

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

To Scripps College

September 14-16, 2011

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Chair: Carol Tecla Christ, President, Smith College

Assistant Chair: Marianne B. Sheldon, Mills College

Team Members : Kristine L. Chase, Saint Mary's College of California

Darnell Cole, University of Southern California

Brian T. Harlan, Occidental College

Deborah Nolan, University of California, Berkeley

WASC Staff Liaison: Barbara Gross Davis

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

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

Description of Institution and Visit

Scripps College, founded in 1926, is a private, liberal arts, women's college with a distinctive interdisciplinary approach to the study of the humanities. It is located about thirty-five miles east of Los Angeles. With a student body of fewer than one thousand, the college aspires to provide an education that is academically distinctive, academically challenging, and morally engaging. It emphasizes educating women for leadership. Over 90% of Scripps students live on campus. Scripps is one of The Claremont Colleges, a consortium of five undergraduate and two graduate institutions. The close physical proximity encourages cross registration as well as shared programs and facilities, including the library and multiple intercollegiate departments and programs.

The signature program of a Scripps education is the three-semester Core Curriculum in Interdisciplinary Humanities (Core), which focuses on critical thinking and engagement with contemporary issues. The college has recently undertaken a major review of this program, a development that will assist in the preparation of a response to issues raised in the Commission action letter that followed the last review.

The Capacity Preparatory Review (CPR) Visiting Team conducted its review and prepared its report based on the extensive materials provided by Scripps as well as interviews and meetings on campus between September 14th and September 16, 2011. Scripps was well prepared for the visit. The members of the team are appreciative of the hard work and collegiality of Scripps administrators,

trustees, faculty, staff, and students during this review process. The team was particularly impressed by their candor and transparency, qualities that facilitated the team's work. The team extends its sincere thanks to President Bettison-Varga, Accreditation Liaison Officer Amy Marcus-Newhall, and the entire Scripps community for their hospitality, helpfulness, and engagement.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report is in alignment with the proposal presented by Scripps in spring 2010. As a result of extensive discussion and widespread conversation, the Scripps Institutional Proposal identified two themes as the focus for its self-study: "Enhancing the Culture of Teaching and Learning" and "Educating Women to be Agents of Change." Those two themes have been carried through to the CPR report. The Scripps CPR report is organized around two reflective essays, one on each theme.

The CPR Report was well written and clearly organized, and it addressed all of the Standards and Criteria for Review (CFR's). Substantial evidence was presented to demonstrate its institutional capacity. With respect to the two themes of the report, the team has reached two conclusions:

First, the team recognizes the origins of the development of the second theme, Educating Women to be Agents of Change, in Scripps' strong emphasis on the development of leadership in its students, but is recommending the re-framing of this topic as the college prepares for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER).

A second major observation coming out of the reaffirmation review process is the need for an enhanced institutional assessment program. Engagement with the CPR process encouraged the college to develop an assessment program focused on six areas: articulation of SLOs, assessment, development of faculty capacity for assessment, inclusion of students in assessment, need for products (CPR) and results (EER), infrastructure and resources. The Scripps report, however, notes candidly that progress has not been as rapid as initially expected, in part because of significant leadership transitions at the senior level. The extent to which these circumstances are relevant to understanding the effectiveness of Scripps organizational structures and decision-making processes will be discussed below (CFRs 3.8, 3.10).

Response to Previous Commission Issues

Scripps College was “blanketed in” by WASC in 1949 and was most recently reaccredited in 2002. In the course of that process, the due dates for the Institutional Proposal, CPR report, and EER report were extended to align them more satisfactorily. The March 2002 WASC Commission action letter commended the progress that Scripps had made since the previous WASC team report and highlighted four areas for attention:

- 1. Achieving Academic Excellence: While the Commission felt that a genuine commitment to achieving a higher level of academic excellence had been demonstrated, it urged continued self-examination, targeting areas likely to yield high benefit. It encouraged the college to assess whether the level of achievement**

of Scripps graduates meets faculty expectations. Within this context, the Commission specifically recommended that the college develop a more structured correlation between the Core and the writing program.

