REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

PITZER COLLEGE

DATE OF THE VISIT:
MARCH 25, 2019 – MARCH 28, 2019

TEAM ROSTER:

James Harris, Chair
President, University of San Diego

Larisa Genin, Assistant Chair
Associate Dean, Faculty, Accreditation and Undergraduate Programs, Saint Mary's College of California

Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth, Member
Executive Director, Office of Inclusive Excellence, University of California, Irvine

Shirley McGuire, Member
Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, University of San Francisco

Amos Himmelstein, Member
Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Occidental College

Richard Osborn, WSCUC Visit Liaison
WASC Senior College and University Commission

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 the Reaccreditation Process

Pitzer College is a nationally recognized liberal arts college founded in 1963. Originally founded as a residential, undergraduate women's college, Pitzer became coeducational in 1970. The college has since expanded beyond its foundational focus in social and behavioral sciences to include several interdisciplinary programs. Currently, four of the top five majors are interdisciplinary by definition. In recent years, approximately 45% of all Pitzer students have majored in an interdisciplinary field. Pitzer College offers 37 baccalaureate-level majors with the oldest programs dating back to 1964 and the youngest back to 2005. These majors do not include those offered at other colleges within the Claremont Colleges, which Pitzer students may pursue.

The College is in a unique position due to its role as part of the consortium of the Claremont Colleges, a group of five undergraduate liberal arts colleges and two graduate institutions. Although there are other consortia among colleges, the fact that the colleges are contiguous makes taking courses, attending talks, and participating in events, sports, and clubs across the campuses more than just a possibility. The Claremont Colleges share many institutional services, including the Honnold-Mudd Library, the Bernard Field Station, health services, and intercollegiate athletics. The consortium provides the undergraduate colleges the opportunity to maintain a close-knit residential college experience for their students with their own student body and faculty, while providing a greater variety of programs than a single college could support on its own.

In fall 2017, the college enrolled 1,074 undergraduate degree-seeking students, including 584 (54%) women and 490 (46%) men. Approximately 39% of the total enrollment are domestic students of color; 47% are white, non-Hispanic; 9% are international students, and; 5% are race and/or ethnicity unknown. Approximately 40-43% of degree-seeking students receive some form of financial aid, including 16% who receive Pell Grants. Last year, the college enrolled students

from 44 states and 31 countries, with approximately 42% coming from within the state of California.

At the time of the report, there were 82 full-time faculty members whose primary responsibility were related to instruction, including 61 tenured professors, 16 professors who were on the tenure-track, 5 faculty members on multi-year contracts, and 25 with an annual contract. The distribution by rank include 39 full professors, 22 associate professors, 16 assistant professors, 4 language lecturers and one longer-term visiting faculty member in media studies.

Approximately 57% of the faculty identify as women, 57% of the faculty are white, 33% are non-white, and 10% are race/ethnicity unknown. The faculty form field groups, rather than 11 academic departments, which are largely organized by discipline, though there are some exceptions. The field groups are not budgetary entities with departmental chairs or a traditional departmental structure and hierarchy. This model was created to foster interdisciplinary collaboration and creativity in developing and overseeing curricula, co-teaching courses, advising students, assessing student learning, and conducting research. The student-to-faculty ratio at Pitzer College is 11:1. In addition to faculty, Pitzer College employs 186 non-instructional full-time staff.

The college has a unique shared governance model – traditionally referred to as a community governance model which places an emphasis on decision making by a broad range of constituents with participation from faculty, students, staff, and senior leadership to address academic and operational decision making and make policy recommendations to the president and board of trustees. Standing committees, such as the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC), Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APT), and the Academic Planning Committee (APC), are in most cases chaired by a faculty member and include representation from the aforementioned campus constituencies. These committees are responsible for attending to operational and policy issues through deliberative, evidence-informed approaches. This model of governance was designed so that a wide range of voices can be heard when decisions are made but also can cause some confusion with regard to decision making authority which can hamper the institution's ability to provide a timely response to issues which need to be addressed.

During the campus visit the team confirmed the importance of this model to every stakeholder group however, there was a palpable level of concern about how successful the college can be in meeting future academic challenges without a realistic model for reallocating funds to the highest academic priorities.

Pitzer embraces a set of core values that distinguish the college's model for 21st-century undergraduate teaching and learning: social responsibility, intercultural understanding, interdisciplinary learning, student engagement, and environmental sustainability. These educational values are framed by the college's aspirational community values that emphasize community, diversity, dialogue, inquiry, and action. Such ideals promote ethical practices and serve to guide the daily implementation of the college's mission which is to produce engaged, socially responsible citizens of the world through an academically rigorous, interdisciplinary liberal arts education emphasizing social justice, intercultural understanding, and environmental sensitivity. The values form the basis of the recently revised educational objectives that are the foundation of a Pitzer education.

Since 2015, Pitzer has undergone significant leadership changes which were precipitated by a perceived rupture in the leadership of the college. These events triggered a vigorous dialogue among faculty, trustees, students, and staff with respect to communication, decision making, leadership, institutional policy, campus climate, and governance. In June 2015, the tenured and tenure-track faculty took a vote of no confidence in the previous president in reaction to the president's decision to not renew the then vice-president for academic affairs and dean of faculty.

Although there was a break in continuity with regard to governance during the summer of 2015, there was continuity in terms of larger-scale institutional activities. The 2011-2016 Tactical Plan academic goals called for the development of social responsibility and intercultural understanding as authentic educational objectives—meaning the development of critical abilities that would be fully integrated into students' learning. The plan included a call to change the social responsibility graduation guideline to a social justice guideline, to create ad hoc

committees to enhance the rigor of the guideline, and to rethink the interdisciplinary and intercultural exploration graduation requirement.

When the College discovered that students were not meeting expectations for social responsibility and interdisciplinary and intercultural exploration, a task force was established to research best practices on related educational objectives elsewhere, define these educational objectives for Pitzer, and develop course criteria and student learning outcomes for meeting these educational objectives. During academic year 2014-2015, proposals for the creation of two new educational objectives were passed by Faculty Meeting and College Council with an expectation that these would take effect for the incoming class of 2016. In spring 2015, College Council approved the first major revision to the college's educational objectives since their introduction in 1998. The implementation of the new educational objectives in intercultural understanding, social justice, social responsibility, and the ethical implications of knowledge and praxis, which required the creation of four new types of courses, was the main curricular activity during 2015-2016.

In July 2016, Pitzer College welcomed to campus its sixth president, Melvin L. Oliver, an award-winning scholar on racial and urban inequality. Pitzer College has also welcomed new vice-presidents in the areas of admissions and financial aid as well as advancement. In spring 2017, following a performance evaluation by the faculty and president, the board of trustees approved the recommendation to remove the "interim" label for Dean of Faculty Nigel Boyle, who will continue to serve in this role through June 2019. This academic year, the College conducted a search for a new Dean and at the time of the team's visit the process had produced a set of finalists. In July 2018, the college welcomed three executive-level leaders: chief of staff and general counsel; vice-president for student affairs, and; vice-president for finance, administration, and treasurer. The addition of these members to the president's cabinet coincided with strategic planning and the reaffirmation of WSCUC accreditation during the 2018-19 academic year. The visiting team was impressed with the caliber of the cabinet that the president has assembled to lead Pitzer through the strategic planning process and its implementation.

