



CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW REPORT

Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, California

July 2009

Claremont McKenna College

<http://www.claremontmckenna.edu/wasc/>

Contact Person:

Jerome W. Garris, Vice President for Special Projects and
Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty
Claremont McKenna College
Claremont, California 91711
Phone: (909) 621-8195
Fax: (909) 607-1212
jgarris@claremontmckenna.edu

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following people graciously gave of their time and expertise in the development and completion of the Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2008-2009 at Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, California.

SENIOR STAFF

Pamela B. Gann, President and Chief Executive Officer

Robin J. Aspinall, Vice President for Business and Administration & Treasurer

Matthew G. Bibbens '92, Vice President for Administration and Planning, Registered In-House Counsel, and Secretary of the College

Lisa Forman Cody, Associate Dean of the Faculty and Associate Professor of History

Georgette R. DeVeres, Associate Vice President of Admission and Financial Aid

John P. Faranda '79, Vice President of Alumni Relations

Jerome W. Garris, Vice President for Special Projects and Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty

Gregory Hess, Vice President and Dean of the Faculty; Russell S. Bock Chair of Public Economics and Taxation

Jefferson Huang, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

Cynthia A. Humes, Chief Technology Officer, Executive Director of Information Technology Services, and Associate Professor of Religious Studies

William R. Lowery, Vice President for Development and External Relations

June R. McCartney, Executive Assistant to the President and Associate Secretary of the College

Richard L. Rodner, Associate Vice President for Public Affairs

Stephen M. Siegel '87, Associate Vice President for Development

Richard C. Vos, Vice President and Dean of Admission and Financial Aid

Richard T. Watkins, Associate Vice President for Development

WASC STEERING COMMITTEE

Jerome W. Garris, Chair; Vice President for Special Projects and Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty

Anthony Fucaloro, Professor of Chemistry and George C.S. Benson Professor of Public Affairs

Diane Halpern, Professor of Psychology

Eric Helland, Professor of Economics

Cynthia A. Humes, Chief Technology Officer and Associate Professor of Religious Studies

Joke Johnson, Assistant Dean of the Faculty

Elizabeth Morgan, Registrar and Director of Institutional Research

James B. Pinter-Lucke, Associate Professor of Mathematics

Ronald Riggio, Henry R. Kravis Professor of Leadership and Organizational Psychology and Director of the Kravis Leadership Institute

Colleen Wynn, Assistant Director of Institutional Research

Justin Young, Director of the Writing Center and Visiting Assistant Professor of Literature

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Lisa Forman Cody, Chair; Associate Professor of History and Associate Dean of the Faculty

Candace Adelberg, Claremont McKenna College student

Asuman Aksoy, Professor of Mathematics

Mark Blitz, Fletcher Jones Professor of Political Philosophy

Newton Copp, Newton H. Copp, Sidney J. Weinberg, Jr. Chair in Natural Sciences and Professor of Biology

Mark Angelo Costanzo, Professor of Psychology

Gary Gilbert, Associate Professor of Religious Studies

Jefferson Huang, Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students

Joke Johnson, Assistant Dean of the Faculty

Manfred W. Keil, Associate Professor of Economics

Robert Kirkland, LTC, Professor of Military Science and Adjunct Assistant Professor of History

Elizabeth Morgan, Registrar and Director of Institutional Research

Michael D. O'Neill, Associate Professor of Mathematics

Arthur L. Rosenbaum, Associate Professor of East Asian History

Marie-Denise Shelton, Professor of French

Janet Kiholm Smith, Von Tobel Professor of Economics and Dean of the Robert Day School of Economics and Finance

Michael L. Sutton, Professor of Physical Education and Director of Athletics

Nicholas O. Warner, Professor of Literature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Preparation of the Capacity and Preparatory Review.....	3
New Developments since Submitting our Institutional Proposal.....	4
Changed Financial Circumstances	4
Robert A. Day Gift.....	5
Freshman Humanities Seminar Program	5
Joint Science Department.....	5
Globalization	6
New Consortial Programs.....	6
Departmental and Institute Reorganizations.....	7
Expanded Facilities.....	7
Capital Campaign	7
Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity	7
Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness	8
Essay on Standard 1:	9
Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	9
Essay on Standard 2:	11
Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	11
Essay on Standard 3:	15
Engaging the Environment and Ensuring Sustainability	15
Essay on Standard 4:	17
Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	17
Essay on Theme 1: Assessing Student Learning.....	19
Essay on Theme 2: Planning for Growth.....	27
Context for the Issue of Enrollment Growth at CMC.....	27
The Current Status of the Growth Issue at CMC	28
Planning for Future Growth.....	31
Conclusion.....	32
Preparedness for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)	32
Work Plan and Milestones for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)	34
Appendix I: Required Data Elements.....	1
Appendix II: Stipulated Policies	2
Appendix III: Additional Documentation.....	3
Appendix IV: Response to Previous WASC Accreditation.....	6

Introduction

The Capacity and Preparatory Review is designed to enable the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Commission to determine whether an institution fulfills the [Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity](#): The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of I. institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and appropriate organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.” In keeping with the Commission’s goal of a focused accreditation process that permits adaptation and responsiveness to institutional context and priorities, Claremont McKenna College elected to conduct its Capacity and Preparatory Review within the framework of two broad thematic areas that clearly emerged as major priorities and received consistently high ratings of importance across all the different constituencies of the College community: Planning For Growth and Assessing Student Learning.

Claremont McKenna College (CMC) is a highly selective, independent, coeducational, residential, undergraduate liberal arts college. Its [mission](#), within the mutually supportive framework of [The Claremont Colleges](#), is to educate its students for thoughtful and productive lives and responsible leadership in business, government, and the professions, and to support faculty and student scholarship that contribute to intellectual vitality and the understanding of public policy issues. The College pursues this mission by providing a liberal arts education that emphasizes economics and political science, a professoriat that is dedicated to effective undergraduate teaching, a close student-teacher relationship that fosters critical inquiry, an active residential and intellectual environment that promotes responsible citizenship, and a program of [research institutes](#) and scholarly support that makes possible a faculty of teacher-scholars.

Previously known as Claremont Men’s College, Claremont McKenna College has been coeducational since 1976. The College currently enrolls 1,212 students, employs 280 staff members and has a faculty of 150. The College occupies about fifty acres of land and has eighteen residence halls, including four garden apartment buildings, and fifteen academic, student services and administrative buildings. The College also owns more than seventy houses adjacent to the campus, which are rented primarily to faculty and staff. A [children’s school](#) (two years through third grade) is supported on campus. As a member of The Claremont Colleges, the College was founded intentionally with, and still maintains, its specialized mission within a liberal arts environment to educate its students for leadership in business, the professions, and public affairs, coupling the theoretical with the applied. Despite our focus, the College has sufficient resources to offer [31 undergraduate majors](#) in addition to contributing to many other majors offered via the other Claremont Colleges. Pursuant to its mission, the largest programs are Economics and Government. Beginning in 2009–2010, the College will offer a masters degree graduate program in Financial Economics through its new [Robert Day School of Economics and Finance](#).

The College has long been one of the most selective institutions in the nation and has been consistently rated among the top 20 liberal arts colleges nationally by U.S. News and World Reports. For Fall 2009, we have admitted just 16% of our 4,277 applicants. The yield rate for the 2008 freshman class was 40%. With combined SAT scores of 1400, 84% of our freshmen were in the top ten percent of their graduating class, and 54% were drawn from outside California. For the last several years the College’s overall five-year graduation rate has consistently remained above 90%. We are also able to enroll a highly diverse group of students; in 2008–2009, 37% percent of our students were from minority groups (61 Asian-Americans, 37 Hispanics, 18 African Americans, and 3 Native Americans). The faculty is composed of highly productive teacher-scholars and has grown substantially in recent years to 133.7 FTE with a student-faculty ratio of 8:1. The current percentage of tenured faculty is

51%. In 2008–2009, we employed 36 full-time non-tenure track faculty and adjuncts (see [CMC Common Data Set](#)).

As indicated in our [Initial Proposal](#), the Claremont University Consortium (CUC) is a unique model of higher education in America. The Consortium consists of five adjacent undergraduate colleges, two graduate institutions, and a central organization, Claremont University Consortium, that provides services shared by all students, faculty, and staff. The Claremont Colleges are nationally and internationally renowned for academic excellence. The Consortium includes Pomona College, the founding institution (established in 1887), Claremont Graduate University (1925), Scripps College (1926), Claremont McKenna College (1946), Harvey Mudd College (1955), Pitzer College (1963), and the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Science (1997). The Colleges not only share a [library system](#), [bookstore](#), [counseling center](#) and [health facilities](#), among others, but also offer joint academic programs and cross-registration. Currently the Consortium reports that The Claremont Colleges enroll over 7,000 students, boast 775 faculty members, and maintain over 1,960 staff. More than 2,000 courses per semester are available to students in Claremont through our [common registration system](#).

Within the context of the Consortium, CMC operates a stellar [joint intercollegiate athletics program](#) for both men and women on behalf of CMC, Harvey Mudd, and Scripps Colleges. (Pomona and Pitzer form their own joint intercollegiate program.) Our [Washington, D.C. semester-long program](#) is open to all undergraduates of The Claremont Colleges and combines academic courses and internships. CMC also houses [International Place](#), a resource for orientation, advising, support, and programming for international students from all of The Consortium’s institutions. Currently the College is also the lead college for the Joint Science Department, which is a three college department jointly supporting CMC, Pitzer, and Scripps Colleges.

CMC operates ten [research institutes](#) established to engage faculty and students in research efforts related primarily but not exclusively to public policy issues. The institutes assist the College in attracting and retaining superior faculty, as well as extending student academic experiences beyond the classroom through applied research projects involving faculty. Indeed, nearly one-half of our graduates benefit directly or indirectly from the research programs of the research institutes. Experience has shown our students capable of engaging in substantive research; our Institutes provide a hands-on opportunity for students to define problems, analyze data, articulate findings, and gain new skills and techniques (*Doc 05c-8. Board of Trustees Research Institute Survey Report, 2005*) CMC also strongly encourages all students, regardless of their major or financial situation, to extend their education beyond Claremont through extensive study abroad options and through college-funded summer internships in the United States and abroad. Currently about one-half of each graduating class participates in at least one semester of off-campus study (*Doc 03c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008*) Indeed, a larger percentage of our students study abroad than at Stanford, Swarthmore, or Williams.

We believe this reaccreditation process can be leveraged to deepen campus engagement with important issues facing the College. We have engaged the four major themes of “Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives,” “Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions,” “Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability,” and “Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement.” In addition, we are devoting considerable attention to our two specific themes approved by the Faculty and the Board of Trustees in the Spring of 2007: “Planning For Growth” and “Assessing Student Learning in the Areas of General Education Skills and in the Major.”

Preparation of the Capacity and Preparatory Review

The [WASC Steering Committee](#) began the College's accreditation planning and coordinating efforts in spring 2006. The WASC Steering Committee appointed two subcommittees to work on drafts of the capacity and preparatory review and the educational effectiveness review sections of our Proposal. Although we originally intended to have these two subcommittees continue their efforts after the completion of the Initial Proposal, it became clear that the combined WASC Steering Committee was better suited to develop together the Capacity and Preparatory Report (CPR). Nearly all of the Steering Committee's efforts have been focused on advancing the College's assessment and evaluation program since the submission of our Proposal to the Commission. The rationale for this effort was the result of our self-study process used to produce the College's Proposal; our self-study of the College's compliance with the CFRs indicated that there were a dozen CFRs that needed varying degrees of attention. In nearly every case, these were related to educational effectiveness shortfalls.