The team felt that Scripps has satisfactorily addressed this recommendation. Scripps continues to show a deep level of commitment to achieving a higher level of academic excellence, with the self-examination, prioritization, and assessment of student achievement such an ambition requires. The team gave particular attention to the connection between the Core and the writing program because the college had determined, after careful consideration, that the two should not be directly linked. The team felt that the situation was in reality more complex, and that the college had achieved a greater connection between the programs. The college has recently hired a tenure track faculty member to direct the writing program who also teaches in the Core program. Although the two programs do not have common reading materials or common assignments, the learning goals of the writing program are closely and deliberately linked to the goals of the Core program. The team felt that the connection between the writing program and Core I was adequate, and that the goal of the earlier recommendation had been met, although it was concerned with the exclusive use of part-time faculty to staff the writing program, a topic that will be taken up later in this report

2. Toward a Learning Organization: Although the college has taken useful steps to gather evidence to demonstrate educational effectiveness, greater connections between classroom assessment

and program assessment need to be developed. The institution should systematize its approach to educational effectiveness and use data and evidence for planning and decision-making.

In developing a systematic approach to assessment, the college has taken a grass-roots approach, beginning with the establishment of course-level student learning outcomes and then building upon these in order to develop program, Core, general education, and institutional-level student learning goals and outcomes. The approach has worked well in that it has allowed for the entire community to become engaged in the generation of outcomes; this grass-roots approach is more consistent with the Scripps culture than a top-down mandate would be. The challenge of this approach, however, is in accounting for a wide variety of voices, and in some cases the realignment of course to program-level outcomes. In many ways, it is easier to begin with higher-level learning goals and to use those to define those at lower levels. At the same time the team recognizes the college's instinct to broaden participation, understands the value of hearing from a community of voices, and appreciates the need to make assessment work within the Scripps cultural context. The college does need to be cognizant, nevertheless, as was reaffirmed in the 2010 letter in response to the Institutional Proposal, that WASC is more interested in assessment of program and institution-level rather than course-level outcomes. The effort to align existing course objectives to program and institutional student learning goals and outcomes (and ultimately the college's mission) will therefore require considerable urgency.

- 3. Diversity: Although the college has increased the representation of faculty and students of color and added an intercultural component to its core program, the Commission urged the college to consider how diversity might be incorporated into the Scripps definition of academic excellence as “an essential element.”**

The team found that Scripps had made some progress in relationship to diversity since the last review, but felt that much work remains to be done (see section of this document on diversity, below). The recent revision to the Core I course includes common reading on issues of diversity. In regard to faculty hiring, Scripps is the host institution for the first consortium faculty appointment in Africana Studies (jointly funded by the Five Undergraduate Colleges as well as the Claremont Graduate University) and has made a part-time appointment in the Politics Department in the area of race and gender of a faculty member who served last year as a Consortium for Faculty Diversity Fellow. Scripps is to be commended for seizing on these consortium collaborations. However, Scripps should pursue additional faculty hires from underrepresented ethnic minorities and should continue to integrate diversity-related topics into the Core courses.

- 4. Identity as a Women’s College: While noting the changes made to enhance the college’s identity as a women’s college, the Commission urged the college to consider the fact that Women’s Studies did not appear to be central to the college curriculum.**

The team found that the institution has a general education breadth requirement that focuses on women and gender. In addition, the team found that

the recently revised syllabus of the common Core I course, taken by all freshmen in their first semester, includes a gender studies component with readings and discussion on the topic. For these reasons, the team concluded that women's studies is central to the Scripps curriculum and that the goal of the earlier recommendation has been met.

On the whole, the team observed that in its preparation for this report and visit, Scripps College paid close attention to the major concerns and recommendations presented in 2002 and that engagement with the reaccreditation process has been campus-wide. All of the major issues raised in the most recent Commission reaccreditation letter were acknowledged and addressed in the CPR report.

The remainder of this report addresses, first, the two themes that Scripps has chosen; then the standards not fully encompassed in the treatment of the themes.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

Theme I: Enhancing the Culture of Teaching and Learning (CFR's 2.1-2.7, 2.10-2.12, 4.4-4.7)

Theme I demonstrates the college's substantial progress toward the establishment of a research program to ensure quality assurance for teaching and learning through both sound assessment practices and a systematic program review process. The team commends the college on this movement forward, and

specifically the dedicated work of faculty who designed and participated in the pilot program review group and the methodological and administrative support provided by campus units in carrying this out. Through a detailed account of the development of learning outcomes in the Core Curriculum in the Interdisciplinary Humanities (Core) program, as well as in a sample of programs representing each academic division, the theme outlines the current state of student learning assessment at the college. The college clearly has a realistic understanding of its present state and the work that lies ahead, as is evidenced in the goal it lays out for itself: to establish student learning outcomes and assessment tools at the department and the institutional level. However, the college has made more progress in defining program goals, both for majors and for the core curriculum, than it has overall learning goals for students' experience at the college. ***The team therefore strongly recommends that the college complete and implement a comprehensive academic and co-curricular assessment program, including the development of college-wide learning goals, outcomes-based program review, and the enhancement of institutional research capacity to support assessment work*** (CFR's 2.3, 2.11, 4.4, 4.5).