Description of the Team's Review Process

On September 12th and 13th, 2018, an Off-site Review of Pitzer College was conducted in Oakland, California. James T. Harris, the President of the University of San Diego, served as the Chair while Larisa Genin, Associate Dean, Faculty, Accreditation and Undergraduate Programs, Saint Mary's College of California, served as assistant chair. Team members included Shirley McGuire, Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs, University of San Francisco; Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth, Executive Director, Office of Inclusive Excellence, University of California, Irvine; and Amos Himmelstein, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, Occidental College. Richard Osborn, WASC Vice President, provided support.

The off-site review process included the development of a team worksheet that identified Pitzer's strengths, challenges, and outstanding work or other aspects of the college that deserved commendations. After a thorough review of the Institutional Report and all initial supporting materials, the team developed the following Lines of Inquiry for the Accreditation Visit to the campus on March 25-18, 2019. These Lines of Inquiry were:

1. How is Pitzer College using the strategic planning process to prepare for the changes in higher education environment including enrollments, financial stability and potential risks?
2. Can you please tell us more about the institution's governance and budget planning? What are the lessons learned from centralized vs. de-centralized decision-making process?
3. Can you help us understand your key performance indicators? How are they decided and used?
4. What are the plans for developing a sustainable culture of assessment including ensuring faculty buy-in for assessment and program review?
5. Can you please provide updates on assessing educational objectives and core competences?
6. What is Pitzer's model for student success? What are the contributing factors to high retention, persistence and graduation rates?
7. How are special populations such as low income students being recruited, retained and served?
8. What programs are particularly effective in retaining and graduating students? Does it differ by student background (e.g. gender, ethnicity, low income, etc.)?

9. What approaches have you taken to examine post-graduation outcomes for students and alumni engagement?

These Lines of Inquiry were sent to the campus within one week of the off-site review along with a request for additional information. The campus was advised that it had until January 28, 2019 to respond. Pitzer's response provided additional information that assisted the team in better understanding the College and helped shape the scope of the Accreditation Visit to Pitzer.

From March 25 to March 28, the team visited the campus and met with key campus stakeholders including the board, President, Cabinet, faculty, staff, students and alumni. The visit included three open sessions with students, faculty and alumni. A confidential email was available to receive comments from the community. The team learned more about the strategic planning, governance structure, assessments, program reviews, student learning, allocation of resources and fundraising.

The team appreciated the work of Marco Antonio Cruz (WSCUC Accreditation Liaison Officer) and his dedicated team who did an outstanding job of organizing and managing our visit. The team benefitted from the collegial, honest, and thoughtful participation by everyone involved in this process.

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

The Pitzer College Institutional Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation was organized in seven chapters to provide the visiting team with updated information related to key performance areas for the college; an overview of processes that support institutional effectiveness, quality assurance, and improvement; and an examination of how the college is building infrastructure and capacity to foster sustainability and accountability.

The Institutional Report was clearly written and reflected a thoughtful and inclusive approach to its development. It provided an excellent overview of its history and how its founding values

have shaped the mission and goals of Pitzer College today. In addition, the development of teams that included members from the various constituencies with specific assignments for review and writing, demonstrated how faculty, staff and administration worked collaboratively to produce a very important document that was a good reflection of the unique shared governance model at Pitzer. The result was a quality report that presented an accurate assessment of the campus and where it would like to focus for its future development.

Beyond being thoughtful and easy to read, the report included a thorough review of the institution's responses to previous WSCUC recommendations. That narrative focused on the campus' actions following the submission of their Interim Report to WSCUC in 2014 and how they organized to continue to take action on the five recommendations made in the commission action letter of 2011. Although the team was impressed with the level of detail in addressing concerns identified in previous WSCUC reports and progress, it was disappointed at times with the lack of depth of analysis, particular in relation to student success outcomes, and signs of uneven advancement in other areas, such as assessment and program review.

Overall, the team found the Institutional Report to be indicative of the care, effort, and intention on how the process of self-review for accreditation should be, and in this case was, accomplished. While each chapter was approached separately, there was a common thread throughout the report that focused on the inclusive process used to address WASC Standards. The candor and transparency of the document was welcomed and appreciated by the visiting team. Ultimately, the report provided the necessary level of review and self-reflection but raised other issues for the team to consider.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews

In the action letter dated July 5, 2011, the Commission recommended that Pitzer College address five areas for its Interim Report in 2014. The five areas included; 1) Assessment of Student Learning and Achievement, 2) Revision of the Program Review Process, 3) Strengthening Institutional Research Capacity, 4) Campus Life Outcomes, and, 5) Evidence of the Sustainability of Educational Effectiveness Initiatives.

In a letter in response to Pitzer's Interim Report, dated March 2, 2015, the Commission acted to receive the report and asked the College at the time of its next review in 2019 to provide an update on progress made on the five areas of focus based on its findings at the time. With regard to the Assessment of Student Learning and Achievement, the Commission believed that the College had provided evidence that Pitzer understood WSCUC's concern and had begun to respond in earnest. The Commission stated that most of the progress was at the systems design level and infrastructure from a top down approach which was an important first step. The commission stated that more work needed to be focused on turning these important steps into a culture of evidence so that more faculty will embrace assessment as part of the institution's DNA.

In the area of Program Review, the Commission noted that Pitzer was on schedule to have 97% of all field are program reviews completed by 2017 and appreciated the reduction in time from three to two years. It recommended that expectations for what represents good achievement be considered as part of the program review process and that the College would need to provide evidence of further progress by 2019.

Major progress was cited by the Commission with regard to strengthening the institution's capacity for data collection and research. The Commission cited the creation of templates for curricular mapping, the development of an institutionalized framework for assessment by the Office of Academic Assessment, the production of dashboards with disaggregated data on

retention and graduation rates as well as the work of the Office of Institutional Research as laudable attempts to assess reasons for the College's success in several areas.

In its review on the development and assessment of outcomes related to campus life the Commission found no evidence of data or outcomes of campus life. It stated that a culture of assessment does not appear to exist in this area and was described as being "in infancy". It was recommended that this area be given a high priority leading up to the reaffirmation review in 2019.

The fifth area under review was the sustainability of educational effectiveness across the campus. In its interim report Pitzer did provide evidence of building a sustainability infrastructure with a number of new and permanent staff members hired. While there was evidence of administrative and staff commitment to this work it was suggested that the next visiting team would want to know how widely embraced these practices are among the faculty.

Component 2: Compliance with Standards and Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Pitzer has a formally approved mission statement that is appropriate for a Liberal Arts college. It states: "*The mission of Pitzer College is to produce engaged, socially responsible citizens of the world through an academically rigorous, interdisciplinary liberal arts education emphasizing social justice, intercultural understanding, and environmental sensitivity*".

