research in the coordination of all institutional research efforts, meets with faculty, students, and alumni from each school at all sessions throughout the year, and supports the development of many institutional research projects. The Provost and the Associate Provost have primary responsibility for review of ongoing research and evaluation.

The WASC Steering Committee (SC) is charged with supporting staff and faculty engagement in the review process. The SC meets face-to-face at least 3 times per year and by teleconference 4 – 6 times per year. The members of the SC engage their respective constituencies through electronic forums as well as at regularly scheduled in-person or residential meetings to raise questions for examination, to examine obtained results, and to get feedback for the process. Lastly, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee has intentionally and carefully coordinated its work with the WASC review process to maximize response, alignment, and collaboration.

Stream 2 – Institutional Research & Evaluation Activity. Conducting institutional research projects in two ways provides a flexible and feasible method of institutional evaluation and improvement for an institution of our size. Fielding defines and conducts ongoing institutional research in a number of areas, henceforth called institutional projects. In addition, Fielding solicits institutional research to be proposed and conducted by constituent members – faculty, students, alumni, and staff. These projects are funded by the institution and are called constituent projects. For constituent projects, the Provost’s Office defines topics of interests, issues a request for proposals and awards funding with two requirements: a) the project must yield concrete, useable outcomes that can inform ongoing activities at Fielding and b) a plan for integrating the investigation in ongoing institutional processes. All institutional projects and constituent projects are coordinated through the Fielding Office of Research.

Institutional projects consist of a series of ongoing program evaluations within the schools as well as examining, across the institution, issues such as retention, information technology capability, financial status, diversity, institutional alignment, library requirements, and the like. Constituent

projects recently or currently in progress include: evaluations of the nature of the scholar-practitioner model and its role in student progress, the role of learner transformation in retention, student information technology competency, the role of diverse knowledge forms in student progress, and the contributions of Fielding dissertations to knowledge.

Stream 3 – Outcomes Review & Utilization. The primary vehicle for ongoing improvement is the evaluation of institutional research outcomes within relevant constituent bodies, such as committees within the Schools, governance bodies, institutional committees, and the WASC Steering Committee (SC). The SC and the Office of Research provide coordination to ensure that data and results are seen and put to use by the appropriate bodies. The outcomes of those efforts are available for inclusion in written documents to satisfy either internal or external needs. In addition, the SC develops work teams from faculty and staff to address the outcomes of institutional and constituent projects as they impact various processes at Fielding. Those work teams provide written outcomes that are also available for internal and external needs. For this WASC process, the SC will be forming work teams as needed for specific projects.

Stream 4 – Writing for Internal & External Needs. Various groups and individuals provide the written documents we use for ongoing institutional evaluation. These efforts are undertaken by each of the following as appropriate: the group undertaking an institutional project, the constituent member undertaking a constituent project, a specialized team formed for a specific institutional research purpose, or a specialized team formed for an externally motivated institutional research purpose, e.g., WASC re-accreditation or APA re-accreditation. During the WASC process, the SC will form small sub-groups and also create specialized teams comprised of representatives of the Fielding community, to compose each of the documents to be submitted to WASC. Details and timelines are in the project plan.

Focus of Capacity & Preparatory Review (CPR)

The focus of the CPR is on three priorities:

- 1) issues of alignment,
- 2) issues of leadership and institutional vision, and
- 3) issues of infrastructure, especially information technology.

Alignment. In this area, we have focused on a) strategic plan development and implementation, especially as it impacts horizontal integration across the university and b) the role of governance groups, especially the Fielding Council, in achieving vertical alignment throughout the university.

The key indicators for evaluating horizontal integration will be the outcomes of the strategic plan evaluation process, especially measures of academic and administrative unit collaboration and efficiency. The key indicators for evaluating vertical alignment will be the outcomes of the evolving Fielding Council relationship with administrative leadership as measured by an evaluation tool to measure institutional alignment. Milestones to be observed will include: a) approval of the strategic plan by the Board of Trustees in October, 2006 and b) completion of the initial vertical alignment evaluation by December, 2006 and follow-up by December, 2007.

Leadership and Institutional Vision. In this area, we are focusing on: 1) the effectiveness of and the relationship between the President and the Board, and 2) Fielding's continued work on its diversity priorities. The key indicators and milestone for evaluating President/Board relationship and effectiveness will be the outcomes of a comprehensive third-party evaluation shared in May, 2006. The key indicators and milestones for evaluating progress on diversity are the Diversity Action Plan matrix, which is a continuously updated project led by the Provost and monitored by the Board's Diversity Committee.