Simultaneously, the College community was working on plans for future enrollment growth that would affect all areas of the College's operations. Most of this growth planning has been undertaken at the Senior Staff and Board of Trustees level with Matthew Bibbens, Vice President for Planning, leading the effort.

After approval of the Proposal, the Steering Committee has made periodic presentations on institutional progress to faculty, staff, and trustees. Members of the Steering Committee also provided on-going assistance to each academic department as they established the learning goals and SLOs for their discipline during the last year. In cooperation with the Curriculum Committee, which includes the chair or dean of each department, several key academic administrators, and students, the Steering Committee prepared the general education goals and SLOs. (*Doc 06b-5 & 4. Curriculum Committee Agenda and Minutes, 12-11-08; 01-29-09*) The Faculty adopted the general education goals and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) on May 12, 2009 (*Doc 06a-1. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 05-12-09*), and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board and the Board of Trustees approved them on May 15, 2009 and May 16, 2009 respectively (*Doc 06e-1. Academic Affairs Committee Agenda and Minutes, 05-15-09; Doc 06d-1. Board of Trustees Agenda and (draft) Minutes 05-16-09 with General Education Assessment Goals and Learning Outcomes 05-14-09*) The Steering Committee is now reviewing the initial results of the assessment of the general education goals and SLOs.

Having worked for more than three years on assessment and evaluation, our first Theme, the members of the Steering Committee have gained considerable experience dealing with assessment and evaluation and with the challenges of moving the institution forward in terms of measuring student learning. Every academic department has developed student learning goals, to be included in the 2009–2010 CMC [Catalog](#), and a majority have decided on relevant SLOs. Although much more work needs to be done, two programs – the Master in Finance and Literature – have already determined which courses map onto which SLOs. (*Doc 05d-1. Literature Department Learning Goals 02-09; CMC: MA in Finance Application 09-08-08, [Program Description and Evaluation](#)*)

The Steering Committee has also taken a leadership role in helping with the development of general education goals, pertinent SLOs, and multiple means of assessing student achievement. The college now uses the use of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), which complements our long-standing participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the national UCLA HERI Senior Survey, and completion our own Student Life Survey, and the CMC alumni survey. (*Doc 04d. CLA Fall 2008 Interim Report, Claremont McKenna College; Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports; Doc 04c. 2006, 2007, 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA-HERI); Doc 04a. CMC Student Life Survey Results 2006, 2007; Doc 4f. CMC Alumni Survey Summary 02-16-09*) Our commitment to

participation in national studies progress underscores our steps to create a workable assessment and evaluation program for the College's educational purposes.

Since the submission of our Proposal in 2007, the College has invested considerable time and effort to prepare for planned institutional growth, the subject of our second institutional theme. The College has hired an architectural firm to assist with the development of a campus master plan of buildings and grounds for an eventual enrollment of 1,400 students. A table top Master Planning exercise for faculty, staff, and students was held in the Spring of 2009. To provide for future expansion of sports and other facilities, the Board of Trustees recently authorized negotiations to purchase additional land (40 acres) on the east side of the current campus. The College has also formed an ad hoc committee to conduct a planning exercise for institutional growth, and has developed a timeline that is expected to lead to enrollment growth recommendations to the Board of Trustees in early Fall 2009. (*Doc 06d-2. CMC Board of Trustees Academic Programming Initiatives, 03-13-09; Doc 06d-21. 2002 Strategic Plan Tracking Report, 06-18-09; Doc 06d-22. 2009–2010 Strategic Planning Framework, 06-18-09*) All of these infrastructure decisions and projects are leading the College carefully toward institutional growth within our means and capacity.

Our progress to date on both of our central themes, Assessing Student Learning, and Planning for Growth, is a clear indication that we have both the capacity and the institutional will to move ahead toward successful completion of our eventual educational effectiveness review. As we argued in our Proposal, there is a powerful and useful nexus in the Standards' emphasis on institutional capacity, educational effectiveness, and student learning outcomes. Indeed, as we noted, "it would be nearly impossible for us to undertake a master planning effort for institutional growth without examining our capacity for growth and its effects on student learning outcomes."

We have adopted a two-pronged framework for planning that will permit us to examine upcoming issues, including the next phase of possible growth, admission and financial aid programs, academic and curricular issues, financial planning, and campus master planning. To complement our campus master planning effort, we are also engaging in a more focused effort to amend our current Strategic Plan to meet changing circumstances. (*Doc 03a-1. CMC Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002–2012, 03-15-2002*) We expect a preliminary update to our Strategic Plan to be completed in early 2010. We will utilize existing Faculty, College, and Board of Trustees committees to carry out both planning processes with the Board's Executive Committee serving as the Steering Committee. With the assistance of our master planning architectural consultants, we believe our current data collection capabilities will be sufficient to assess the quality of our operations and organization as we undergo the planning process. The metrics covered in our annual Strategic Indicators Report provide a steady stream of valuable data to support the planning process now getting under way. (*Doc 03c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008*)

New Developments since Submitting our Institutional Proposal

Revisiting our Strategic Plan and focusing on planned institutional growth will allow us to address some major changes that have occurred since our submission of the Institutional Proposal for Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2007.

Changed Financial Circumstances

Like many other institutions, particularly those with large endowments, the College has recently experienced some serious financial setbacks. Our [endowment](#), which was estimated at \$528 million on June 30, 2008, has since declined in value as a result of the financial down turn by between 20–25%

(fiscal year 2008–2009). Since our endowment accounts for about one-third of our operating budget, this reduction in value has a significant effect on our available operating revenue. Additionally, gifts to current operations are also down significantly from previous years. Although the financial base of the College remains solid, the net effect is that the College has been forced to reduce its operating expenses in order to bring them into balance with our reduced revenues. This turn of events has resulted in several very recent policy decisions: the initiation of voluntary early retirement options for faculty and staff; a moratorium on salary increases for the 2009–2010 fiscal year; reduced hiring plans for staff and faculty; no increases in operating budgets for the next fiscal year; and the reduction of eleven staff positions.

Robert A. Day Gift

A positive development for CMC is receiving a \$200 million gift from alumnus and Trustee Robert A. Day, the largest gift ever granted to a liberal arts college. This gift has led to the creation of the new [Robert Day School of Economics and Finance](#) to house the economics, accounting and finance programs. Further, it has spurred the establishment of a graduate program in financial economics and the highly competitive Robert Day Scholars Program for qualified seniors from all of The Claremont Colleges. Selected scholars receive financial support toward tuition together with unique extra-curricular opportunities of workshops and other events to enhance their leadership qualities while they pursue an intensive program of liberal arts courses. To gain accreditation for the graduate program, the College submitted a substantive change proposal to WASC in the Fall of 2008 requesting approval of the Master of Arts degree in financial economics. The Commission approved the program in April 2009 and the first students will enter the one-year MA in Finance program this Fall. We anticipate enrolling between 15 and 20 students in the inaugural class. (*Doc 02a. WASC Substantive Change Proposal, RDA MA in Finance 2008-2011, 09-16-08; Doc 02b. WASC Substantive Change Committee Action Report for RDS MA in Finance 12-04-08; Doc 02c. WASC Structural Change Committee Approval, 03-19-09, RDS MA Program in Finance*)

Freshman Humanities Seminar Program

Additional curricular changes have occurred since the submission of our Proposal in the summer of 2007. After extensive discussion of the freshman general education curriculum, the Faculty decided to eliminate *Questions of Civilization*, a course required for all new students in their first year with a common set of readings. Instead, the College developed a new [Freshman Humanities Seminar \(FHS\) Program](#) in Fall 2008. Freshman Humanities Seminar courses aim to give first-year students an introduction to some of the questions fundamental to individuals in their relationship to society and the world. FHS courses also aim to provide students with the analytical skills necessary to engage critically with issues, texts, and arguments and to express their ideas clearly, both orally and in writing. As such, these classes will be intensely participatory and writing-intensive. They are meant to allow for a variety of opinions based on reasoned argumentation and grounded in the reading and interpretation of texts. The FHS program is also designed to encourage tenured and tenure-track faculty to offer first-year courses rooted in their discipline but exploring questions fundamental to individuals in their relationships to society and the world. (*Doc 06a-9. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 02-08-08*)

Joint Science Department

Our Joint Science Department, a three college department jointly supporting CMC, Pitzer, and Scripps Colleges, has undergone significant changes. The organization of the Joint Science curriculum was partially modified with the support of a major grant from the National Science Foundation for the development of a new integrated introductory science course linking year-long introductory biology,

chemistry, and physics courses into a common two-year course. (*Doc 06a-12. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 03-06-07*) A new operating agreement among the three Joint Science Colleges setting out new responsibilities for the joint administration of the program is being further refined in the Fall of 2009. A third major change was the creation of a new Dean of Science position and the hiring of Professor David Hansen from Amherst College as the new Dean of the Joint Science program beginning in 2009–2010.

Globalization

During 2007–2008, at the President’s initiative, the College started a major self-study of our progress in achieving the globalization objectives set out in our 2002 Strategic Plan, which had concluded, “The sweeping global changes now underway are creating an ever more interdependent world. Everything from communications, financial investments, and commerce to politics, science, and technology must now be viewed from an international as well as a domestic perspective. In response to these challenges, we must ensure that CMC students receive the knowledge and skills that they will need in an increasingly global environment.” (*Doc 03a-1. CMC Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002–2012, 03-15-02*) As part of the 2007–2008 self-study, a series of ad hoc faculty discussion groups met to explore new initiatives in the international arena, and faculty were polled concerning levels of expertise, interest, and current course offerings. One of the proposed initiatives was that the College should direct its international efforts toward East Asia, South Asia and the Middle East. In addition, the 2007–2008 self-study provided the College with data on the extent of our current international programs, faculty members’ international expertise and experience, and on future developments in the international environment. The self-study report, *Globalization at CMC*, served as the principal discussion topic at the March 2008 Board of Trustee retreat. (*Doc 6d-6. “Globalization at CMC” 2–29-08*) At the retreat, there was broad consensus among the Trustees for the College to move forward with its plans to enhance global education. Subsequent to all of these efforts, the College has hired an Executive Director of International Programs to expand international experiences for students and faculty, and the Vice President for Admission has begun recruiting in the Middle East and stepped up our recruiting efforts in Asia.

An additional globalization initiative was embarked upon in 2008 when The Claremont Colleges received a request from the government of Singapore to develop a proposal for the establishment of a new Claremont college in that island nation. During the spring and summer of 2008, CMC, along with Pomona College, took the lead in developing a proposal for such a new college that was submitted to the Singapore Ministry of Education in March 2009. (*Doc 07e. Claremont Singapore Proposal Ministry of Education, March 2009*) The proposal calls for the creation of a liberal arts college in concert with a Singapore university partner. It is currently under review by the Singapore authorities.

New Consortial Programs

The College also reached an agreement with Pomona College to develop a new cooperative language program in [Arabic](#), and in 2008, CMC successfully hired Professor Bassam Frangieh from Yale University to offer the first courses in the Fall of 2008. The success of this program led to the approval by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty of the proposal for a new interdisciplinary major in Middle East Studies. (*Doc. 06b-1. Curriculum Committee Meeting Agenda and Minutes 04-02-09; Doc. 06a-2. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes 04-17-09*) In 2009–2010, the College will search for a second position in Arabic.