Pitzer also has a strong commitment to the public good. This commitment is found in its emphasis on social justice, reciprocity, advocacy, organizing, research, and collaboration, thereby prompting structural shifts to systemic inequalities in local and global contexts. What is equally impressive is its recognition of its community partners as co-educators and its clear articulation of reciprocal benefits for students and for communities that can be seen in the many activities in the Community Engagement Center (CEC) (1.1).

Pitzer has made explicit its educational objectives which are consistent with its mission and stated purposes. As a liberal arts college with a strong interdisciplinary curriculum in the social and behavioral sciences, Pitzer presents a unique opportunity for self-exploration and for exploration of the world. The College expects students to take an active part in planning their course of study, to bring a spirit of inquiry and adventure to planning that course of study, and to work hard to meet the intellectual goals of a Pitzer education. To guide students and their advisers, the College has identified the following six educational objectives: Breadth of Knowledge, Understanding in Depth, Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning and Effective Expression, Interdisciplinary Perspective, Intercultural understanding and Social Justice, Social Responsibility, and the Ethic Implications of Knowledge and Action. Pitzer ensures data is available to the public on student achievement, retention, graduation rates and student learning (1.2).

Pitzer states publicly its core values as well as its commitment to academic freedom and acts accordingly. The institution has in place specific guidelines and practices demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth (1.3). Pitzer states it has a multi-pronged approach to improving diversity, equity, and inclusion across the campus. The evidence it provides is the establishment of a Diversity Committee which plays a major role in hiring faculty and staff. The Pitzer in Ontario Program and the Community Engagement Center (formerly CCCSI) were established in 2002 to promote social responsibility through local community engagement. Social responsibility and intercultural understanding were officially incorporated into the curriculum and educational objectives for students to meet in 1998. When affirmative action policies around the country were under siege, Pitzer established an Affirmative Action Task Force (AATF) that reviewed the institution's affirmative action policy and reaffirmed our commitment to hiring a diversified faculty. The recommendations of the AATF were approved by faculty meeting and College Council and incorporated into the faculty handbook in spring 2014 (1.4).

All of Pitzer's efforts for increasing diversity in society through its policies has come from different committees and task forces composed of faculty, staff, and students. It has stated that because of the breadth and range of these activities, Pitzer chose not to hire a chief diversity

officer, but rather an associate dean of faculty, hired from within the faculty, to have diversity, equity, and inclusion as a central focus within their portfolio. The associate dean does not promote diversity, equity, and inclusion from the top-down but coordinates existing efforts, fosters new programs, and provides informational and financial support for these new efforts.

While Pitzer has stated its commitment and demonstrated a willingness and capacity to identify and address equity concerns on campus, it is still unclear what communities the College seeks to serve or how changing social demographics will impact the way the institution serves its students and the public good. There is also no evidence that the College assesses perceptions of campus climate by students, staff and faculty on a regular basis and share that data with the campus community or that said data is used to inform institutional action.

The primary purpose of Pitzer College is educational and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. As part of the consortium of The Claremont Colleges, a group of five undergraduate liberal arts colleges and two graduate institutions Pitzer is able to provide a greater variety of programs than a single college could support its own. This is accomplished without jeopardizing Pitzer's ability to function as an autonomous institution (1.5).

The College has published policies on student grievances and complaints which can be found in the student handbook. It does not have any history of adverse findings against with respect to these policies. An accreditation team member has confirmed that the college maintains records in accordance with policies in general for five years across several offices depending on the type of complaint (i.e., Title IX coordinator maintains records related to sexual misconduct complaints, and the offices of Dean of Students for complaints against students, Dean of Faculty for complaints against faculty, and Director of Human Resources for complaints against staff members or against third parties. The accreditation team has recommended greater transparency in regard to posting information about record maintenance for student grievances and complaints (1.6).

Pitzer has clear descriptions of the credits it offers and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit it awards in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation

is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal. At the time of the writing of the accreditation report, the College was working on reforming the student judicial conduct review process and providing information to help students and families understand financial aid programs that are available to students. Pitzer exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations. The College's finances are audited on an annual basis by a qualified independent auditor (1.7). Pitzer's commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies were demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC (1.8).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard 1.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions - Teaching and Learning, Scholarship and Creative Activity, Student Learning and Success

The Institutional Report discusses the faculty commitment to student learning through their core values: social responsibility, intercultural understanding, interdisciplinary learning, student engagement, and environmental sustainability. Standard 2 was reviewed by a university committee of faculty from major decision-making communities, staff from academic and student affairs, and two representatives from Student Senate. The comments in the institution's review for Standard 2 reflect a thoughtful and critical evaluation of what the campus believes has been accomplished, and where there is need for improvement. Student success and college ranking data suggests a strong commitment to teaching excellence and student learning which was supported in interviews with faculty and students during the campus visit (CFRs 2.1-2.4). Pitzer is to be commended for its commitment to academic excellence that can be seen in the rigorous requirements for attaining the educational objectives, the many pathways available to purse a major field of study, and the variety of learning opportunities created and supported outside of the classroom. It is not clear, however, that the University faculty, staff, and administrators understand the contributors to student retention, persistence, and success at Pitzer College and how these outcomes differ by student background (CFR 2.10). The team recommends that Pitzer could become more data-informed through the consistent assessment of the educational objectives, majors, and student outcomes and dissemination of those results to committees and

inclusion in program review (CFRs 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5) Institutional Research (IR) capacity has increased and there will be a data warehouse to assist with analysis and dissemination (CFR 4.2).

Pitzer College is also commended for its remarkable rise in national reputation and image. Pitzer is ranked #41 in Liberal Arts Colleges, an increase of almost 30 places since 2002, and is ranked #35 in Most Innovative Schools in *U.S. New and World Report* in 2019. The institution has been ranked highly based on value added, diversity, and low student debt for many years. While being a member of the Consortium has helped Pitzer in their ability to attract talented faculty, staff, and students, the campus visit confirmed the team's impression from the report that Pitzer itself is an intellectually vibrant and academically exciting community. Discussions with community member revealed that members sometimes focus more on Pitzer's standing in comparison its some of the higher ranked and better resourced "siblings" in the Consortium than on Pitzer's own national standing as an excellent liberal arts institution.

All programs have learning outcomes (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3, 2.6). Program review and assessment processes are in place for both curricular and co-curricular programs (CFRs 2.7, 2.11); however, a culture of assessment has still not developed (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4). There is some evidence of closing the loop and using of institutional data or assessment results inform teaching. There is an acknowledgement that assessment places a burden on the faculty and the work is not yet recognized during the tenure and promotion process (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9). In addition, advising is uneven in places and the University could work on greater consistency across majors and advisors (CFR 2.12), while other student support services are strong and the transfer student experience appears to be fine (CFR 2.13).

Pitzer's faculty, including those in the W. M. Keck Science Department, are highly-qualified educators and many are internationally known for their research (CFR 3.1). The junior tenure-track faculty complete an annual review of their goals and achievements. There is a meeting with the Dean of the Faculty and members of their field group that is recorded to keep all on the same page regarding professional development and advancement. Career progress for associate and full professors are also reviewed regularly (CFR 3.3). The Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure

(APT) Committee make recommendations to the President regarding contract renewals, tenure, promotion, and faculty reviews. There are two student voting members on the committee in the spirt of transparency and shared governance.