The team recognized the significant role that has been played by the director of the Office of Assessment, Planning, and Institutional Research (OAPIR) in moving the college forward. The office generates and makes available essential institutional data, administers and analyzes national surveys and course evaluations, orients staff and faculty on how to conduct assessment, and supports critical processes such as enrollment management and strategic planning. With the

impending departure of the OAPIR director, the team suggests that the college take steps to sustain the important work of the office. The college might also explore other pathways to support these functions, such as creating incentives for leadership among the faculty, and seeking out best practices of peers and consortium members.

Notwithstanding the sincerity of effort made thus far with assessment, the team found cause to question the college's ability to sustain its forward progress. The college's self-reported Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators reveals that only 4 out of the college's 24 academic programs, and only Core I, II, and III out of the general education program, currently have a formal assessment plan. In addition, the quality of the assessment plans leaves some room for improvement, since outcomes are not written in the standard style of stating student behaviors that will demonstrate learning, outcomes are not mapped to curricula, and no schedule of when outcomes will be assessed has been established. Based on team meetings with faculty, there also appears to be a lack of clarity around the institution's expectations for assessment, and the link between assessment and program review. Finally, the tools currently in use for direct assessment are in an initial stage of development, and a general understanding of the practicality and value of such tools as analytical rubrics and electronic portfolios does not seem to be widely accepted.

The team found much to admire about the laudable program review system that has been put in place, and the speed with which this has been accomplished. Particularly impressive is the feedback loop and the link to budget and planning

facilitated by the Internal Program Review Committee and the Faculty Executive Committee. The prioritization of external recommendations for the Dean, with input from program members, is an important tool for ensuring that the assessment loop is closed. Fully cognizant that there is a need to establish departmental learning outcomes quickly, the team suggests that the college carefully consider whether faculty have all the contextual and informational materials they need to produce high-quality self-studies. The focus of self-studies, for example, need not rely as heavily on resource needs as the examples provided in the team room exhibits, although it is understood that resource needs should be a topic of discussion. Other critical areas for program reviews include examination of the curriculum, direct assessment of student learning, and indirect assessment of the student experience. The team therefore suggests that as the program review cycle progresses, programs both expedite the development of their assessment plans and attempt to collect at least a minimum amount of baseline data to include in their self-studies. The team also encourages the college to consider developing templates for assessment reports, self-studies, and external review reports in order to clarify expectations and streamline the process.

Theme 2: Educating Women to be Agents of Change

The second theme of the institution's report grew out of the goal articulated in Scripps' strategic plan of educating women to be leaders in the 21st century. The team found that the institution is already involved in much work that supports educating women to become agents of change in both academic and co-curricular programs. For example, many students hold internships as well as participate in

research projects that bridge theory and practice. Moreover, there are many student-led organizations and committees; students also have opportunities to participate on college-wide and trustee committees. The high level of involvement of students in co-curricular activities and the support of the staff and faculty for such involvement reflect positively on the Scripps' capacity to link scholarship, teaching, student learning and service and demonstrate the value the college places on co-curricular activities (CFR 2.9).

The plan for developing the theme, educating women as agents of change, also includes creating a Center for Women's Research and Leadership. The team reviewed prior committee reports on the vision for such a center (2003, 2006, and 2008), which reported on several campus-community focus groups, faculty-only dialogues, and surveys about the purpose and goal of the Center (CFR 4.1, 4.2). Over the past academic year, there were additional opportunities for the community to discuss the development of the center, the most recent in Fall 2010, led by a committee of faculty, students, staff, alumnae, and a trustee (CFR 4.8). The future Center is widely viewed as a potentially unifying vehicle for the diverse efforts designed to educate women as agents of change already ongoing on campus. The creation of such a Center would be well aligned with Scripps' strategic plan specifically "Strategy 3 National Leadership" (CFRs 1.1, 1.2). The team noted the strong institutional support for the Center, a sound governance plan, including a steering committee of faculty, staff and students and an advisory board of trustees and women leaders (CFRs 4.6, 4.8), and the intriguing idea of locating the Center in a renovated wing of Denison library (CFR 4.2). However, there seem to be