Departmental and Institute Reorganizations

During academic year 2008–2009, the College also agreed to a request from the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies to separate into two free standing departments, reflecting the fact that the two disciplines have steadily grown apart in recent decades. This was a significant development because the College has not established a new department since departments were set up in the 1960's, and does not plan to add any new departments. (*Doc 06a-5. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 12-09-08*)

Another significant change since the submission of our Proposal was the decision to reduce the number of its research institutes by one. The Reed Institute for Decision Science was closed upon the retirement of Professor Janet Myhre, the founder and Director of the Institute.

Expanded Facilities

A number of major facility changes have also occurred at the College in the last two years. The College has constructed and opened the national award-winning [Claremont Hall](#), the largest residence hall at CMC accommodating 105 students with capacity for future expansion. In the Spring of 2009, construction was completed on the [Biszantz Family Tennis Center](#). This state of the art Tennis Center boasts twelve lighted Plexipave (acrylic all-weather surface) courts, and allowed CMC to host the Division III national men's tennis championships this past May. By relocating the former tennis facilities, space located in the middle of the campus has opened up for future buildings. Adjacent to the Tennis Center, we can now utilize a 90 x 60 grass multi-use practice field. In addition, Claremont McKenna College has completely renovated Fawcett and Auen Halls, two large tower residence halls. The College has also constructed several new rental houses for faculty and has recently received approval to purchase land to the east of the campus for the construction of a new baseball and softball complex together with additional parking.

The most significant construction project, however, is a new \$75 million academic building on the west side of the campus. This new [Kravis Center](#) project consists of the construction of a five-level, 162,000 square-foot academic and administrative facility that will serve as the western gateway to the Claremont McKenna campus. The overall project includes offices, classrooms, seminar rooms, research institute spaces, an underground parking structure, and outdoor courtyards.

Capital Campaign

Another major development in 2008 was the announcement of a [capital campaign](#) with an ambitious goal of \$600 million dollars. To date, the College has raised \$425 million toward the goal. This campaign includes the aforementioned gift of \$200 million from Robert Day in support of the Master in Finance program, as well as a landmark [\\$75 million gift](#) from the Marie-Josée and Henry R. Kravis Foundation. In recognition of this generous gift, the College will designate its new signature academic building as The Kravis Center. In addition to these munificent gifts, the main goals of the campaign are to raise funds for student scholarships and endowed faculty chairs. (*Doc 07g. Preliminary Campaign Progress Report 05-06-09*)

Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity

CMC has a highly differentiated mission for a liberal arts college, which it has pursued with great vigor and intentionality since its founding. Our mission together with our membership in The Claremont Colleges Consortium enables the College to maximize the impact of its resources with fewer academic departments (10) than is typical of most prominent liberal arts colleges. Our financial

resources, including a very substantial endowment per student, are impressive in comparison to most other colleges of our size, even though we are currently experiencing some shrinkage. Our [annual operating budget in 2008–2009](#) was \$73.4 million, and we had an operating surplus of \$10.8 million for the 2007-08 fiscal year. Private gifts and grants for 2007-08 were \$42.6 million. After adjusting for deferred gifts and adding in unconditional promises to give, total contributions finished the fiscal year at \$208 million. Endowment per student reached \$465,000 in June of 2008, although it has declined somewhat since then. Total debt outstanding decreased during 2008 to 12.5% of total assets. As reported in our Proposal, the continuing increase in student applications together with our financial strength are the major factors that have led us to consider increasing our size, and to make growth one of the two themes we have chosen to explore for this Capacity and Preparatory Review. All of these factors also suggest the College can muster substantial resources to ensure successful educational effectiveness for a larger number of students.

Our financial resources allow us to maintain a student faculty ratio of 8:1. Our four course teaching load and highly competitive salaries permit us to recruit a powerful faculty of highly accomplished teacher-scholars who are prepared for the task of educating an impressively capable student body. Only 3.6% of 551 students polled in 2007 in our Student Life survey (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007*) indicated that they were dissatisfied with their level of contact with faculty outside of classes. Our need blind, no loan financial aid policy permits us to accept all applicants without regard to ability to meet our costs, and to admit only the most qualified students. Our generous financial aid also means that our level of underrepresented students is comparatively high, since there are very few financial barriers to attendance. The total tuition discount, despite the generosity of the College's financial aid program, was 34.1% for 2007–2008. Our financial and personnel resources are clearly sufficient to meet the needs of our institutional goals as contained in our current Strategic Plan. They also permit us to actively develop data for planning and analysis on a regular basis as is evidenced by our annual CMC Fact Book and the Strategic Indicators Report. (*Doc 03d-2. CMC Fact Book, 2008; Doc 03c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008*)

Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness

CMC has made a commitment to develop a comprehensive educational effectiveness program that includes programmatic and overall learning and is based on the collection and evaluation of data. This extends our existing efforts to evaluate student learning and is consistent with our goals and mission. For some years the College has actively gathered data from various internal and external sources to evaluate our educational effectiveness as an institution of higher education including surveys of students and alumni and completion of external program reviews. However, it is only since our current reaffirmation review began that we have embarked on an ambitious institution-wide effort to focus these assessment activities on student learning outcomes as mandated by the Standards. Given our progress to date since the submission of our Proposal, we believe we are well on the way to meeting this core commitment.

In 2008, WASC revised a number of the CFRs and added new requirements to the institutional review process. Throughout our Report, we focus attention on our core commitments to capacity and educational effectiveness, the Standards, and the revised CFRs.

The institution is very close to completing its definitions of educational effectiveness and has made a firm commitment to fully implement and sustain a comprehensive and systematic educational effectiveness program. Finally, the College operates with high levels of institutional integrity and maintains active and regular relationships with WASC to ensure that any changes of substance are readily communicated for review. (See Appendix II: Stipulated Policies)

Essay on Standard 1:

Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

CMC has a distinctive [mission](#) that clearly defines its central tendencies and operational practices and is published in the [Catalog](#) and the Faculty Handbook. (CFR 1.1) There is broad agreement on educational objectives and the College has adopted educational goals and SLOs for the College as a whole. The College is actively developing similar indicators of achievement at the departmental and program as well as at the course level. When this effort is completed in 2009–2010, the College will have a system for measuring student achievement in terms of learning outcomes, in addition to our existing means of evaluating retention and degree completion (*Doc 03d. CMC Fact Book; Doc 03c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008*). We currently ensure information on student achievement public on our website by means of our [Common Data Set](#) (CDS) which includes figures on graduates by major. We are pleased that our five-year graduation rate is over 90%. When available, we will provide the results of our general assessment program on our website as well. (CFR 1.2 as revised)

The College has a highly accomplished leadership cadre with extensive experience and considerable length of service to the College. The President is assisted by eight Vice Presidents who oversee the various functional areas of the College. The Academic Vice President and Dean of the Faculty is assisted by the Dean of the Robert Day School, two Associate Deans, and an Assistant Dean of the Faculty. The President, Vice Presidents, Associate Deans of Faculty, and several other administrative officers comprise the [Senior Staff](#), which functions as the major administrative planning, decision-making, and operations body. (CFR 1.3) The credentials of the College's leaders are impressive. The President is the former Dean of the Duke Law School and has led the College for ten years. The Vice President for Academic Affairs (Academic Dean) is a distinguished economist and holds an endowed chair. The Vice President for Special Projects has a thirty-year administrative career having served as a Professor, Dean of Students, Dean of the Faculty, Provost, and Acting President at several Colleges. The Vice President for Student Affairs has an eighteen-year career in Student Services, including fourteen at CMC. He also is ABD at Claremont Graduate University. The Vice President for Development has more than thirty years of experience in development at several liberal arts colleges together with extensive experience as a development consultant. The Vice President for Alumni and Parent Relations is a graduate of the College and has nearly twenty-five years of experience in development and administration at CMC. The Vice President for Business and Administration has worked for twenty-four years in college financial administration at Pomona College and for seven years at CMC, and prior to that was a Senior Accountant with Coopers Lybrand. The Vice President for Admission has served in this capacity for twenty-two years. The Vice President for Administration and Planning is a graduate of the College, serves as the College's General Counsel and Secretary to the Board, and has worked on planning and development at the College for nearly ten years. (*Doc 06f-21 through 28. CV's for Vice Presidents*) During their retreats, all members of the Senior Staff establish a set of new goals for the next semester (or summer) and produce a report on the accomplishment of the previous period's goals. (*Doc 06f-1 & Doc 06f-7. Senior Staff Meeting*)

The [Board of Trustees](#) has forty members and meets four times a year. Particularly through its committees, it exercises careful oversight of the different operations of the College, including conducting annual reviews of the President. (*Doc 06d. Pertinent Board of Trustees meeting materials; Doc 06e. Pertinent Academic Affairs Committee Agendas and Minutes*)

The College has published statements of [academic freedom](#) (CFR 1.4) that protect teaching and research, and it is also addressed in Chapter Four of our [Faculty Handbook](#).

The College recognizes the importance of diversity in our society and through its [Statement on Diversity](#) and the mission of the [Diversity Committee](#) is to maintain continuing attention to diversity issues on our campus and in our operations. (CFR 1.5) (*Doc 04a. CMC Student Life Survey Results 2006, 2007; Doc 04c. Senior Survey (UCLA- HERI) 2006, 2007, 2008; Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports*) We are pleased that our continuing efforts to attract underrepresented groups of students have met with considerable success. In 2008-09, minority students made up 37% of our freshmen class (*Doc 03d-2. CMC Fact Book 2008*). Some of this growth can be attributed to our membership in Posse and Questbridge, two programs designed to assist institutions in recruiting underrepresented students. Unfortunately, these high cost programs are too expensive to maintain in the current fiscal environment and we will need to rely on our own admissions staff in the next few years to maintain our momentum in minority recruitment. Efforts to add to diversity among our faculty have been less successful. The percentage of women is up only slightly from 27% in 1999–2000 to 30% of full-time and tenure track faculty (including Joint Science) in 2008–2009. The percentage of minority faculty has experienced better growth during the same years, up from 10% to 17%. The growth in both cases is somewhat offset by the fact the regular academic tenured and tenure-track faculty has grown by 32.5% since 1999–2000. The tenured appointment of Jamaica Kincaid to a chaired professorship in Literature beginning in 2009–2010 does bode well for future efforts to attract distinguished minority faculty to the College. We are also pleased that her appointment is the second appointment of an African-American woman to the faculty in two years. Efforts to improve the diversity of our Board of Trustees have experienced only modest success. Board membership for 2008–2009 was 40. This included 7 women (17.5%), 2 African Americans (5%), 1 Asian American (2.5%) and 1 Latino (2.5%).

The College has no history of political, religious, corporate or other interference in the delivery of its educational programs or the pursuit of its self-defined mission, and is, within the context of The Claremont Colleges Consortium, an autonomous self-governing institution. (CFR 1.6) The institution operates with integrity, treats its students fairly, and has published [grievance processes](#). (See Appendix II: Stipulated Policies) In the 2007 Student Life Survey, 84% responded that they had sufficient access to administrators and faculty, and 67.4% noted that administrators acted on student concerns in a timely manner. (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007*) The College has published grading policies as well as published procedures for [grade appeals](#). (CFR 1.7 as revised). Additional general grievance procedures have been proposed, are under review, and are expected to be approved in the Fall of 2009.