The processes for renewal, promotion, tenure, and appeals are outlined in the faculty handbook (http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=9&navoid=645) and discussion during the campus visit with faculty, the dean, and the dean's staff indicated that the process is perceived as thorough and fair (CFR 3.2). More junior faculty did indicate that workload can be high for them and that highly political activity by their tenure peers can absorb energy that junior faculty could better spend on other scholarly activities. Diversifying the faculty is a goal; consequently, hiring committees at Pitzer require diversity training, include an affirmative action facilitator, and require candidates to submit a diversity statement. During the campus visit, some faculty hoped that Keck Science Department will go back to including the facilitator on their hiring committees.

Most of the discussion during the campus visit about faculty development focused on the consortium's Center for Teaching and Learning that is shared by the five members of the consortium (https://teaching.claremont.edu/). Funded by a grant from the Andrew W. Melon Foundation, CTL provides mandated workshops for new faculty that focus on topics such as syllabi construction, inclusivity, and assessment. The CTL will meet with faculty confidentially about their latest review and visiting the campus to provide input on teaching practices. Activities like the book club create a teaching and learning culture (CFR 3.3). The center is only four years old and some faculty are still learning all that it provides.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard 2.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability - Faculty and Staff, Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources, Organizational Structures, Decision-Making Processes

Pitzer College places a strong reliance and importance on its faculty and staff. Both the quality and diversity of its faculty and staff seem to match those of the institutions aspirations to deliver a high-quality education to a gifted student population. The college is committed to these ideals and core values in its hiring and evaluation practices. As is the case in other areas of the college, being a member of the Claremont Consortium allows Pitzer to cover several administrative offices and services by relying on shared resources with the other schools.

The college is also able to leverage its strong faculty and staff through its emphasis on shared governance. Although the shear numbers seem sufficient to deliver an outstanding education to its students, this commitment to shared governance can place an excessive burden on many of the employees and not allow the college to move on issues without maneuvering through a cumbersome and somewhat unclear process. It is also not clear how the Pitzer shared governance model includes mid-level and lower level staff positions (CFRs 3.1-3.3).

Pitzer's strong market position and student demand, along with its membership in the 5Cs and the recent increases in annual giving, puts the college in a favorable financial position. Any small, liberal arts college that is able to maintain its credit rating with a stable outlook in the current environment should feel confident that it would still be operating beyond the next decade. Pitzer's prudent fiscal management has resulted in operating surpluses for several years even though they are highly dependent on student-based revenue. It's easy to simply state that Pitzer should find ways to diversify its revenue sources, but it is quite another thing to actualize it. Liberal arts colleges that offer only baccalaureate degrees and do not offer graduate programs are all in the similar position of relying heavily on student tuition, room and board revenue. It is unclear how exactly the Consortium allocates resources to each of the schools; however Pitzer appears to be the highest net importer of students among the five schools.

Although Pitzer is able to reach its net tuition revenue goals, and may increase the amount through enrollment growth, the college will need to review the process used to develop the annual operating budget and how decisions are made to allocate and reallocate resources. The Budget Implementation Committee needs some rethinking on how it operates and what its membership is charged to do. Fortunately, the recent hire of VP/Treasurer Laura Troendle gives confidence that a reimagining of the budget process and realignment of existing resources will be accomplished in a clear and coherent manner. (CFRs 3.4, 3.5)

Continued investment in the school's physical plant and technology resources will be essential for Pitzer to stay competitive. The capital spending ratio, although not as high in most recent years, does seem sufficient. The college has made several investments in capital projects and landscaping that exhibit the school's commitment to one of its core values, environmental sustainability.

The overall staffing and organizational structure at Pitzer is adequate for a school of its size and as a member of a consortium. There seem to be qualified people who are accountable for the work that needs to get done. The committee structure covers the necessary administrative functions with the relevant roles and responsibilities given to the appropriate positions. While there are multiple ways colleges can organize its administrative and curricular structures, Pitzer seems to have it covered. The one area that seems to be overloaded is the Dean's Office. The VP for Academic Affairs has a very flat structure with a lot of direct reports. It must be incredibly difficult for the VPAA to manage strategically with all of these reports. Given the college's move toward a more data-informed culture and the need to implement and evaluate the strategic plan with institutional metrics, one consideration would be to move the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment to the Office of the Treasurer.

One of Pitzer's founding principles has been centered around shared governance, including Board, administration, faculty, staff, and students in decision-making. While this principle has brought a unique strength to Pitzer, the team has found growing challenges with the model, including a process that requires a long time to make both routine and consequential decisions, the inability of the President and Vice Presidents to make appropriate decisions without broad

consultation, and some groups not feeling respected in shared governance. The team recommends a study of possible areas of improvement of shared governance, including the building of greater trust in decision-making between administration, faculty, staff, and students.

It is a little puzzling that communication and transparency regarding decision-making is reported as an institutional challenge. Effective and consistent communication in colleges and universities is often a challenge, but one might expect it to be less of a challenge at a school that truly applies shared governance in its decision-making. It seems that there is a disconnect between the participants in the shared governance process and the communication to the rest of the Pitzer community.

While there is a budget planning process in place, it is still unclear how institutional priorities and needs are captured in the process and weighed against available resources. This will become particularly important as the college completes its strategic planning process and starts to implement its goals and objectives.

Pitzer has the right pieces in place and is poised to excel in this accreditation standard. With the addition of a knowledgeable and well-functioning new senior leadership team, along with a vibrant, reinvigorated faculty, the school can continue to rise and take on new challenges (CRFs 3.6-3.10).

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard 3.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement - Quality Assurance, Processes, Institutional Learning and Improvement

The Institutional Report discusses the progress Pitzer College has made in quality assurance. There is a program review process and assessment infrastructure and training in place (CFR 4.1). There has been an increase in IR capacity and a new data warehouse (CFR 4.2). There are still

serious gaps in the assessment progress and program review cycle. The core competencies and some of the educational objectives and majors have been assessed at least once. Some program review have not been completed, particularly in the intercollegiate Keck Science Department. There is little evidence of a full culture of assessment and that the findings are being used in decision-making (CFRs 4.3, 4.4). Faculty buy-in is an issue with workload issues being cited as an obstacle (CFR 4.5). The team recommends that Pitzer foster a data-informed culture to ensure best practices, including assessment of core competencies, educational objectives, majors and student outcomes.

The team met with many members of the Pitzer community to discuss assessment and program review process and progress, including faculty from several field groups, the Academic Planning Committee (APC), the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty, the Vice President of Student Affairs, the Associate Dean of the Faculty, the Director of Institutional Research and Academic Assessment, the Assistant Dean of Faculty, and support staff from multiple units during the visit. It was clear from the interviews that Pitzer is fully committed to student learning and continuous improvement in the curricular and co-curricular areas (CFR 4.3). The community members were also honest about the obstacles they have faced. Considerable work has been done at the grass-roots level to create an academic assessment process that will be owned by the faculty. For example, the APC has been responsible for review of assessment of the core competencies and majors and the program review results (CFR 4.4). Given the APC's role in resource allocation for the field groups, it is an appropriate place to review the findings. Community members discussed other ways to disseminate the results so that they could inform decision-making, including College Council and strategic planning committees (CFR 4.6).