significant differences in the vision that college constituencies hold for the Center. Some imagine it as principally serving students, integrating and catalyzing opportunities for student leadership, and supporting co-curricular activities that connect research and practice, thus helping students connect learning in the institution to leading in the world (CFR 1.5); others see it as a scholarly research center on the topic of women's leadership. Moreover, there are no current resources identified to support the Center; its creation would depend upon raising \$7-\$12 million. For these reasons, the team does not believe that the institution has the time or resources to make sufficiently adequate progress on the Center to assess its efficacy of the Center before the EER. (CFRs 4.5, 4.6)

Furthermore, the team was concerned with the breadth and ambition of the research questions that that the CPR report proposes to answer in pursuing this theme. They are:

1. How do we define agency at Scripps? How does it differ from traditional definitions of leadership?
2. In what ways does the interaction between the curricular and co-curricular aspects of our curriculum aid students in their discovery and definition of purpose?
3. Does students' level of engagement increase over their four years at Scripps?
4. In what ways does the environment at a women's college aid in the development of agency?

The team also found that these proposed research questions were overly broad. Moreover, the data currently being collected are not adequate for addressing them. Indeed, it would be difficult for almost any institution to collect meaningful data that would adequately address these questions, however laudable the goal. For these reasons, the team does not think there is adequate evidence of institutional research capacity to carry out the proposed research in this area.

While the team understands why Scripps has chosen “Educating Women to Be Agents of Change” as its second theme and recognizes the centrality of women’s leadership to Scripps mission and identity, it believes the college would be better served by reframing this topic, focusing on assessment of the co-curricular, including programs designed to develop leadership (CFR’s 4.3, 4.5).

The team believes that Scripps can successfully address its second theme if it significantly narrowed its focus to one on assessing how co-curricular activities prepare Scripps women to be agents of change. Scripps provides many opportunities for students to develop their capacity as agents of change, and there is broad student participation in these activities. Documentation both of these opportunities and of student participation in them would provide evidence of this claim, and offer a basis for assessing their appropriateness, quality, and effectiveness.

Moreover, the team found that the office of Student Affairs is well-prepared to undertake an evaluation of co-curricular programs. Over the past year, with support from the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Student Affairs has

developed a mission statement and established learning goals and outcomes for their programs. Both the mission and the learning outcomes that the office has defined center on developing students as leaders, engaged citizens, and agents of change. This coming year, each staff member in the office has a plan to develop rubrics and create assessment tools to measure success of one of their programs. (CFRs 2.1, 2.3, 2.6, 2.9, 2.11, 2.13, 4.3, 4.5).

The team also believes that a more narrow focus in this area would offer the institution the opportunity to coordinate institution-led and student-led activities, with the potential for increasing the impact of each. Given the high number of student-initiated activities on campus, the team thinks there is the capacity to engage students in this evaluation process by including student-led co-curricular activities in the evaluation. The team believes that this approach would have the added benefit of providing students with valuable skills for effecting change.

Evaluation of Scripps Under the Standards

Scripps has a clearly stated mission that is supported by appropriate operational practices. It is open in its communication both internally and externally, and displays integrity in its operations (CFRs 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9). Education is its purpose; it is independent of inappropriate outside influence (CFR 1.6). As Scripps itself notes, the indicators for achievement of institutional purpose and educational objectives are still under development (CRF 1.2); this issue was discussed fully above. The issue of diversity and its implications for the programs and practices at Scripps will also be discussed below (CFR 1.5). The leadership and governance processes are highly effective (CFR 1.3), and faculty play an important

role in the governance of the institution (CFR 3.11). Scripps values and supports their scholarship, creativity, and curricular innovation (CFR 2.8).

Fiscal Resources, Fiscal Stability, and Impact of the Recession

Scripps College enjoys a stable organizational and resource structure that insures it has the capacity to provide an education fulfilling its mission.