To ensure that the College functions with integrity and sound business practices, the Board of Trustees has created an [audit committee](#) as a standing board committee, and has adopted policies on conflicts of interest. (*Doc 06d-5. Board of Trustees Conflict of Interest Policies*) The College's financial operations are audited annually and there are no material conditions attached to the [audits](#). (CFR 1.8 as revised).

The College pursues an open and honest relationship with WASC and promptly notifies the Commission of any circumstances that materially affect its accreditation status. Most recently this occurred in 2008 with our substantive change application to add the master's degree program in Financial Economics. (CFR 1.9 as revised)

Essay on Standard 2:

Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The College's resources are positioned to carry out our educational mission in terms of teaching and learning and to ensure student success. With a student faculty ratio of 8:1, CMC is in a select cadre of colleges and universities able to offer a rich faculty-student environment that epitomizes the essence of small college learning. A full 98.7% of our faculty members have earned the terminal degree in their field, and all are expected to demonstrate [active scholarship as well as strong teaching skills](#). Toward the end of each semester, students are asked to evaluate every course in which they are enrolled. (*Doc. 05b-1. Course Evaluation Form; Scantron Form; Doc. 05b-2. Course Evaluation Individual Averages, Spring 2009; Doc. 05b-3 Course Evaluation Department Averages, Spring 2009; Doc 05b-4. Course Evaluation College Averages, Spring 2009*) These evaluations are a resource used by the Dean of the Faculty's Office in annual reviews of untenured faculty, Appointment, Promotion and Tenure decisions, salary decisions, etc. Since our last WASC review, the College has adopted a new policy of engaging outside peer reviews of departments and academic programs. All departments have completed the first cycle of external reviews and a new cycle is scheduled to begin in 2010–2011. (CFR 2.1) (*Doc 05c-1. External Review Guidelines, May 2000; Doc 05c-2. Overview of the Department of Economics; Doc 05c-3. Assessment of the CMC Economics Department and Economics Major, April 2005*)

Requirements for the undergraduate degree are available in the [Catalog](#). The graduate degree requirements and courses will be included in the 2009–2010 Catalog. The curriculum follows a standard four year program, and is grounded in a distributional model of general liberal arts education including: a required first-year introduction to the humanities in the Freshman Humanities Seminar (FHS); a senior thesis in the major as a capstone experience; courses for at least one major; free electives; and completion of our General Education Requirements. For our General Education Requirements, students must take at least 44 semester hours (or the equivalent) of courses in mathematics, composition and literary analysis, science, social sciences, humanities, and foreign language. The major usually requires at least 40 semester hours of course work. Many CMC students select to complete a dual or double major and complete between 70 and 80 semester hours in their combined majors. Students make up the remainder of the courses with free electives and are encouraged to take advantage of the broad array of courses offered by the Consortium.

Students easily fulfill the Standards' minimum of 45 units of upper division courses during their completion of a total of 128 semester hours of coursework. Students must complete a minimum of 32 courses, earn a cumulative C (6.00) average for all courses taken, a C (6.00) average in all courses in the major(s), and a C (6.00) average in all courses taken in the senior year to be eligible for graduation. (CFR 2.2)

Each course has a syllabus that explains the goals of the course, the requirements for completion of the course, and grading policies. (*Doc 06b. Curriculum Committee materials*) We have asked the faculty to include learning outcomes in their course syllabi and to prepare to post their course syllabi online. Some faculty members are reluctant to comply with these requests arguing that it is too prescriptive. The Graduate Program has generated syllabi for its courses with SLOs and they have mapped the SLOs to courses and posted them on the website (see above). The economics faculty members are currently mapping their courses to their learning outcomes and we expect their course syllabi to include SLOs by the fall. The Government Department has also mapped its SLOs to courses, but is not

ready to include the SLOs in course syllabi. The Literature Department, too, has mapped its SLOs to courses, and is considering adding SLOs to their syllabi, but they most likely will not have completed this process by the beginning of the Fall semester. The Joint Science faculty has mapped courses to SLOs for its general education courses but not yet for the major courses. (*Doc 05a. Sample Course Proposals and Syllabi*)

Undergraduate students engage in a course of study that emphasizes both depth (the major) and breadth (the general education program) (CFR 2.2a), and prepares them for “leadership in business, the professions, and government.” “By combining the intellectual breadth of the liberal arts with the more pragmatic concerns of public affairs, ... CMC helps students acquire the vision, skills, and values they will need to lead society.” (Quoted from 2008–2009 CMC [Catalog](#), page 1.) Our assessment and evaluation program, described below, is designed to evaluate our success in achieving these twin aims. Results from our 2008 Alumni survey provide some preliminary data. Asked how well CMC prepared them for leadership roles in their professions after college, 74% of 2,559 respondents answered *extremely well* or *very well*; only 4% answered *not well*. Alumni responded favorably to the College’s general education program. Summing up their academic experience, 2,554 of 2,564 alumni respondents indicated in the 2008 that CMC’s education met their expectations (see above). Current students share these perspectives. 91% of respondents in the 2007 Student Life Survey indicated their expectations for the academic program of the College had been met. (*Doc 4a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007*).

The newly developed graduate program in Financial Economics is consistent with the College’s mission and builds on the strength of the College’s outstanding economics department because its newly hired graduate faculty will also offer courses to qualified undergraduates. The approval of the graduate program through the substantive change process in the Spring of 2009 demonstrates that the College has sufficient resources, including new and existing faculty and administrators, to sustain the program and to create a graduate level academic culture. (*Doc 02a. WASC Substantive Change Proposal, RDA MA in Finance 2008-2011, 09-16-08; Doc 02b. WASC Substantive Change Committee Action Report for RDS MA in Finance 12-04-08; Doc 02c. WASC Structural Change Committee Approval, 03-19-09, RDS MA Program in Finance*)

As will be explicated in more detail below, CMC has developed student learning outcomes (SLO’s) for all departments, for the general education requirement, and for many courses. These outcomes have been developed by the faculty and reflect the intentions and expectations of the programs to which they apply. As a result, they are consistent with our curriculum, our extensive library resources, faculty advising, and the institutional learning environment. As noted earlier, students are quite satisfied with many services offered by the College. This also applies to library resources. 79.7% of seniors responded in the 2008 Senior Survey that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the library resources available to them. (*Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI)*) And 80.4% of 547 students participating in the 2007 Student Life Survey were satisfied or very satisfied with the library resources. (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007*). In terms of information technology resources, seniors responding to the NSSE survey averaged 3.58 on a four point scale in terms of their use of computers in their academic work compared with 3.45 for all Carnegie I institution’s students. 83.7% of students responded that academic computing met their needs in the 2007 College Life Survey. (*Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports*) (CFR 2.3 as revised)

Through monthly Faculty Meetings, Curriculum Committee and departmental decisions and deliberations, the faculty has assumed the responsibility for establishing and reviewing student learning. As a result, the expectations for learning and student attainment are widely shared. All academic courses and programs are presented to the Curriculum Committee by the department or program, and, after approval, submitted to the full faculty for discussion and final approval. (*Doc 06a.*

Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes – examples; Doc 06b. Curriculum Committee Agenda and Minutes – examples)

Our traditional methods of evaluation include student evaluations of every course, interviews with students, and in-class observations. These will soon be coupled with our emerging evaluation and assessment program, which will permit us to publicly demonstrate the levels of learning attained by our students. We intend to publish the results of the NSSE, CLA, and other surveys that pertain to student learning as well as other assessment data on our website. (CFR 2.4)

Students are actively engaged in learning. Responding to the four point scale of the NSSE survey with 1 equaling “never” and 4 equaling “very often,” seniors averaged 3.42 and freshmen averaged 3.30 when queried about asking questions in class. Comparable figures for all Carnegie I students were 3.29 and 3.03. (*Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports*) CMC students are challenged to meet high expectations and are provided with feedback on their performance. A majority, 57.6%, of our seniors in the 2008 Senior Survey indicated they were intellectually challenged and stimulated by their professors, compared to 53.6% at all other four-year private colleges, and 33% indicated they received feedback from professors in addition to their graded work. (*Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI)*) When asked about receiving prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on their academic performance, seniors responding to the NSSE survey (see above) averaged 3.12 and freshmen 3.09 on a four point scale of frequency. The comparable Carnegie I averages were 2.97 and 2.83. (CFR 2.5 as revised) The new Xitracs program that the College has recently purchased will also assist the College with the management and tracking of documentation used for evaluation and assessment of institutional data and provide demonstrative means of evaluating student learning beyond our current methods and help to ensure that faculty expectations are imbedded in our evaluation of student work. (CFR 2.6)

All programs offered by the College are subject to external program review. The initial cycle has been completed (see above). By the time the next cycle begins in 2010–2011, every department will have completed its evaluation and assessment program and will have results to share with external reviewers, something that was not previously possible. (CFR 2.7)

CMC actively values, promotes, and requires scholarship among its faculty. Some of our faculty members, particularly in the sciences and in psychology, have engaged in scholarship related to teaching, learning, and assessment. This research is valued and is considered in cases of promotion and tenure. (*Doc 05e-3. Promotion/Tenure Letter from Department; Doc 05e-2. Promotion/Tenure Letter from Outside Reviewer*) (CFR 2.8 as revised)

The College also recognizes the important linkages among teaching, scholarship, student learning, and service. President Gann has composed a whitepaper addressing [The Power of Student Research](#), noting “One of the clear advantages of small classes and close student-faculty relationships is that our faculty encourage students to get involved in academic experiences outside the traditional classroom and they are more than willing to serve as mentors for student research projects.” [Departmental tenure reports](#) address faculty contributions to teaching, advising and student learning, research activities, and service. (CFR 2.9) (*Doc 05e-1. Promotion/Tenure Report from Department*)

CMC regularly assesses the preparation of its students prior to admission and collects and analyzes data disaggregated by areas of study and, where possible, by demographic categories. The College tracks success measures such as student graduation rates, disaggregated by ethnicity and gender and published these data annually in the CMC Fact Book. (*Doc 03d. CMC Fact Book*) We are pleased to note that the six-year graduation rate for all male students has risen in the last five years from 89% to 96.3%. The 2008 six-year percentage graduation rate for African American males entering in 2002 was 100%; the rate for White males entering in 2002 was 97.6%; the rate for Hispanic males was 91.7%;

and the rate for Asian-American males was 90.5%. Six year graduation rates for all women have remained constant over the last five years at 92%. The rate for Asian-American women was 100%; for Native American women it was 100%; for Hispanic women it was 93.8%; for White women it was 91.2%; and for African-American women it was 85.7% reflecting that six out of seven African-American women graduated.