Program reviews in academic affairs and student affairs led to important improvements in those units and there was some evidence of closing the loop (CFRs 4.4, 4.6). The interdisciplinary nature of the field groups has made keeping to the program review schedule difficult. The team recommends that the process be modified to consider the interdisciplinary nature of many of Pitzer's academic programs. For instance, Pitzer may want to create a data sharing agreement with Scripps for assessment and program review of the Keck Science departments in order to

reduce faculty time devoted to paperwork and to get a better picture of student learning in these majors.

There was evidence that the strategic planning process has started, although behind schedule. Interviews during the campus visit with faculty, staff, students, and administrators on the Faculty Executive Committee and Academic Planning Committee revealed that the strategic planning process was inclusive and informed by the student success, program review, and assessment data in the self-study. Discussions with multiple groups in academic and student affairs suggested that the college is beginning to prepare for the changing higher education environment (CFRs 4.6, 4.7). Faculty, staff, and students talked about Pitzer's tuition dependency and challenges associated with supporting an increasingly diverse student body. Still, the team recommends that Pitzer continue timely progress on completion of the institution's strategic plan and implementation of priorities.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Standard 4.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators:

Assessment work was summarized in the IEEI for the 6 educational objectives and the 37 academic programs. Two of the educational objectives have learning outcomes that fully overlap with the academic program learning outcomes and, therefore, are evaluated at the program level (i.e., Breadth of Knowledge and Depth of Understanding). Two of the educational objectives have been assessed, although the results have not been discussed by faculty. There is some evidence that the faculty have reflected on or made curriculum changes in response to those assessment results, but data-driven decision-making is not a key element Pitzer's curriculum revision process, yet (CFR 4.1). Assessment of the remaining two educational objectives is still with courses being reviewed by workgroups. Academic program review process is in place (CFR 2.7), but stalled when the campus was developing their educational objectives. Less than half of the academic programs having undergone program review. Some of the programs are overseen by a consortium group and coordination may be required to complete future evaluations. In

addition, some of the methods described such as syllabus review, are not effective ways of assessing student learning (CFR 2.6.). Interviews during the campus visit showed that Pitzer is committed to continuous improvement and has worked on building a more sustainable assurance of learning process. As mentioned above, the team recommends that the program review needs to be better aligned with the interdisciplinary nature of the field group and collaborations.

Compliance with Federal Requirements:

The appendices to the accreditations team's report include the Federal Compliance Forms. The team found that the institution is in compliance with federal requirements. The team supports Pitzer's work with the other Consortium members to further clarify the credit hour policy the schools share.

Component 3: Defining the Meaning of Degrees and Ensuring Their Quality and Rigor

The meaning of the Pitzer College undergraduate degree is rooted in its mission:

> *"…key components of the mission are emphasized through the promotion of the college's core values of social responsibility, intercultural understanding, interdisciplinary learning, student engagement, and environmental sustainability. These core values, which stem from the goals identified in the mission statement, are also directly mapped onto our college-level educational objectives (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2). Pitzer's community values—community, diversity, dialogue, inquiry, and action—extend well beyond the academic program and inform co-curricular activities, residential life, and interactions within the greater campus community." (Pitzer College* Institutional Report, *p. 43-44.)*

The Institutional Report links the mission and the meaning of the Pitzer College degree with both the shared governance model and participation in the Claremont Colleges Consortium. Pitzer is to be commended for being well integrated with the consortium, which also helps define the student experience.

Pitzer College is also to be commended for the clear educational objectives that embody Pitzer's mission, values and guiding principles. The college used an inclusive process to create six measurable Educational Objectives: Breadth of Knowledge; Understanding in Depth; Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning, and Effective Expression; Interdisciplinary Perspective; Intercultural Understanding; and Social justice, Social Responsibility, and the Ethical implications of Knowledge and Action (CFRs 2.4, 4.6). These educational objectives map onto their core values. During their self-study process, focus groups showed that faculty, students, and staff agreed on the "hallmarks of a Pitzer education" which included study aboard, commitment to diversity, and a holistic education (Institutional Report, p. 45). The social justice and community engagement focus of the college was particularly distinctive, according to community members.

Assessment of the educational objectives is in the early stages. Pitzer College used direct assessments from senior seminars to evaluate the quality of the degree. Breadth of Knowledge and Understanding in Depth are too assessed through the majors; however, more than a third of the majors have not been assessed. Teams of faculty and co-curricular practitioners have developed learning outcomes and rubrics and conducted a first year of assessment data for two educational objectives: Intercultural Understanding and Social Justice, Social Responsibility, and Ethical Implication of Knowledge. The results suggest that most Pitzer College students are proficient to highly proficient in these two educational objectives. The faculty, however, have just begun discussing these results and closing the loop has not yet occurred. The last two educational objectives are still in the working group stage. Definitions of proficiency exist with field experts in the Pitzer community setting high standards that have been approved by field groups, faculty, and collaborative decision-making groups. Still, proficiency is not enough to ensure the integrity of the Pitzer College degree (CFR 2.2). Alumni outcome data would help Pitzer demonstrate that students achieved the objectives and are successful.

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

The Institutional Report describes campus-wide efforts to examine student learning, educational quality, and performance standards of graduates at Pitzer College. The priority on student learning is underscored by the fact that teaching and advising – of all the criteria in the promotion process – are elevated as the most important considerations for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion.

WSCUC core competencies are described as mapping onto various campus educational objectives, with course approaches such as "comparing and evaluating the ideas of others" and "exploring mathematics, statistics, quantitative/survey research methods" respectively addressing learning in critical thinking and quantitative reasoning; those in effective expression addressing skill development in written and oral communications; and major, writing, and most humanities and social science courses addressing development of information literacy (CFRs 2.2a, 2.3). The college uses direct methods to assess student artifacts and their efforts are guided by the nationally-recognized AAC&U VALUE rubrics, which are commendable. Evidence from three of five core competencies was presented with written communications being assessed in first-year seminars and senior assignments initiated by faculty. Information literacy was examined in senior theses, and oral communication was assessed through senior poster presentations. All of the assessments were spearheaded by faculty groups and with planned discussions of program improvements (CFRs 2.4, 2.5). Faculty collaboration as part of a working group were scheduled to collect artifacts from three statistics courses to begin the assessment of quantitative reasoning in fall 2018 (CFRs 2.4, 2.5). A line of inquiry was initiated and discussed with groups during the site visit about the status of assessment of core competencies. There have been advances in data management to integrate various data into one comprehensive and accessible data warehouse, with anticipated campus access in approximately 18 months. However, overall progress to understand student development in core knowledge areas has been slow, with mixed results about student proficiencies, and with few actions identified to inform continued improvement. No closing loop specifics were discussed after learning that nearly a third of students scored below proficiency in developing coherent research questions in written communications and in

communicating evidence for information literacy (CFR 2.6). These efforts also reflect slight progress in this area since WSCUC's recommendations on this topic in 2011.