Unlike many comparable institutions, Scripps is weathering the current challenging economic environment very well. It has a history of careful fiscal management, which has yielded small annual budget surpluses and clean audits: Scripps' policy over the years has been "no margin, no mission." Scripps has an endowment whose conservative management has minimized damaging swings in endowment results and income (CFR 3.5). Specifically, over the past few years Scripps has been able to fulfill its revised Strategic Plan goal of raising enrollment to 950 students while maintaining its goal of a tuition discount of approximately 36%. At the same time, the college has fully-funded depreciation, maintained its "no-deferred maintenance" policy for its physical plant, and increased both faculty and staff salaries, so as to remain competitive in attracting and retaining the best people. Scripps was aided in the last area by a generous targeted anonymous gift that helped Scripps come closer to its goal of having faculty salaries in the top third of its comparable group (CFRs 3.2, 3.5). Additionally, the team found that Scripps is maintaining its information technology infrastructure well, following planned replacement cycles and providing support for varied academic programs across the curriculum (CFR 3.7). The team commends Scripps for its careful financial stewardship, (including investment management) that has enabled the college to

maintain programs at a time when other institutions have suffered significant cutbacks in core programs.

At the same time, and at least a great a challenge as the economy, has been an almost complete turnover in the college's senior leadership. The key positions of President, VP for Academic Affairs and VP for Business Affairs/Treasurer, along with others, have changed hands from long-tenured individuals. Scripps has filled all these positions with well-qualified and enthusiastic individuals who clearly are committed to continuing the college's careful stewardship of resources (CFRs 3.1, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10). However, in order to achieve its educational goals into the future, the team feels that Scripps needs to reconsider its operational policies and strategic decisions in some important areas. The first is in resource allocation. Throughout the visit, the team was struck by the contrast between outstanding resource commitments to plant, information technology and faculty support, in contrast to significant unsatisfied needs in staff and program resources. Several key areas (institutional research, student affairs, human resources, assessment, advancement, among others) are thinly staffed and funded for their responsibilities. ***While Scripps has understandably and laudably focused on a "no-deferred maintenance" policy towards its physical plant resources, the team recommends that the college consider broadening its definition of deferred maintenance to include human and other non-plant resources so that a strategic conversation can occur about the appropriate amount of the budget that is devoted to human and program resources as opposed to maintenance and enhancement of the physical plant*** (CFR 3.1).

A second area of concern is the relationship of the Board of Trustees to the management of the institution. Given the significant turnover at the executive level, it is not surprising that the Board has been more proactive in its oversight role. However, it was clear from conversations both with several Board members and with senior staff that some realignment of Board focus would benefit the college, assuring attention to strategic issues, while leaving operational and managerial decisions, such as minor capital expenditures, to senior administrators. ***Given the important initiatives in fundraising, program growth and facilities planning, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees refine its focus to one primarily concerned with decisions at a strategic rather than an operational level*** (CFR 3.9).

A third area of concern is the reliance on adjunct faculty to provide a key part of the general education requirement: the Writing Program. The 2002 Commission letter recommended a “tighter more structured correlation between CORE and the writing program,” a recommendation this report addressed above. Scripps’ response in its CPR report (p. 4) notes one reason Scripps was not able to better integrate the writing program into the CORE was the inability to engage part-time, non-tenure track faculty into curricular planning discussions. The team confirmed that the writing program is staffed almost entirely with adjunct faculty (with only the program director a full-time tenure-track faculty). The adjuncts are only on campus in the fall term (when students take the course) and are not expected to fulfill service roles; nor are they voting members of the faculty. Scripps

might ask if it is devoting sufficient faculty resources to this key program (CFRs 3.2, 3.5).

Diversity

The 2007 Scripps College Strategic Plan establishes a useful framework and a good set of initiatives for advancing the college's progress in regard to diversity, aimed to "strengthen the integration of the full range of human experience and backgrounds into Scripps' academic, co-curricular, and residential communities" (CFR's 1.5, 3.2, 3.4). The team believes that both the rationale the plan articulates and the challenges it identifies provide good context and direction for Scripps to assess its current progress and more fully realize its goals. However, the team is concerned that progress has been slower than it might be. ***The team recommends that Scripps implement with greater urgency all of the initiatives described in Scripps well-articulated and conceived strategic plan for diversity*** (CFR 1.5).

The Scripps College Academy (SCA), for example, is a successful outreach program; from 2002-2009, eighteen SCA students have matriculated at Scripps. With greater planning and investment, this program might offer not only continued community outreach, but also a fruitful source for recruiting first-generation college-bound women from racially and economically diverse groups. Perhaps the development of an identical program in the Keck Science collaborative could present an additional opportunity for recruitment.