Student satisfaction and campus climate are tracked every year through the CMC Student Life Survey, the Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI), and a number of other surveys. For example, 92.7% of our seniors responding to the 2008 Senior Survey said they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with their overall quality of instruction. 92.6% of 547 students surveyed in our 2007 CMC Student Life Survey indicated their overall experience at CMC had been positive. For alumni, only 29 respondents out of 2,553, 1%, indicated in the 2008 Alumni Survey that CMC gave them poor preparation for life. (*Doc 04a. CMC Student Life Survey Results 2006, 2007; Doc 04b. Freshman Survey (UCLA-HERI) 2006, 2007, 2008; Doc 04c. Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI), 2006, 2007, 2008; Doc 04f. CMC Alumni Survey Summary 02-16-09*) (CFR 2.10 as revised). CMC has occasionally assessed some of its co-curricular programs such as athletics, but does not have a systematic assessment schedule. (*Doc 05c. CMS Athletic Self Study for External Review, and related documents*) (CFR 2.11 as revised)

The College provides accurate, timely, and well regarded academic advice through the Registrar: 92% of students responding to the 2007 Student Life Survey rated the Office as helpful when they sought assistance, the highest rating for any administrative office. The College has a faculty advising program and annually holds an orientation and information meeting for faculty members advising new students regarding academic policies and requirements. A majority of students (66% for major advisors and 59% for general education advising) indicated in the 2007 Student Life Survey that they are satisfied with the advising system. (CFR 2.12 as revised)

The Student Support Services provided by the College are extensive and well-regarded by students. For example, 83.9% of respondents in the 2007 Student Life Survey reported that the Dean of Students Office was helpful; 75% felt the financial Aid Office was helpful; 69.9% indicated that the Career Services Office was helpful; and 65.8% felt the Facilities and Campus Services Office was helpful. The 2008 Senior Survey indicated that 73.1% of the Seniors indicated they were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with student housing facilities compared with 57.4% at all four-year private colleges; 60% were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with psychological services (compared with 54.5%); and 58.2% were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with student health services (compared with 53.7%).

In the 2007 Student Life Survey, 54.7% of all students surveyed indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with Collins Dining Hall, the CMC campus dining center. (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007; Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI)*) Student services operated by CMC are supplemented by additional services operated by The Claremont Colleges Consortium including the psychological and health services referred to above. (CFR 2.13) Transfer students are usually not a large group and receive personal advice from the Registrar upon entry to review their academic program and their requirements. (CFR 2.14)

Essay on Standard 3:

Engaging the Environment and Ensuring Sustainability

The Claremont McKenna College community places a high value on environmental stewardship as well as working on campus and within the community to build and support sustainability and carbon neutral practices. In 2007, CMC President Pamela Gann signed the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, with the College also developing a campus-specific plans over the next two years.

Already, CMC tracks environmental impacts as reported by The Roberts Environmental Center, and takes steps to reduce its environmental footprints. Sustainability Guidelines have been adopted to encourage leadership opportunities in such areas as power use, building construction, waste management practices, and purchasing.

The College supports and enhances its educational program through substantial investment of physical resources, information technology, and personnel and careful, planned, and effective use of resources helps provide for an educational environment of high quality for our students and their learning. The endowment provided the College with \$465,000 per student in 2007–2008. The annual operating budget provides over \$70 million for an enrollment of 1212. ([CMC Financial Reports](#)) As shown above (see Section I, Institutional Context), the College employs sufficient faculty and staff to deliver an outstanding educational program to its students as evidenced by our 8:1 student faculty ratio. Students report high levels of satisfaction with their education at the College. 89.3% of 460 students who responded to the question in the 2007 Student Life Survey indicated they would recommend CMC to siblings and friends as a good place to go to college. Only 3.1% would not recommend it. (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007*) (CFR 3.1)

The faculty is highly-qualified as attested to by their credentials in the College [Catalog](#), and while not as diverse as we would wish (see above Section I, Responses to Prior Commission Actions.), it is well able to achieve its educational objectives, to oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its programs. As the College puts its assessment and evaluation program into effect, it will include part-time and full-time visiting and adjunct faculty in the assessment process, in program reviews, and faculty development. (CFR 3.2 as revised). The College has had an extensive new faculty orientation program for some years. (*Doc 07a. New Faculty Orientation.*) In the last three years, CMC's own faculty orientation program has been supplemented in the early summer with a new faculty orientation program for all of The Claremont Colleges (*Doc 07b. New Faculty Workshop 2009*).

In section 3.5 of our [handbook](#), we have well-developed faculty workload and evaluation policies that include a four course teaching load, expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service, as well as policies on outside consulting and teaching. (CFR 3.3) The College provides faculty development support through the [Faculty Research Committee](#) and the [Teaching Resource Center](#) (although its budget has been curtailed in the recent financial environment). (CFR 3.4 as revised)

The institution has a long history of financial stability, unqualified audits, no accumulated deficits, and sufficient resources for long-term viability. Financial planning is realistic and reflects careful enrollment planning and diverse and significant revenue sources. We use a five-year financial planning model for much of our institutional planning and it is updated regularly. (*Doc 07f. CMC 5-Year Financial Model; Doc 03d. CMC Fact Book, 2007, 2008*) (CFR 3.5 as revised)

Turning to Information Resources, Claremont McKenna College has made considerable progress. In its [Tracking Report](#), the Information Technology Services Department records its progress on five strategic Information Technology Goals:

- (1) Focus on Instruction, Learning, and Research** – How technology is used effectively and efficiently to: a) enhance, deliver, and evaluate instructional initiatives and student learning; b) develop, enhance, support, and evaluate research initiatives; and c) provide high quality training and support for the use of information technologies to assure productivity and efficiency among students, faculty, and staff.
- (2) Infrastructure and Security** – The ongoing need for reliable, secure, appropriate, and cost-effective hardware, software and network access across the College, focusing on management of the total cost of ownership to the College over the technology life cycle and staying abreast of the advances in our infrastructure and facilities and continue thoughtful and efficient upgrades.
- (3) Strategic Use of the Web and Web-based Technology** – The development of a College-wide web strategy and the necessary support services required for the College to make strategic use of web-based technology for both internal and external communication, transactions, and information sharing.
- (4) Service and Community** – Using technology to improve the quality of life for the College community and the communities it serves, including our students; trustees; parents; alumni; consortium; and the external community.
- (5) IT Organization, Policy Management, and Consortial IT Cooperation** – To improve IT resources by reorganization, consolidation, and review of policies to foster better morale, greater communication, more productivity, and alignment with shifting legal obligations, as well as to foster better cooperation in consortial information technology initiatives.

Instructional technology support continues and is located in a small subdivision of Information Technology Services. In concert with the TRC, ITS arranges training sessions for students in the fluency skills, works with faculty to design special training for classes, and offers faculty workshops.

The measures of student happiness with Information Technology considered in the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute Senior Survey (HERI) of the class of 2008 show high marks across the board as compared to the responses from other like institutions nationwide. Three of 22 measures studied relate to computing. Even within CMC, IT fares extremely well in terms of students reporting that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with Information Technology at CMC. Of the 22 CMC indicators, Availability of Internet Access shows the highest level of satisfaction (88.3% of our students are “satisfied” or “very satisfied”; we are higher than our other like institutions by 15 percentage points); ITS’s Computer Facilities rank third (81.7% of our students are “satisfied” or “very satisfied”; higher than our other like institutions by 13.3 percentage points); and our third IT measure, Quality of Computer Training/Assistance, comes in at #12 of the 22 measures at CMC, with 65.4% of our students expressing that they are “satisfied” or “very satisfied.” This third measure is higher than our peer institutions by 11.7 percentage points.

Further, our excellent rate of ports to pillow, speed of the internet, and strong wireless resources have led to our receiving the #1 ranking of all 22 CMC indicators in the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute Senior Survey (HERI) of the class of 2008. We routinely score very well in this area on this study; a full 88.3% of students queried reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied,” and we are higher

than our other like institutions by 15 percentage points. Clearly, the College has sufficient information resources both of its own and those shared with the other Claremont Colleges to support its educational purposes and meet the needs of students learning outcomes as noted above in survey data reported in several paragraphs above. (CFR 3.6 as revised)

Our ITS [Information Technology Strategic Plan Tracking Report](#) further notes the information technology resources for academic and administrative needs, which are supplemented by those resources of The Claremont Colleges including [The Honnold Libraries](#). (CFR 3.7) The Student Life Survey of 2007 indicates that 83.7% of all 547 students polled indicated that the College's information technology resources met their needs. In 2008, 81.7% of seniors polled in the Senior Survey indicated that the computer facilities and equipment met their needs compared to 68.4% at all private four-year colleges. And 88.3% of CMC seniors were *satisfied* or *very satisfied* with their access to the Internet, compared to 73.3% at all other four-year private colleges. Finally, in terms of the quality of computer training and assistance, 65.4% of seniors were satisfied or very satisfied, versus 53.7% for other colleges. (*Doc 04a-2. CMC Student Life Survey Results, 2007; Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA-HERI)*)

The College has effective roles and responsibilities for its staff and places priority on its academic programs ([Faculty and Administration](#); *Doc 06f-20. CMC Organization Chart 07- 01-09*) (CFR 3.8 as revised) The College has an independent Board that exercises appropriate oversight and authority and evaluates the President. It meets four times per year. It engages in self-review to enhance its effectiveness. (*Doc 06d. Board of Trustees Agenda and Minutes*) (CFR 3.9 as revised) The College has a full-time CEO and Treasurer as well as sufficient numbers of other administrators to ensure effective leadership. As noted above, the Senior Staff is composed of the President of the College, eight Vice Presidents and seven other staff members. (CFR 3.10 as revised)

The faculty exercises academic leadership to ensure academic quality and educational purposes and character. Indeed, over the last two years, through the work of the Administration Committee, the Faculty Handbook has been extensively revised and issues of faculty responsibility were reviewed and expanded to ensure that the role of the faculty was clearly aligned with its responsibilities. (*Doc 06h. Administration Committee Agendas; Doc 06a. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes; Doc 06d. Board of Trustees Agenda and Minutes*) (CFR 3.11 as revised)

Essay on Standard 4:

Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

The College engages in dialogue concerning its purposes especially when embarking on strategic planning efforts as the College is currently doing. These efforts enhance institutional planning and as the emerging educational assessment and evaluation program gains traction, it will assist the College in setting educational priorities and approaches to student learning. The faculty was actively involved in developing our Strategic Plan. The College regularly monitors the effectiveness of the planning processes and of our current Strategic Plan which covers the time period from 2002 until 2012. (*Doc. 03a. CMC Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002 - 2012, 03-15-02*) The 2002 Strategic Plan continues to provide guidance for College decision-making, but we are in the process of new planning effort to respond to changing external circumstances. (*Doc 06d-21. Board of Trustees 2002 Strategic Plan Tracking Report, 06- 18-09; Doc 06d-2. Board of Trustees Academic Programming Initiatives, 03-13-09; Doc 06d-22. Board of Trustees 2009-2010 Strategic Planning Framework, 06-18-09*) (CFR 4.1 as

revised) These planning activities align the various academic and other resources with the Strategic Plan priorities. (CFR 4.2) Planning processes are informed by data and increasingly will include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness and student learning (see above). (CFR 4.3) The College uses measures and metrics to ensure quality, as well as comparative data from outside sources, to ensure quality delivery of our programs and services (*Doc 03c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008; Doc 04g. IPEDS Data Feedback Report 2008*) (CFR 4.4 as revised)

The College has an Office of Institutional Research with a full-time professional researcher and supplemented by the Registrar and its data is used and continue to be used both for decision-making and for assessing student learning. ([Office of Institutional Research](#)) Nearly all student surveys and data used by various college offices, including the Student Life Survey, are developed with and collected by the Office of Institutional Research. (For example, CMC Common Data Set, IPEDS surveys, Student Life Survey, etc.) (CFR 4.5 as revised)

The Faculty evaluates teaching and assesses learning, and will be adding to its capacity in this area through the coming implementation of the College's assessment and evaluation program. In 2009–2010, the Curriculum Committee will be reviewing our current educational offerings through an in-depth evaluation of the structures of our majors and sequences; the Curriculum Committee will also embark on a review of grading practices and grade inflation questions. The Senior Staff uses assessment techniques and data analysis for most of its important decisions. (See above) (CFR 4.6)