The important information being gleaned about some educational objectives and graduating student shortfalls to achieve proficiency should further motivate the school to double its efforts for ongoing reviews in these critical areas. Incentives to improve response rates for NSSE data collection, and more refined study of the skills of graduating students, disaggregated by specific student identity groups, may provide better nuanced understanding about this increasingly diverse student body.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation

Pitzer's definition of student success integrates "the institution's mission and values with core competencies into its educational objectives" (Institutional Report, p. 68). The institution highly values self-exploration expecting "students to take an active part in planning their course of study, to bring a spirit of inquiry and adventure to planning that course of study, and to work hard to meet the intellectual goals of a Pitzer education" (CFR 2.5; Pitzer catalog: http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=496). The Pitzer educational objectives are heavily aligned with the mission (https://www.pitzer.edu/about/mission-and-values/. Students must successfully complete the educational objectives through a major and a general education curriculum consisting of intercultural understanding; social justice, social responsibility, and ethics; breadth of knowledge; and written expression requirements. Student learning outcomes and degree expectations are clearly posted on the website in the catalog and on field group pages for all programs of study, including majors, minors, double majors, combined majors, honors programs, special advanced degree programs, and the creation of a specialized degree. (CFRs 4,3, 4.4). Still, interviews with administrators, faculty, and staff revealed that people do not know why the students are successful. The team recommends that Pitzer foster a data-informed culture to ensure best practices, including assessment of core competencies, educational objectives, majors and student outcomes. (CFRs 2.2a, 2.7, 4.5, and 4.6)

There is alignment between the educational objectives and the living/learning outcomes for the Office of Student Affairs that guide the co-curricular activities, especially outcomes emphasizing intercultural understanding, social justice, social responsibility and community engagement (CFR 2.11). Information about student support services is comprehensive and accessible on the website (https://www.pitzer.edu/student-life/student-affairs/). Student success includes co-curricular high impact practices such as learning communities, internship and field experiences, and study abroad, as well as curricular experiences such as student research and capstone classes. The NSSE data from 2017 shows that over 93% of students participating in the survey reported engaging in 2 or more high impact practice (Institutional Report, p. 68). Students appear to be well supported by Pitzer's Academic Support Services (PASS), which "provides resources, training, programming, collaboration, and direct services to facilitate academic success, create inclusive environments, and achieve access and equity" (CFRs 2.10, 2.13; https://www.pitzer.edu/student-life/academic-support-services/). Students are provided with coaching, tutoring, access, accommodations, assessment, crisis intervention, wellness support and other resources. There is a Writing Center for student, alumni, and staff on campus https://www.pitzer.edu/writing-center/) that recently went through a program review.

Career Services Center provides many services and assessment data shows that 62% of Pitzer Students visiting last year (https://www.pitzer.edu/career-services/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2017/07/Career-Services-Impact-Overview.pdf.) Still, interviews with students and faculty showed that the student advising experience is uneven and often falls on small group of faculty. The team recommends that Pitzer develop a holistic advising system, in particular for students from under-represented groups, which considers equity in workload for faculty.

Pitzer is to be commended for their exemplary retention, persistence and graduation rates. The indicators show a strong commitment to student success and learning. Retention and graduation rates are publicly available on Institutional Research web page, along with other measures of student success (CFR 2.10; https://www.pitzer.edu/institutional-research/wp-content/uploads/sites/33/2015/02/2014-Institutional-Dashboard-Public.pdf).

Graduation rates have increased since the last WSCUC visit: four-year rates have moved from 71% to 76% and six-year rates have moved from 80% to 83%, well above the national average for comparable colleges. The unit redemption rate is 94% and the Absolute Graduation Rate is 88% on the WSCUC Graduation Rate Dashboard for the 8-year total. Retention rates have also increased since the last visit: 1st to 2nd year rates have moved from 90% to 95%, 2nd to 3rd year rates from 83% to 88% and 3rd to 4th year rates from 79% to 86%.

The Institutional Report discusses challenges Pitzer has had obtaining and analyzing disaggregated data (CFRs 2.10, 4.2). The institution is working on a data warehouse that will allow the institution to consolidate student information across units. Retention and graduate data by gender and ethnicity can be found in the Institutional Report on the IR website: https://www.pitzer.edu/institutional-research/wp-content/uploads/sites/33/2014/09/Retention-Report.pdf. The report indicates that retention rates for white males appear to lag behind other groups. A report on the IR website suggests that retention numbers for white female and Asian American students may have dropped at some point (https://www.pitzer.edu/institutional-research/wp-content/uploads/sites/33/2014/09/Retention-Report.pdf). Pitzer seems to be in the early stages of understanding what factors contribute to high or low retention, persistence, and graduation rates, especially for subgroups of students. The Institutional Report discusses the development of a strategic enrollment and retention task force by the vice president for admissions and financial aid.

Pitzer is a nationally known institution with a strong reputation and image. The short-term impact of the Pitzer education appears to be strong. The First Destination survey for the Class of 2017 showed that 87% of students that responded were either employed full-time, attending graduate school, or participating in another professional education experience (https://www.pitzer.edu/career-services/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2017/07/Career-Services-Impact-Overview.pdf). Assessment of additional alumni outcomes would be valuable as Pitzer seeks to understand the long-term impact of the Pitzer education.

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

The Institutional Report provides relevant background and history associated with the establishment of assessment of learning at the program level at Pitzer College. The campus has capacity for a high level of program review and data use with 100% of the 37 program areas reporting established learning outcomes. A revised program review schedule and selected annual reports from 39 campus areas show that faculty field groups are at some stage of program review and collaborate as faculty-led field group teams on these assessment endeavors (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7). It also is laudable to note that the Office of Academic Assessment filled in a void in the past by conducting evaluations without faculty involvement, and that funding allocations are now available to support external reviews of field groups (CFR 2.7). Examples of the field group reviews showed that these assessments informed about relationships of the major curriculum to institutional learning outcomes, as well as to curricular comparisons with peer campuses for planning future faculty lines and courses (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.4). However, field groups face a daunting challenge to understand how student course taking through the Consortium – which provides tremendous capacity for students to access courses across the 5Cs to fulfill their majors – informs student learning when program and other assessment can only factor in impacts of Pitzer courses, and not those from the remaining 5Cs (CFRs 4.1-4.3). Moreover, broadened engagement of faculty groups in reviews requires balancing assessment that will be meaningful in the face of higher workload for smaller programs. Further, there is a need to connect the results from curricular and co-curricular assessments in ways that inform continued improvements to the holistic Pitzer experience (CFR 4.3).

Quality assurance efforts are informed by other reviews and learning evidence, which include assessment of the campus Writing Center, program review of the Office of Student Affairs and ad hoc campus assessments shown as part of campus websites and/or institutional dashboards (CFRs 4.5, 4.6). It is highly advantageous that Pitzer College representatives assess both curricular and co-curricular learning, but this line of inquiry pursued during the site visit highlighted a lack of collaboration to learn from one another's techniques to improve the whole student experience (CFR 4.7). The Writing Center's review is informed from multiple sources

and provides insights about revised curriculum now aligned to the campus educational objectives, as well as a diverse clientele of students from across academic levels (CFR 4.7). The Student Affairs recommendations support sustaining assessment, cross-academic collaborations, and divisional strategic planning at a time that may leverage the current campus strategic planning process (CFR 4.7). However, evidence of closing the loop from this assessment and moving the recommendations into use is needed.