SCORE, Scripps Communities of Resources and Empowerment, which offers institutionalized support for racial and ethnic minorities and for queer-allied students, is another successful diversity initiative; yet, its staff have not been able

to fully focus their attention on the needs of these student groups because they have been asked to take on the planning and implementation of Scripps Orientation three times in the last four years.

The team believes greater progress could be made in increasing the diversity of the student body. Although 24%-27% of Scripps students come from racial or ethnic minority groups, only 15% come from traditionally under-represented groups. Of the 946 students attending Scripps in the fall of 2010, 60% are white, 10% are Hispanic, 10% are Asian/ Pacific Islander, 4% are Black, and 3% are international; there has been little change over the past four years with slight increases in numbers of Asian students in the first-year class and significant decreases in the number of African American students. Perhaps pressure on the financial aid budget, and an effort to lower the discount rate, is a contributing factor. The team believes that the college would be well served by developing both short- and long-term enrollment policies and strategies that do not sacrifice diversity for revenue targets. There may also be an opportunity to increase diversity through strategic recruitment of transfer students, those who come from the three colleges for which Scripps already has articulation agreements. (It seems that there were no transfer students admitted this year.)

In the area of faculty hiring, recruitment of faculty from underrepresented groups remains an important goal for Scripps. Through the Consortium of Faculty Diversity Fellow Program, Scripps has hired a part-time faculty member in the Politics Department, whose work is in the area of race and gender and the welfare state. The Five Colleges have also jointly funded faculty hires in Africana Studies

and Asian American studies; the faculty in Africana Studies resides at Scripps and significantly contributes to diversifying the faculty both in his presence and in his scholarship.

Data appended to the CPR report show the percentage of full-time women faculty has remained at about 44% percent over the past 3 years. The same table shows that the number of full-time minority faculty members decreased slightly from 20% in Fall 2009 (n=18) to 19% in Fall 2010 (n=16) with the addition of two Hispanic faculty members, but the loss of one African American and two Asian American faculty members, and the reduction of one African American faculty appointment from full to part time. The team wondered whether the “faculty salaries, benefits, training and development program and other forms of support” articulated as a goal in the diversity section of the 2007 Strategic Plan would have prevented this attrition. Examining such questions can provide both better understanding and policy development to support the goal of attracting and retaining diverse faculty and staff.

Among part-time faculty, women comprise 75% (n=21) and minorities 11% (n=3). These data lead the team to ask whether serious campus climate issues exist for faculty members who are in traditionally underrepresented racial/ethnic groups, particularly given that there are only five African American faculty members at Scripps (four full-time and one part-time). The team encourages active participation in CFD (Consortium for Faculty Diversity) for post-doctoral hiring, a strategy Scripps has already identified.

Scripps has been more successful in recruiting a diverse staff. In fall 2010 data, women represent 70% (n=160) of full-time and 73% (N=76) of part-time employees. Underrepresented minorities comprise 35% (n=79) of full-time and 52% (n=54) of part-time employees; African Americans still comprise the smallest group with only 21 full- and part-time staff members. However, two of the most recent hires of senior staff are from underrepresented groups. The team encourages Scripps to continue to diversify its staff and urges that "... diversity training to all staff members at Scripps beyond the current programs" be made immediately available to staff, faculty and students in leadership positions. Diversity training can be a powerful tool for building a commitment to diversity across the institution, affecting hiring and retention practices, encouraging the development of diversity-related programs, and fostering a climate receptive to Scripps' strategic diversity initiative. As the Scripps Strategic Plan states, the team encourages the college to consider "how diversity-related issues and initiatives can best be coordinated within the College's administrative and academic structure."

Student Success

Scripps has identified several sets and types of data to measure student success. In addition to the assessment tools for individual programs and for the elements of the core curriculum described in the discussion of Theme One, above, Scripps collects and analyzes retention and graduation data, and the college participates in several national surveys: the CIRP Freshman Survey, the First Year College Survey (HERI), the Senior Survey (HEDS), and NSSE. It also collects

information about graduate school admission and job placement immediately after graduation.