Faculty committees engage in ongoing inquiry of teaching and learning and apply the outcomes to improve curricula and programs. The review of our former Civilization program and substitution of the Freshman Humanities program is an example of the faculty's and students' desire to improve the curriculum. (*Doc 06a-9. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 02-08-08*) Another recent innovative example is the new Accelerated Integrated Science Sequence (AISS) of the Joint Science Department which allows selected students to complete a year of introductory biology, chemistry and physics in a two-year sequence through four team-taught integrated courses. (*Doc 06a-12. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 03-06-07*) (CFR 4.7 as revised) Finally, alumni and appropriate stakeholders are involved in regular assessment of educational programs. The College recently received the results of a major survey of alumni including feedback on academic programs. (*Doc 04f. CMC Alumni Survey Summary 02-16-09.*) The various advisory boards for our research institutes engage in such assessments regularly. The Robert Day School has a new advisory Board that is engaged in advising on the educational program, including the co-curricular component. ([Robert Day School](#)) (CFR 4.8)

Essay on Theme 1: Assessing Student Learning

In our Proposal for the CPR and the EER, we raised six central questions regarding how we intend to make progress on assessing student learning. Below, we record each question and explicate our current experience to date:

- (1) *How will faculty and staff workloads be affected by a focus on educational effectiveness?* We have determined that we have sufficient faculty and staff resources to develop the assessment process without the need to make additional hires. As the assessment and evaluation process becomes more operational over the next several years we will need to continue to monitor the demands it places on our faculty and staff. Furthermore, at this point, it has become clear that we currently have sufficient in-house expertise to develop our learning goals and SLOs without the need to bring in outside consultants.
- (2) *How will incentives for faculty be managed to ensure their active and willing participation in the educational effectiveness effort?* We have been able to accomplish a great deal with the assistance of our current faculty. When the College adopted the four course teaching load in 2005-06, the Board determined that the College would no longer grant additional course reductions for faculty taking on administrative tasks. The College considers service as an element in tenure and promotion decisions and work on assessment has clearly become a part of the service component.
- (3) *How frequently should departmental and programmatic assessment and evaluation take place?* Most departments intend to conduct some aspects of assessment each year, although they may not test for every SLO each year. As we gain more experience, we should learn on a department by department basis how much assessment we can expect each year. At the overall institutional level, we are currently producing assessment data annually through our rotating system of student and alumni surveys that permit some evaluation of student learning outcomes annually. As part of our external review policy, departments are required to complete an internal review or self-study to pass on to the review team. When the next round of external reviews begins in 2010–2011, we will require each department to incorporate their assessment and evaluation results in the self-study materials. We anticipate conducting at least two departmental reviews each year.
- (4) *How much emphasis should be placed on general education outcomes as opposed to programmatic outcomes?* We have placed greater emphasis on implementing general education outcomes assessment and evaluation but at the same time ensuring that assessment at the programmatic level is proceeding at a pace commensurate with departmental resources.
- (5) *How can we ensure that our data collection efforts will be conducted in a timely fashion and that the results will be available to decision-makers in a timely fashion?* The WASC Steering Committee has taken the lead in successfully monitoring the general education and departmental assessment planning and implementation efforts. In the Fall of 2009, we plan to create a Committee on Assessment to take over this function on a permanent basis. It will become a regular faculty/staff committee for service and assignment purposes. The Committee will be chaired by a faculty member, as part of his or her regular committee responsibilities, or by one of the Associate Deans of the Faculty. The Committee will be supported by the Office of Institutional Research, the Dean of Faculty's Office, and Information Technology Services.
- (6) *How can we involve our Teaching Resource Center in educational effectiveness activities to enhance pedagogical effectiveness and SLOs?* We have begun work on a plan to incorporate

the TRC into the process although current funding limitations have reduced the level of activity of the Center.

As we set out in our Proposal, under the management of the Office of the Dean of the Faculty and with the guidance of an Assessment Subcommittee composed of faculty and staff (the WASC Steering Committee), we promised a significant effort by every academic department and program to develop a set of measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs). The Curriculum Committee was to be charged with developing a set of SLOs for the general education program. At this point we are pleased to report that this task was accomplished in the spring of 2009 and the goals and SLOs were passed on to the Faculty Meeting and the Board of Trustees for approval. (*Doc 06b-5 & 4. Curriculum Committee materials 12-11-08, 01-29-09; Doc 06a-3 & 2 & 1. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes 03-10-09, 04-17-09, 05-12-09; Doc 06d-1. Board of Trustees Agenda and (draft) Minutes 05-12-09*) After the completion of the Proposal, the Curriculum Committee, or some other representative committee, was projected to evaluate various options for assessing general educational outcomes such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). In 2008–2009, the Curriculum Committee and the WASC Steering Committee agreed to adopt not just the CLA, but to use also the NSSE, the Senior Survey (UCLA - HERI), our own Student Life Survey, and a planned alumni survey to support our evaluation efforts. In fact, we have moved ahead of our schedule and have actually administered these surveys and are currently evaluating the initial results. And as mentioned before, the College requires every student to complete a [senior thesis](#), which is a general education requirement, but also a capstone experience in at least one of each student's majors. Most departments are intending to use an assessment of the senior thesis for departmental evaluation purposes. We expect to be able to develop a common rubric for the thesis that will permit us to assess the theses for general education purposes as well.

Under our timeline, departments were expected to proceed and establish departmental goals and means of assessment by the Fall of 2009. Currently, all departments have developed their goals and most have completed work on establishing learning outcomes for students and means of assessing the outcomes. Thus, we expect to be very near to completing our goal in the Fall. The Assessment Subcommittee, acting under the authority of the Dean of the Faculty, will act as the clearing house to receive the results of the assessments by the various departments and programs, and will produce an annual report on the results.

We believe we have demonstrated the capacity at the general educational and departmental levels to complete the remaining aspects of these tasks and to move on to the gathering of data and evaluation tasks. At this point, it is not clear that we will need additional clerical assistance to handle the burden of the assessment data we produce. All future external reviews will require the inclusion of SLO materials. Since these evaluation and assessment activities may well require additional survey efforts, it may be necessary to add staff assistance in the Office of Institutional Research.

As is the case for most of higher education, Claremont McKenna College has for many years relied almost exclusively on traditional means of evaluating students' learning, including letter grades, examinations both oral and written, research experiences involving students, senior theses, writing assignments, classroom and thesis presentations, surveys of student perceptions of their learning, alumni surveys and external program reviews. However, after the last re-accreditation process and the receipt of the Commission's Recommendations (see Section I), the College began to more seriously consider other means of assessing student learning more systematically. The College had been aware of the advantages of such efforts before 2001. During academic year 2000–2001, the College developed its current Strategic Plan (*Doc 03a-1. CMC Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002–2012, 03-15-02*). As part of the planning process, a subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Committee was created to focus on curricular matters including assessment of student learning. Chaired by Professor Stephen Davis, the Committee completed its work in the Spring of 2001. (*Doc 03a-2. Strategic Plan 2001 - Curriculum Final Report*) The Committee developed a set of general student learning goals for the College's curriculum. The context established for the goals was that CMC would continue to provide students with "an outstanding liberal arts education, one that emphasizes public affairs and leadership,

and helps them to achieve academic excellence and to become leaders in the various professions that they enter.” The Committee determined that the basic “aim” or goal of a CMC education is to teach CMC students “transferable abilities — analytic skills, independent thinking, and ability to make sensitive value judgments — that will help them to lead meaningful lives that are of service to themselves and others in our rapidly changing and diverse world. Following upon these transferable abilities, the Committee identified seven “certain characteristics,” (or learning outcomes) that graduates of the College should possess. These seven characteristics were:

Intellectual Breadth. Graduates should be broadly educated through a coherent, diversified, well-balanced curriculum in the humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences, and mathematics.

Intellectual Depth. Graduates should be well educated in at least one major field of study.

Character and Integrity. Graduates should be persons of humaneness and integrity, aware of and influenced by ethical and moral issues both of a personal and a public nature.

Critical Thinking Skills. Graduates should be able to think clearly, critically, and constructively about intellectual and practical problems, and thus be able to reach rational conclusions. They should also understand the scientific method and be skilled at quantitative reasoning.

Communication Skills. Graduates should be able to read and listen carefully, and to express themselves clearly, coherently, and convincingly, both orally and in writing.

Leadership and Interpersonal Skills. Graduates should be able to exercise responsible leadership in all areas of life, and especially in their chosen careers, as well as to work effectively with others as members of a team.

Technological Literacy. Graduates should be capable of using appropriate technology tools that are relevant to their fields of study and careers.

The members of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Curriculum felt that the general education courses of the CMC curriculum were the means to accomplish the outcome of intellectual breadth. They believed the major courses were the locus of intellectual depth. These views still characterize our thinking with respect to our assessment and evaluation plans.

While the College believes that the traditional means of assessing student learning in depth provide valuable measures of student accomplishment, we also acknowledge the need to add different methods of assessment to ensure that our students are achieving the specific outcomes we have set for them. In 2001, the Strategic Planning Committee on the Curriculum recognized this and indicated that the College would need to identify means of ensuring that graduates were coming close to the seven characteristics or learning outcomes established for the CMC curriculum. The Committee noted that there were no “universally accepted metrics...to wield.” However, the members of the Committee did note that a combination of external and internal measures could give a reasonably clear picture of student learning at CMC. In terms of national surveys that would permit comparison with other institutions, the Committee made reference to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The Committee recommended that CMC “explore using this instrument, and administer it, as designed, to both freshmen and seniors.”

The College’s faculty and the Board of Trustees approved the Strategic Plan in 2002. However several of the subcommittee’s recommendations on curricular matters were not included in the final report, although a number were reviewed by committees set up to implement the Strategic Plan recommendations. Although the faculty’s concerns with the recommendations of the Curricular Report did not relate directly to the assessment of student learning, the fact that the recommendations were not

included in the final report meant that they were laid aside and no further action was taken. The issue of assessing student learning was not actively pursued until the approaching reaffirmation of the College by WASC which started with the requirement to submit a Proposal in 2007. The Dean of the Faculty formed a [WASC Steering Committee](#) composed of faculty and administrators to guide the reaffirmation effort and indicated that the development of a college-wide assessment and evaluation program of student learning would be a major part of this reaffirmation activity.

Acting on this initiative, the College, under the leadership of Vice President for Student Affairs, implemented the 2001 recommendation of the Strategic Planning Committee on the Curriculum and arranged to administer the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to CMC freshman and senior students in the spring of 2008. The NSSE survey asks students a series of 85 questions divided into 13 categories, including academic and intellectual experiences, mental activities, reading and writing, interpersonal relationships, time usage, and overall satisfaction. The student responses of the NSSE provide evidence relating to nearly all our student learning outcomes. The NSSE also permits cross institutional comparisons with groups of other selected colleges and universities. (*Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports*)

At the same time, the WASC Steering Committee began exploring the possibility of administering the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) survey as well and it was decided to administer the CLA to freshmen and seniors in 2008–2009, through the auspices of the Office of the Dean of the Faculty. (*Doc 04d. CLA Fall 2008 Interim Report, Claremont McKenna College*) The Steering Committee also began to take another look at the results of another of its regular surveys, the Senior Survey developed by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA, and focus specifically on the assessment of student learning. (*Doc 04c. 2006, 2007, 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA-HERI)*) Thus by 2007–2008, the College had identified three separate means of assessing student learning using nationally normed means of assessment that would also permit comparison with other institutions of higher education. At this point in time, we have administered and analyzed each of the three surveys and have gained considerable experience in how to organize and encourage students to participate in the administration of the surveys. Based on our experience to date, the WASC Steering Committee has decided to administer each of these surveys on a three-year rotating basis. We completed the cycle this year and will begin again with the Senior Survey in 2009–2010, the NSSE in 2010–2011, and the CLA in 2011–2012.