The campus provides candid discussion about the areas of quality assurance where improvements are being pursued. Approaches to remedy data availability and access through a data warehouse are in final development stages, and hopefully will engage institutional research more directly with field group efforts for planning and programming (CFR 4.7). This collaborative approach exemplifies the campus' movement from its self-described "top-down" assessment approaches to one more closely aligned with educational objectives, greater faculty engagement in major reviews, and additional staff to implement these transitions successfully. Updated impact reports provided to the accreditation team during its visit highlight increased knowledge rates of students and similar trends for disaggregated data by low socio-economic and other characteristics that are part of ad hoc reporting (CF 4.7). These dashboards and longitudinal data snapshots enable campus members to view continuing and emerging trends to influence programming but require collaboration to define common indicators (CFR 4.7).

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability, Preparing for the Changing Higher Education Environment

Pitzer is positioned to continue its place and status as a premier liberal arts college. This is evident by its strong market demand that rivals even the most elite colleges. Pitzer's admission draw rate (yield rate divided by acceptance rate) is comparable with some of the most highly selective colleges. Being a member of the Claremont Consortium is certainly an advantage for Pitzer, but it will need to clearly define and differentiate itself from the other schools. The Keck science program and the Norco Inside Out prison program (with the possibility of offering a BA) will help define the curriculum as unique among liberal arts colleges.

The big challenge for Pitzer financially going forward will be the ability to enroll the current large percentage of low-need students at a high sticker price while keeping the tuition discount rate from increasing. The five-year budget forecast assumes the discount rate will remain below 30% in each year. This will likely be difficult to achieve given the total cost of tuition, even if only increasing the tuition price by 3.5%, and still attracting top quality students. The college's ability to attract and provide access for high-need and Pell eligible students will be difficult if the discount rate remains below 30%. Since the operating budget is highly dependent on tuition revenue, generating net tuition revenue growth without enrollment growth will be challenging.

Another financial issue the college will be facing is the need to preserve and grow the endowment. Pitzer should be applauded for looking closely at endowment spending and reducing it several years ago while keeping the spending policy between 4-4.5% with a 16-quarter average. This was a very sensible decision. Given the pressures on low tuition revenue growth, the temptation would have been to increase the draw from endowment for operations. But preservation alone will not be enough. The college will need to increase the endowment per student in order to stay ahead of financial pressures on the operating budget. Increasing the contribution ratio from investment income into the operating budget should be a priority. Raising funds for endowed scholarships could be one of the areas of focus for the next campaign.

If Pitzer hopes to achieve its strategic financial and endowment goals, it will need to invest significant resources into building a sustainable culture of philanthropy through deeper alumni engagement, board leadership and a major fundraising campaign. This will require developing a bold strategic plan to inspire donors to fund key strategic initiatives.

Pitzer should be commended for building its infrastructure around institutional research and assessment. Developing a data-informed decision-making culture is not an easy task and is something that is becoming more and more necessary as institutions execute strategies and plan for the future. This commitment will prove to be very valuable as Pitzer determines its allocation of limited resources. It will be very important for the Treasurer's office and the budget committee to include the OIRA in a more formal way.

The recent planning process for developing the strategic plan seems to be a positive experience. The process has brought the community together around common themes and helped to rebuild trust between the various members of the Pitzer community. The vision and aspirational goals and objectives in the strategic plan will be the framework to guide the school going forward. It will be very important for the college leadership to prioritize the goals and objectives and the Financial Sustainability and Facilities/IT Working Group will need to support the Treasurer's Office to develop a financial plan that will support and operationalize the implementation of the plan. Reallocating and realigning existing resources will likely be the primary funding sources for many of the initiatives and proposals that will emerge from the planning process. The college may also increase enrollments as a means for generating greater net tuition revenue, but will need to do so without significantly increasing the discount rate. Communication about these priorities and how the college will set out to implement the plan will also be critical for community buy-in.

With the addition of the new VP/Treasurer, Pitzer is now looking at multi-year budgeting and financial planning. This is a positive step for the institution and needs to continue as the college moves forward. The inclusive and transparent process VP Troendle is bringing to Pitzer will repair the trust between the Treasurer's Office and the rest of the community. Her ability to educate members of the Pitzer community regarding the budget issues and challenges creates an environment for well-informed input and discussion. This can only lead to better decision-making when planning the financial future for Pitzer.

Component 8: Reflections and Plans for Improvement

The concluding chapter of the Institutional Report provided a detailed summary of the progress and results of the college's efforts of self-evaluation and assessment that it undertook as part of the reaffirmation of accreditation process. It is clear that their approach attempted to include the involvement of all key stakeholders, especially the faculty.

The Team was highly impressed with the many accomplishments of Pitzer College. The College's strong commitment to teaching excellence and student learning is commendable. Its

commitment to and the advancement of the liberal arts as a cornerstone for every Pitzer student is remarkable and is one of the reasons why the college possesses such a strong academic reputation among its peers. The association with and integration into the Claremont Colleges consortium is also a great strength and one that continues to help the college expand the learning and living experiences of its students.

In a time of great change in higher education nationally, Pitzer College has had to address these changes while simultaneously traversing its own difficult leadership transitions. The Visiting Team was impressed with the college's ability to navigate these transitions without any apparent negative impact on the experience of its students. Although these leadership changes have caused some concern from outside agencies, the college maintains strong financial ratings. The improvements in the generation of annual funds in recent years was also noted by the team and is viewed as a sign of good financial health and potential growth for non-tuition revenues.

The Visiting Team noted that the college has excellent admission and yield rates and commends the college for the exemplary retention, persistence and graduation rates. Few colleges in the United States can boast of the student success of Pitzer College. We are hopeful that this success will continue into the future once the college enacts new assessment processes across the campus.

In spite of the many accomplishments of the College, the visiting team felt strongly that much work remains to be done if the college is to continue on a positive trajectory in the future. We were particularly concerned about the little progress that had been made with regard to strategic and academic planning until the outside consulting firm was hired last fall to contribute to the advancement of this work. While the visiting team fully understands the difficulties associated with leadership changes and transitions and the need to wait until a new senior leadership team was in place, the college has not demonstrated a commitment to this work prior to the arrival of President Oliver. With his new team in place, we are encouraged that the strategic plan is forthcoming and that implementation can begin immediately.

The visiting team did not find sufficient proof to assure us that Pitzer College has developed a sustainable culture of assessment including ensuring faculty buy-in for assessment and program review. While it has done some good work in putting in place the administrative infrastructure to support assessment and program review, given the significance of faculty in the governance of the college, we remain concerned by the lack of depth of faculty engagement in this effort.

The visiting team also did not discover clear evidence that the college fully understands which of its academic and co-curricular programs are most effective in retaining and graduating students. While the success of its students is laudable, Pitzer does not appear to be able to articulate and support with data why it has been successful.