Much of this data is also disaggregated by race and ethnicity, encouraging useful analysis of student success for under-represented groups. Scripps itself acknowledges that more work is necessary on student learning outcomes; indeed, it has begun to take shape as part of this re-accreditation process. Particularly given Scripps' goal of educating women to become agents of change, the team feels Scripps might more systematically track post-graduation outcomes and attempt to link them to assessment data for the undergraduate experience.

Scripps' 2007 strategic plan identifies a goal of increasing student retention and four-year graduation rates to 90% in the course of five years, 6% higher than the three-year 2002-2004 year average of 84%. In this three-year average, there is a gap between the success of white and minority students (87% in comparison to 81% for Hispanic students, and 78% for Black and Asian students). Data on student attrition and retention show very high retention from the 1st semester to the 2nd, which has over the last decade exceeded 96% (see Data Exhibit 3.2) and fairly high retention from the first to the second year (ranging from 88% to 95%); it is from year 2 to year 3 that more substantial decreases occur typically hovering around 87%. There is further attrition between years 3 and 4, with 4-year-retention rates around 85%. Recent years have seen substantial improvement in retention and graduation rates for minority students, but the numbers are very small, so percentages are less revealing. On the visit, the team felt that Scripps could conduct a fuller analysis of why students leave Scripps; although a retention

study was completed during the 2009-10 academic year, discussion of this topic at some meetings during the visit was more anecdotal and impressionistic than analytic. Scripps' success in reaching its retention and graduation goals will depend upon rigorous analysis.

Scripps retention and six-year graduation rates are respectable within the context of those of selective liberal arts colleges, but there is room for improvement, as the college itself recognizes.

Recruiting and Marketing Policies

The team reviewed Scripps admissions and marketing materials and found them to be complete and accurate in their representation of the institution.

The Claremont University Consortium

Scripps College is fortunate indeed that it is a member of The Claremont Colleges (TCC), which includes the five undergraduate colleges, Claremont Graduate University, and Keck Graduate Institute. For a small college such as Scripps, which rightfully values the personal attention and close-knit community its size enables, TCC offer multiple advantages: additional curricular breadth and variety, wider social opportunities for students, economies of scale in administration, a fuller range of services than a small college can offer, the richness of a shared library. Such a consortium, in the team's view, will serve as an increasingly important model for small liberal arts colleges. TCC have the great

advantage of co-location, making it even more of a resource and competitive advantage for its members.

The team believes that Scripps has not taken as much advantage of the consortium as it might. This problem seems to cut in two ways. On the one hand, Scripps feels acutely shortages in staffing, particularly in student life, in areas like disability services and counseling, but also in regard to faculty grant support or information technology, where a consortial solution might offer the best service for the lowest cost. On the other hand, budget priorities don't seem effectively communicated by the colleges to the consortium. The team heard a great deal on the visit about faculty unhappiness with under-budgeting for the library shared by the seven consortium institutions, resource decisions for the library taken without faculty consultation, and a lack of academic leadership in library affairs (CFR 3.6). The team understands that steps have been taken to begin remedying this situation. However, the fact that such a situation developed in the way that it did suggests that something is wrong in the governance process, despite the passion with which Scripps, among other colleges, has advocated for the library.

At least in the team's short experience at Scripps, campus constituencies seemed less aware of the capacities and opportunities that the consortium presented than might be the case. For example, a particular opportunity might exist in the area of institutional research and learning assessment. Scripps' efforts in this regard are less revealing than they might be because of a lack of peer comparisons. The undergraduate colleges of the consortium offer an ideal set of peers. Moreover, all of the undergraduate colleges of the consortium would benefit

from collaborative learning assessment by virtue of the fact that students take significant portions of their program at colleges other than their home college. It seems difficult to do a thorough or complete job of learning or program assessment without more collaborative work in this area by members of the consortium. Finally, the capacity for institutional research may well be deepened and broadened building of common data systems and sharing resources. ***The team therefore recommends that Scripps determine how better to leverage TCC resources for such things as information technology, institutional research, and student services*** (CFR's 2.13, 3.6, 3.7, 4.5).

SECTION III: FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The visiting team was highly impressed with Scripps College and with the intelligence, hard work, and candor it brought to the CPR review. The team particularly commends the college in the following areas.

- Scripps is fortunate to have a dedicated and loyal faculty, staff, Board and alumnae body. The team was struck again and again how individuals go beyond the requirements of their position because of their love for the college and their loyalty to it. Such dedication is a significant asset in the quest for increasing excellence.
- Scripps has distinguished itself in its careful financial stewardship, (including investment management) that has enabled the college to maintain programs at a time when other institutions have suffered significant cutbacks in core programs.