Infrastructure. We are focusing on the availability of needed information technology infrastructure as well as our ability to use it effectively. The key indicators for evaluating this priority are a) the outcomes of the 2005 information technology audit and survey with periodic follow-up for comparison, and b) the outcomes of the evaluation of information technology competencies at Fielding using the results of a constituent project survey with periodic follow-up for comparison. Milestones to be observed will be a) a follow-up information technology audit and survey completed by December, 2007, and b) completion of the initial information technology competency survey by December, 2006. The CPR will include information about the initial IT audit and survey and development of technology training and purchasing requirements based on outcomes of competency surveys.

Focus of Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

The EER will focus on three areas:

- 1) learning outcomes,
- 2) the quality of academic work by students and evaluation by faculty, and
- 3) the impact of doctoral work on alumni.

Learning Outcomes. Here we have designed two sets of direct indicators a) doctoral competencies in Knowledge Area work as evaluated by faculty, and b) doctoral competencies and quality of the

dissertation as evaluated by the dissertation committee and the External Examiner. Less direct indicators of learning outcomes include overall academic progress, and retention; these are being studied in relationship to learner transformation, diversity of curricula, and other issues. Finally, learning outcomes will be examined indirectly through the program reviews, which will include external review.

Milestones to be observed will include a) the availability during 2006 of online evaluation of doctoral competencies of all Knowledge Area work and online evaluation of dissertation quality for all programs, b) the completion during 2007 of constituent projects exploring the less direct indicators related to academic progress, c) the completion and utilization of the ELC doctoral program review and OMD master's program review. We will also use the HOD doctoral program review to be completed in 2007, and the Psych doctoral program review to be completed in 2008. The EER will include two complete years of analysis, feedback, and improvement resulting from evaluation of student Knowledge Area work and dissertations across all of Fielding, as well as the outcomes of the program reviews.

Academic Work and Evaluation. Key indicators for examining consistent evaluation of student work by faculty on Knowledge Area work are reliability and consistency outcomes of Certificates of Completion (COC) within student records across faculty. The key indicators for consistent quality of and evaluation of dissertation work will be a) reliability and consistency of outcomes of dissertation evaluations, and b) dissertation quality and contributions as evaluated by a constituent project. Milestones include a) availability of standardized online evaluations during 2006, and b) completion of the dissertation quality constituent project during 2007.

Impact on Alumni. The key indicators for this area are evaluations of a) scholarly productivity and quality, b) professional practice productivity and quality, and c) cognitive, emotional, and behavioral changes as evaluated by Scholar-Practitioner studies. The key indicators for evaluating this priority are a) amount, frequency, and quality of scholarly productivity, b) amount, frequency, depth, and breadth of professional practice including licensure, job placement, and other factors to be identified as appropriate, and c) specific changes identified for Scholar-Practitioners. Milestones include a) successful development and operation of necessary infrastructure for collecting engaging alumni and collecting information during 2007, and b) completion of Scholar-Practitioner study during 2007. The EER will include one year's accumulation of alumni impact data for evaluation and an ongoing system in place.

Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

The three areas identified by WASC as important when examining data gathering and analysis systems may be grouped as retention data, learning outcomes, and alumni outcomes. The Data Work Group of the WASC Steering Committee reported strongest data related to retention, and recommended that we pay more attention to data related to learning outcomes and alumni outcomes. The work plan for the CPR and the EER, as well as the project plan, address those needs and describe in detail how we will collect the data needed for this review. We will also focus on how we can integrate those processes into ongoing academic and administrative processes.

Commitment of Resources to Support Accrediting Review

Description of the organization and structure of resources to support the review process is embedded in the plan of work described in the previous sections. To summarize, the Provost and the Associate Provost for Research & Learning are engaged with a Steering Committee composed of faculty and administrative staff to lead the effort. The Provost's Office has a staff assistant and a budget line to support the work. In addition, the Associate Provost, as Director of the Office of Research, has a staff assistant and budget to support the work. The annual budget for these activities in both offices is approximately \$50,000, exclusive of salaries. The SC will develop project teams with various members of their constituencies to conduct evaluations and to write documents, as needed. Institutional committees and School-based committees have been charged with receiving and using relevant data for improvement.

These efforts are entirely congruent with activities at all levels. Taken as a whole, we hope that we may serve as a model for other small, resource-constrained institutions.