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

Commendations

The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and achievements:

1. Strong commitment to teaching excellence and student learning.
2. Clear educational objectives that embody Pitzer's mission, values and guiding principles.
3. Highly attractive and well-maintained campus, demonstrating the institution's commitment to sustainability.
4. Remarkable rise in national reputation and image.
5. Strategic integration with the Claremont Colleges Consortium.
6. Exemplary retention, persistence and graduation rates.
7. Extensive inclusion of students in shared governance.
8. Recruitment by the President of a highly qualified and experienced Cabinet.
9. Inclusive strategic planning process that was informed by self-study.

Recommendations

1. Engage in dialogue to improve shared governance, enhance communication, and build greater trust in decision-making between board, administration, faculty, staff, and students. (CFRs 3.7 and 3.10).
2. Create a realistic model for re-allocating funds to the highest academic priorities. (CFRs 3.4 and 3.7).
3. Continue timely progress on completion of the institution's strategic plan and implementation of priorities. (CFR 4.6).
4. Re-examine the budget implementation committee structure and role in order to improve the process for developing the annual operating budget. (CFRs 3.4 and 3.7).
5. Strengthen experience and sense of belonging throughout the student lifecycle. (CFRs 1.4 and 2.2a).
6. Develop a holistic advising system, in particular for students from under-represented groups, which considers equity in workload for faculty. (CFRs 2.12 and 2.13).
7. Revise program review process to better align it with the interdisciplinary nature of the field groups and collaborations. (CFRs 1.2, 2.2 and 2.7).
8. Build a stronger culture of philanthropy, alumni engagement and make necessary investments to ensure success of a future comprehensive campaign. (CFRs 3.4).
9. Foster a data-informed culture to ensure best practices, including assessment of core competencies, educational objectives, majors and student outcomes. (CFRs 2.2a, 2.7, 4.5, and 4.6).

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms

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

1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? ☑ YES ❒ NO
	Where is the policy located? General Catalog
	Comments: http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=496#course_credit The process used by the Dean of the Faculty to determine credit hour policy compliance for course that do not meet during traditional hours could be outlined in greater detail in the Catalog.
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 ❒ NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☑ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Credit hours are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee during the new/revised course approval process which requires a syllabus to be submitted.
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 ❒ NO
	Comments: Can be found at this link: http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=496#Standard_Class_Times_at_Pitzer Pitzer is discussing clarifying the policy with the other members of the Consortium.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)?
	What degree level(s)?
	What discipline(s)?
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ❒ YES ❒ NO
	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) *Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.*	How many syllabi were reviewed? 16
	What kinds of courses? 3 science with lab, 1 art course, 1 directed study, 2 first-year seminar, 2 100-level, 5 mid-level, 1 senior-level, 1 capstone
	What degree level(s)? All four
	What discipline(s)? Sociology, Psychology, Organizational Studies, Chemistry, Art, Gender Studies, Anthropology, Political Studies, Environmental Analysis
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☑ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Except for directed studies, the syllabi rely on the course schedule grid and then include significant coursework. Direct study includes a description of learning outcomes, goals, coursework, and meeting schedule.
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 21
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Majors, minors, double majors, combined majors, a 4+1, and the specialized major pathway
	What degree level(s)? Bachelors and a 4+1 in Psychology with Claremont Graduate School
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology, Asian American Studies, Economics, Environmental Analysis, Molecular Biology, Neuroscience, Psychology, Media Studies, Philosophy, and Studio Arts.
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? ☑ YES ❒ NO Majors are 40-64 units, minors are 24-28 units, double and combined majors only allow 18% curriculum overlap and are designed with an advisor.

	Comments: Graduates must complete 32 course credits are required for graduation. 1.0 course credit is equivalent to four semester units or six quarter units: http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=496. Webpages for the degree areas are easy to find and read. There is consistency in units across majors, minors, etc.

Review Completed By: Shirley McGuire **Date: May 22, 2019**

2- MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.	Verified Yes/No
**Federal regulations	Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?	Yes
	Comments:	
Degree completion and cost	Does the institution provide accurate information about the typical length of time to degree?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the overall cost of the degree?	Yes
	Comments: - The institution provides detailed information on available majors and minors: http://catalog.pitzer.edu/content.php?catoid=7&navoid=637 - The institution provides information about tuition and related fees: https://www.pitzer.edu/financial-aid/tuition-fees/	
Careers and employment	Does the institution provide accurate information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?	Yes
	Does the institution provide accurate information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?	Yes
	Comments:	

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**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 regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Larisa Genin, James Harris Date: March 27, 2019

3- STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors

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 ❒ NO
	Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? ☑ YES ❒ NO If so, where? Student Handbook Page 105
	Comments: Complaint policy and options were reported in pp. 110-114 of the *2018-19 Pitzer College Student Handbook* (https://www.pitzer.edu/student-life/wp-content/uploads/sites/22/2018/08/2018-19-Student-Handbook.pdf). The procedures distinguished reporting contacts for complaints against a student (to Sandra Vasquez, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students), complaints against a faculty member (to Nigel Boyle, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty), and complaints against a third party (to Deanna Cabellero, Director of Human Resources), as well as confidential and external reporting options.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? ☑YES ❒ NO If so, please describe briefly: See below
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? ☑ YES ❒ NO
	Comments: Handbook information states that there are three parallel procedures for addressing complaints, depending on if a respondent is a student, a faculty member, or a staff member or third party (pp. 114-143). Additionally, specific reporting procedures for sexual violence, harassment, and stalking are provided on a shared 7C website for the Claremont Colleges (https://www.7csupportandprevention.com/). Reviewed and confirmed adherence to this process with Assessment Liaison Officer.
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? ☑ YES ❒ NO If so, where? See below
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? ☑ YES ❒ NO If so, please describe briefly: Formal student complaints are logged and recorded in a software system that is maintained by the Office of Student Affairs.
	Comments: Record keeping procedures are detailed and range from such components as verbatim transcripts of judicial council hearings (destroyed after deadline periods for appeals have passed) and annual Judicial Council reports to the College Council on the numbers and types of cases heard, to statistical external reports (e.g., Clery). The contacts for each type of complaint oversee those respective records. The College also conducts a Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS) Sexual Assault and Climate Survey, and shares these results online (https://www.pitzer.edu/about/wp-content/uploads/sites/89/2018/10/20181030-PITZER-HEDS-SACC-Survey-Findings-FINAL_V3.pdf). Reviewed and confirmed adherence to record keeping procedures with Assessment Liaison Officer. It is recommended that Pitzer College provide further transparency by including in the handbook and at respective office websites: (a) brief statement on complaint procedures, and (b) information about how these complaints are monitored (e.g., "monitored by [OFFICE CONTACT[annually by [METHOD USED]"

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.)

REVIEW COMPLETED BY: Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth DATE: March 28, 2019

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 ❒ NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? ☑ YES ❒ NO If so, where? Published in the General Catalog
	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 ❒ NO
	Comments:

*§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.

REVIEW COMPLETED BY: Marguerite Bonous-Hammarth DATE: March 27, 2019