It is the College's intention to use the results of these three survey instruments to provide the fundamental data to evaluate our overall or general student learning outcomes. We will also endeavor to identify the senior thesis and other general courses including the Freshman Humanities Seminar that can provide evidence of student general learning. Once again, turning to our 2001 Strategic Planning Committee on the Curriculum's Report, the WASC Steering Committee essentially adopted the work of the 2001 Committee when it set the overall learning goals and the student learning outcomes (SLOs). After slightly revising the Planning Committee's work, the WASC Steering Committee presented the goals to the College's Curriculum Committee in the Fall of 2008. (*Doc 06b-5. Agenda Curriculum Committee 12-11-08, Committee WASC Document 12-11-08*) The Committee endorsed the goals and outcomes with one exception. The WASC Committee's student learning outcomes contained an outcome that addressed student Character and Integrity. The Curriculum Committee felt that while such a goal was laudable it would prove to be difficult to develop an effective means of measuring student achievement with respect to the goal and recommended it be deleted. In its subsequent review of the goals, the Senior Staff voted to reintroduce an SLO on ethics and to add one on leadership. (*Doc 06f-13. Senior Staff Meeting 2008-2009*) This revised version of the goals and SLOs was sent to the faculty. At its meeting on May 12, 2009, the faculty chose to delete the SLOs dealing with ethics and leadership although there was support for conducting further study on means of assessing these two areas of student learning. (*Doc 6a-8. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes 05-12-09*) Finally, the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the goals passed by the faculty and

directed that the faculty work to add SLOs on ethics and leadership in the coming fall. (*Doc 6e-1. Academic Affairs Committee Agenda and Minutes 05-15-09*)

The formally adopted goals now read as follows:

The basic goals of a CMC education are to teach students transferable abilities including analytic skills, communication skills, and critical thinking skills, and to impart intellectual breadth and preparation for responsible leadership and citizenship through exposure to a variety of academic disciplines

The formally adopted student learning outcomes are:

- (1) Graduates will be able to analyze a particular issue, problem, or idea in depth and consider its elements.
- (2) Graduates will be able to express themselves clearly, coherently, and convincingly both orally and in writing.
- (3) Graduates will be able to complete projects that require integrating ideas and information from various sources.
- (4) Graduates will be able to effectively utilize information technology tools.

With the exception of the two SLOs on ethics and leadership, which will require further faculty discussion, the College will move forward with evaluating how successful the College is in meeting the basic goals and ensuring that our graduates meet the SLO's. We will start to continue with the collection of data and the evaluation and analysis of our data. In the first instance this will involve the use of three means of assessment, including both direct (CLA) and indirect (NSSE and the Senior Survey) means of assessment. While the results of the NSSE and Senior Survey are available to us, to date we have only received the CLA results for our freshmen. We expect to receive the CLA results for seniors in the fall of 2009, at which time we will be able to evaluate the results of our assessment testing. And as indicated before, the College will create a new faculty committee in the fall to serve as the College's permanent assessment and evaluation committee charged with evaluating the assessment results and making recommendations to the faculty for improvements in the educational program where needed or appropriate.

In the meantime, the results of the NSSE, and the Senior Survey have been made available to the WASC Steering Committee, the Senior Staff, and the Board of Trustees. They will be provided to the Faculty in the fall. The results of these two means of indirect assessment are very encouraging. In comparing our students with those from Carnegie I institutions that also took the NSSE survey, results from the four questions regarding SLO 1 analytic abilities, provide evidence that our students scored more positively on each question among both freshmen and seniors than the national sample. In terms of value added factors between the freshmen and seniors, the results were not statistically significant. In terms of SLO 2, communication skills, our students scored better on six of the eight questions, scoring lower than the national sample only on the number of drafts they completed prior to turning in a final product and on making a class presentation. In terms of value added – between CMC freshmen and seniors – there was a single statistically significant change showing that seniors contribute more frequently to class discussions. With respect to SLO 3, synthesizing and integrating skills, CMC freshmen and seniors scored higher on each of the eight questions than the national sample. In two areas there was statistically significant value added between the freshman and senior years (putting together ideas or concepts from different courses in assignments and class discussions, and in learning something that changed the way students understood an issue or topic). Finally, in terms of SLO 4,

CMC students scored more positively than Carnegie I students on each of the four questions, with a statistically significant value added factor from freshmen to seniors on using an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment. Thus, our students scored consistently more positively on 22 of 24 questions dealing with our four SLOs than a national sample of Carnegie I students at both the freshman and senior levels. (*Doc 04e. NSSE 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports*) Despite the overall positive writing self-evaluations, the faculty, based on observations of student written work, believe that student writing needs further improvement. The Writing Center Director, Dr. Justin Young, is developing plans for 2009–2010 for an enhanced College-wide effort to concentrate on improving student writing.

We have also evaluated data from the Senior Survey as an additional means of assessing general student learning. In terms of SLO 2, communications, CMC students rated their writing ability more positively than students at all private 4-year colleges taking the survey. 73.4% of CMC students rated their writing either above average or in the top 10%, while 61.8% of students at other colleges rated their writing at the same levels. The Senior Survey provides data from two questions that relate to SLO 4, information technology use and skills. 55.2% of CMC students rated themselves above average or in the top 10% in computer skills, while 42.6% rated themselves similarly at other colleges. 85.3% of CMC students rated themselves above average or in the top 10% in terms of frequently or occasionally using the internet for research for homework. This compares with a somewhat higher figure of 88.9% for all other colleges' students. In this instance, a somewhat lower use of the internet for research purposes may be a positive finding. (*Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI)*)

Finally, the results from our freshman responses to the CLA indicate that our students did extremely well on the test. On the performance task measuring synthesizing skills, recognizing conflicting evidence, interpreting data, and reaching sound conclusions they scored at the 99th percentile. In the make-an-argument part of the test they scored at the 98th percentile. On the critique-an-argument test they scored at the 99th percentile. These scores suggest that in terms of SLOs 1 and 3 our students do very well as entering freshmen. On the analytic writing task, which relates to SLO 2, our students scored at the 99th percentile. Based on these performance levels it is difficult to imagine much value added improvement can occur from the freshmen to senior year experience. (The CLA adjusts these scores for levels of institutions and did so in our case. Unfortunately, there were only two other comparable schools in the database. Thus, the adjusted scores are of little use.) (*Doc 04d. CLA Fall 2008 Interim Report, Claremont McKenna College*)

In our Proposal in May 2007, we indicated that we would begin collecting data with our entering freshman class in 2008. We have accomplished that goal and have moved well beyond it in terms of collecting data on seniors as well. We discussed the possibility of establishing an e-portfolio program for assessment of student learning in our Proposal contingent upon faculty support and approval. That has not happened. The faculty has chosen not to embark on such a program and will rely on the national survey approach we have adopted which permits comparative analysis with other institutions something that is not possible with an e-portfolio approach.

Student Learning Outcome Number One: Intellectual Depth

The College has asked each academic department to establish a core of overall educational goals and specific student learning outcomes as the most effective means of evaluating our success in meeting this outcome. We established March 1, 2009 as the deadline for completing this process. In addition, we asked each academic department to determine means of assessing student progress in meeting the learning outcomes set for the major by the end of the 2008–2009 academic year if possible. Having established departmental goals and student learning outcomes, we will then be in a position to assess student learning using these new procedures and eventually make changes in our major programs as needed to improve student performance and learning. Every department has now established learning

goals for the program. Despite our projections, we have not yet fully reached the institutional goal where every department has established SLOs and agreed upon means of assessment. The following matrix presents the current state of this effort.

**CMC Academic Department and Program Assessment
and Evaluation Program Status**

May 2009

Department		Educational Goals	SLOs	Means of Assessment
Robert Day School				
	Econ & Econ	Completed (3)	Completed (3)	Embed questions, Theses,
	Accounting & Finance			problem sets
	M Fin Econ	Completed (3)	Completed (10)	Embed questions,
Government		Completed (3)	Completed (4)	Theses, Oral Exams
History		Completed (4)	Completed (8)	Theses, exit survey
International Relations (program)		Incomplete (3)	Incomplete (6)	Theses, writing samples
Literature		Completed (5)	Completed (8)	Theses, Orals, writing sample
Mathematics & C.S.		Completed (3)	Incomplete	Thesis, embed questions,
Modern Languages		Completed (8)	Pending	Pending
Philosophy		Completed (7)	Pending	Theses, surveys, Capstone seminar
Psychology		Completed (8)	Pending	Incomplete
Religious Studies		Completed (3)	Completed (6)	Incomplete
Joint Science Gen Science		Completed (6)	Completed (6)	Theses, Tests, Orals,
	Biology	Pending		Writing Samples, Surveys,
				Projects, Grad Admissions
	Chemistry	Completed (6)	Completed (5)	" " "
	Physics	Pending	Pending	Pending

As one can ascertain from the matrix, 12 of the 15 departments and programs have completed the development of their educational goals. Eight of the 15 have completed the development of their student learning outcomes and 12 of the 15 have agreed on methods of assessing student learning outcomes. Finally, the Joint Science Department, our joint science program with Scripps College and Pitzer College, has also completed its Assessment Cycle, Evaluation of Results, and Use of Results cycle for its general education science program. In terms of the general education science program most of the department's goals are being accomplished but efforts to encourage students to engage in the reading of primary science literature need to be improved. Thus, we have made substantial progress and are closing in on our goal of carrying out assessment activities in every department and program during academic year 2009–2010. By 2010–2011, every department and program should have evaluated the results of their assessment activities and use the results for program improvement. It is worth noting that many departments have chosen to use the senior thesis, a required one- or two-semester capstone course in the major(s) as a major means of assessing student learning. These

assessments are likely to involve evaluation of the written research work and the conducting oral exams or presentations, depending on the department involved. Senior theses can also be useful for assessing general learning.

In addition to the departmental and program level assessments identified in the matrix above, the College will use student responses to the 15 questions from NSSE to provide additional data on SLO 1, learning in depth. The responses from the departmental assessments will be reviewed at the departmental level for evaluation and program improvement purposes as the Joint Science Department has already begun to do. The Curriculum Committee and the WASC Steering Committee will evaluate the NSSE results in terms of general education in the Fall semester.