- Scripps has a strongly imagined, distinctive curriculum, broadly embraced by the faculty, evidenced in the Core Curriculum and the Senior capstone.
- Scripps has made substantial progress toward the establishment of a research program to ensure quality assurance for teaching and learning through both sound assessment practices and a systematic program review process.
- Scripps shows a strong institutional commitment to develop women's leadership as evidenced both by the culture of the college and the design of curriculum and the co-curriculum.
- Scripps has a set of opportunities for collaboration, distinctive in higher education through TCC.

Recommendations

- The team recommends that the college complete and implement a comprehensive academic and co-curricular assessment program, including the development of college-wide learning goals, outcomes-based program review, and the enhancement of institutional research capacity to support assessment work (CFR's 2.3, 2.6, 2.7).
- While the team understands why Scripps has chosen "Educating Women to Be Agents of Change" as its second theme and recognizes the centrality of women's leadership to Scripps mission and identity, the college would be better served by reframing this topic, focusing on assessment of the co-curricular, including programs designed to develop leadership (CFR 2.11).

- While Scripps has understandably and laudably focused on a “no-deferred maintenance” policy towards its physical plant resources, the team recommends that the college consider broadening its definition of deferred maintenance to include human and other non-plant resources so that a strategic conversation can occur about the appropriate amount of the budget that is devoted to human and program resources as opposed to maintenance and enhancement of the physical plant (CFR 3.1).
- Given the important initiatives in fundraising, program growth and facilities planning, the team recommends that the Board of Trustees refine its focus to one primarily concerned with decisions at a strategic rather than an operational level (CFR 3.9).
- The team recommends that Scripps implement with greater urgency all of the initiatives described in Scripps well-articulated and conceived strategic plan for diversity (CFR 1.5).
- Finally, the team recommends that Scripps determine how better to leverage TCC resources for such things as information technology, institutional research, and student services (CFR’s 2.13, 3.6, 3.7).

SECTION IV: PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

In the judgment of the visiting team, Scripps has the capacity to conduct an excellent Educational Effectiveness Review, particularly if it reframes the second of its two themes in the way described in this report. In view both of the leadership changes that the college has experienced in the past two years, not only in the

presidency but in almost all of the major executive offices, including the recent resignation of the Director of Assessment, Planning, and Institutional Research, and in view of the reframing that the team recommends, the college may need a somewhat longer period than originally anticipated between the CPR and the EER. After enhancing its IR capacity to support its assessment work and refocusing its second theme, the team believes that Scripps can produce excellent evidence of student learning in both the curriculum and the co-curriculum.

APPENDICES

CREDIT HOUR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Kind of Visit:

CPR

Date: Sep 14-16,

2011

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all CPR, EER and Initial Accreditation Visits. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)	Verified Yes/No
Policy on credit hour	Does this policy adhere to WASC policy and federal regulations?	YES
	Comments: All courses meet for 3 hours/week for 15 weeks (this includes the time to get from one class to the next). The work expected outside of the classroom is 6-8 hours per week per course.	
Process(es)/ periodic review	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
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure?	YES
	Comments: Programs are reviewed every 7 years. New course proposals are submitted to the Academic Policy Subcommittee, then the Faculty Executive Committee, and ultimately voted on by the full faculty.	
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 Registrar audits the credit hour assignments each semester via the Academic Portal. The portal is shared by the Claremont Undergraduate Consortium, and course meeting times are consistent across the consortium in order to allow students to enroll in courses in any of the 5 colleges.	
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? How many syllabi were reviewed? What degree level(s)? What discipline(s)?	Not Applicable

	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	Not Applicable
	Comments:	
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)	What kinds of courses? Internship, Independent Study, Senior thesis How many syllabi were reviewed? 3 Independent Studies, 3 Internships, and 6 Senior theses What degree level(s)? Bachelors degree What discipline(s)? All	
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?	YES
	Comments: Independent Study courses and Internships are overseen by faculty. The student prepares a syllabus, with input from the faculty advisor. The student prepares a petition for the Independent Study/Internship and submits it for approval by the Committee on Academic Review. The senior thesis topic is reviewed and approved by the thesis advisor. The thesis is read by two faculty members.	