Essay on Theme 2: Planning for Growth

In our Proposal, we indicated that we planned to provide a final master planning document to the Board of Trustees during 2010, and we are on schedule to accomplish this goal. We also indicated that the plan we develop would need to provide answers to questions such as:

- What will be the scale and scope of additional physical facilities needed? We have hired a planning firm to assist us in exploring the scale and quantity of new facilities.
- What staffing additions will be needed and in what areas of the College? We have begun to explore the nexus between the present financial conditions and the need to add staff and faculty.
- What faculty additions will be needed and in what disciplines and programs? Based on our last iteration of growth, we have a good perspective on the numbers of faculty and their disciplines, but have not decided that we need to retain an 8:1 student faculty ratio.
- What additional financial resources will be needed and in what areas of operations? This question must be answered subsequent to the answers regarding staffing increases.
- What changes in educational effectiveness, curricular offerings, and pedagogy may be needed? Based on our prior growth efforts, we do not see much change in these areas.
- What changes in our campus milieu will occur? This is an unknown, but is of importance to many in the CMC community. Prior experience with growth suggests that it will not have a major effect.
- What are the central arguments for and against growth? The major arguments for growth are to be found in the current size of the College which restricts program and curricular size. Being one of the smallest highly selective colleges is not seen as an advantage and places us in a competitive disadvantage in terms of admissions. Finally, we have a robust applicant pool that would permit us to easily enroll more students without compromising student quality. The major arguments against growth are its perceived effect on the culture of the College.

We have dealt with these questions over the last two years and in doing so reinforced our notion that the Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review plans are deeply intertwined. Since we had so much to accomplish in terms of student learning outcomes, an in-depth exploration of our faculty, staff, and financial capacity to accomplish our goal of creating a comprehensive assessment program was essential to ensure we possessed adequate resources to accomplish the task. This was also true with respect to institutional growth; many of the questions to be resolved in our master planning efforts are contingent on developing a student learning environment and vice versa. Thus, the stimulus of the Capacity and Preparatory Review provided a timely and structured process for collecting the data and conducting the analysis needed to complete both of our thematic studies.

Context for the Issue of Enrollment Growth at CMC

Although enrollment growth is an important issue at most colleges and universities, it is a particularly important (and sensitive) issue at Claremont McKenna College. CMC was founded as part of The Claremont Colleges Consortium, which is an intentionally designed consortium of purposefully small undergraduate and graduate institutions. Among the central objectives of The Claremont Colleges are included:

- (a) To maintain in each of the colleges the personalized instruction and the other educational advantages inherent in small colleges, and, therefore, to maintain colleges and other educational institutions of limited enrollment. Constitution of The Claremont Colleges, Article II, Sections 2 and 5 (revised in April 2000). (*Doc 07-d. Constitution of The Claremont Colleges*)
- (b) Member institutions shall remain small and that the intimate and personal relationships characteristic of the small institutions shall remain inviolate. Because of the shared services and activities, the number of students in any member institution is a matter of common concern to all the members. As a guideline, no member should enroll more than 35% of the total full time equivalent enrollment of The Claremont Colleges. Constitution - See Article V, Section 1. (*Doc 07d. Constitution of The Claremont Colleges*)

Based on these Constitutional provisions, the current “in Claremont” enrollment limitations have been established for each of the Colleges:

1. Pomona – 1800
2. CMC – 1400
3. Harvey Mudd – 800
4. Pitzer – 1000
5. Scripps – 1000
6. CGU – 1600
7. KGI – 400

In addition to size limitations, CMC also must consider its focused academic mission to provide a “liberal arts education that emphasizes economics and political science.” Each of the institutions making up The Claremont Colleges has a somewhat particularized mission by design in order to avoid the challenge of being composed of identical, competing institutions. The question of growth at CMC is therefore embedded with the question of the development of academic programs at the College (whether we are strengthening our mission or whether we are losing our focus, etc.). Founded in 1946, CMC is still a very young institution, and it has experienced growth and evolution in virtually every decade of its existence. At the same time, although all members of the College community are committed to CMC’s mission as a small highly selective, independent, coeducational, residential, undergraduate liberal arts college, the College has never established a common vision for an “optimal” size for the College. Finally, in contrast to institutions that are more dependent on tuition revenue and need to grow to expand their financial resources, CMC benefits from the ability to choose not to grow. This is not to argue that at CMC the question of growth does not raise concerns regarding the impact on institutional resources and the overall quality of a CMC education. The impact on the College’s high endowment per student (at least during the growth transition period) is a particular concern in this regard.

The Current Status of the Growth Issue at CMC

Growth was a central focus of the College’s 1993 Strategic Plan, in which the College set forth the following core objective:

“The College can best advance the fulfillment of its mission by carefully planned growth to approximately 1000 students by the year 2000. To ensure the benefits that enlargement can produce, the following long-term constraints are established:

- No dilution in the overall quality standards for admitted students
- No dilution in the student/faculty ratio
- No dilution of financial base of endowment per student

The constraints are established to ensure that the pace of growth does not diminish quality.”

The College was successful in meeting these growth objectives and conditions by the year 2000. But when the College entered its strategic planning process in 2000, the College was still “absorbing” the impacts of this growth. At the time, further growth was recognized as a sensitive issue within the CMC community with significant perceived financial implications, and the College decided not to actively address the question of growth in its 2002 Strategic Plan. Instead, the College’s Strategic Plan provides: “That the College will maintain its current goal of enrolling 1,000 students in Claremont. The Plan does not include any recommendation with respect to future growth leaving the issue in the hands of the Board of Trustees. (*Doc 03a-1. Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002–2012, 03-15-02*)

In 2005, the Board of Trustees revisited the question of growth and agreed to grow from approximately 1,000 students in Claremont to approximately 1,125 students in Claremont. The Board authorized this incremental growth at its meeting in October 2005, based on the following principal reasons:

- (1) ***Financial Resources.*** Even prior to the completion of the strategic planning process, the College was beginning to experience the major financial challenges associated with the significant decline in the College’s endowment. As a result, the College was focused on both maximizing the effectiveness of all revenue sources, as well as on minimizing or reducing expenses. The College therefore evaluated the optimal size of the College relative to its existing physical and human resources (with the exception of the dormitory and apartment space and incremental faculty growth necessary to maintain CMC’s student-faculty ratio). This analysis confirmed that increasing the target enrollment to approximately 1,100 FTE students in Claremont resulted in a significant positive financial impact. In short, this incremental level of growth represented a prudent financial strategy of spreading our existing fixed costs across a larger number of students.
- (2) ***Student Selectivity and Shaping the Class.*** The College had also experienced a significant increase in its already high selectivity since 2002. In particular, the number of freshman applications increased from approximately 3,000 in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s to a level of 3,500 in 2004 and to over 3,700 applications in 2005. CMC’s rate of admission had correspondingly fallen from approximately 30% to below 20%. The College was therefore confident increasing the size of the student body to 1,100 students in Claremont would strengthen the overall quality of the class and would also provide more flexibility in the College’s efforts to shape the overall class.
- (3) ***Academic and Teaching Resources.*** The enrollment increase to 1,100 also enabled the College to proportionately increase the size of the faculty by 8-9 core faculty members in order to maintain the College’s then student-faculty ratio of 9:1.
- (4) ***Ongoing Need to Strengthen Alumni Base.*** The Board also recognized that the small size and relative youth of the College’s alumni base places the College at a significant comparative disadvantage in comparison to our peer colleges. Thus, responsible growth enables the College to deepen the impact our mission through our graduates, and is also a vitally important to the long-term comparative financial strength of the College.
- (5) ***Growth to Approximately 1,100 FTE Students and Campus Intimacy.*** Apart from potential concerns about the implications of growth with respect to an institution’s financial position and student selectivity, maintaining CMC’s campus intimacy is perhaps the most significant concern associated with growth. The Board did not view that the growth to 1,100 students in Claremont would have any material impact on campus intimacy and the residential campus. Important factors included our ability to maintain a single dining facility, and the creation of a new residential hall that would be designed to strengthen our residential life model.

(*Doc 06d-15 & 14. Board of Trustees Minutes 09-30-05 & 10-01-05, 11-30-05*)

At the same time that the Board decided to pursue incremental growth in October 2005, it also unanimously decided that the College should be master planning based on a potential enrollment of 1,400 students in Claremont. The Board was not making a decision to grow, but was recognizing that there was a strong basis of support for continuing to consider this issue and that the College therefore needed to base its land use and master planning work on the potential for future growth. Based on this decision, the College made a request to purchase additional land from the Claremont University Consortium in the spring of 2006, which land was necessary to acquire in order for the College to be able to secure the potential for growth to 1,400 students in Claremont. The CUC approved this land purchase request in April 2006 and negotiations are continuing for the final purchase. In combination, our new residence hall, Claremont Hall, the Kravis Center, the East Campus land purchase, and the relocation of the tennis courts have laid the foundation for a transformation of the College's campus and made the topic of master planning a central priority for the Board of Trustees.

During 2007 through 2008, CO Architects was engaged by the College to develop an updated master plan of buildings and grounds for internal use. The process was primarily managed through the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Trustees (B&G), and the primary purpose was to sort through building location questions, particularly related to a fitness and athletic center and a potential new campus center. Concurrently with the work by CO Architects, the B&G also engaged in a process to develop a Statement of Master Plan Beliefs and Principles that were intended to guide the future development of the College. The Statement was approved by the Buildings and Grounds Committee in April 2008. The topic of master planning and growth was a key topic at the Board of Trustees meeting on September 28–29, 2007. (*Doc 06d-8. Board of Trustees Agenda and Minutes 09-28-07 & 09-29-07*) The meeting included a presentation by President Gann on the topic of growth. (*Doc 6d-8. Board of Trustees September 2007 Strategic Indicators on Growth*) The President emphasized that while financial considerations are important, growth must be tied to an overall strategic plan to strengthen and improve the College.

By 2008–2009, it became clear that future development at the College would require the submission of a formal master plan to the City of Claremont. The “financial crisis” that erupted in the summer / fall of 2008 also re-focused the College on the question of potential growth, and the College presented several possible growth scenarios to the Board of Trustees for preliminary review. It also became clear during 2008–2009 that the College needed to update its strategic plan. Key elements such as mission, strategic goals, etc, remain consistent, but the College has already accomplished many of the “priorities” outlined in the 2002 plan. In addition, the College's internal and external environment had evolved in many unforeseen ways since the Plan was adopted, which raise important questions regarding how the College can continue to enhance its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission. Internal examples include the new Robert Day Scholars Program, a new governance agreement for Joint Science and external factors include the fact that the financial framework has been placed under extraordinary stress as is the case at many other institutions. Even the perception of increasing pressure to demonstrate the value and distinctiveness of the residential liberal arts model needs to be considered. Thus, President Gann recommended, and the Board approved, initiating a streamlined strategic planning process in 2009–2010. Growth will be a key strategic topic in this process (unlike the 2002 strategic plan). An Ad Hoc Planning Committee has been formed consisting of the Vice President for Planning, the Dean of the Faculty, the Treasurer, the Dean of Students, and the Dean of Admissions. They will work over the summer of 2009 and make a report to the Board of Trustees in October 2009. They will make a final report to the Board in February 2010. The Board will make a final determination on growth plans for the next 5 to 10 years in either March 2010 or May 2010. (*Doc 06d-3 & 21 & 22. Board of Trustees Academic Program Initiatives 03-13-09; 2002 Strategic Plan Tracking Report 06-18-09; 2009–2010 Strategic Planning Framework 06-18-09*)

Planning for Future Growth

As the foregoing background highlights, the College has reached an important juncture with respect to its planning for future growth, and this timing aligns with the current WASC reaffirmation process. The College anticipates that planning for future growth will be a central priority over the next several years. Although the precise planning process has not been formalized, any planning process would involve faculty, students, staff, and alumni. We anticipate that the planning process will take place over a single year. In making any final determination to grow, the Board and the College will be focused on a variety of issues that will all be central to the future of the College, including (but not limited to):

1. Implications for Admission and Financial Aid
 - a. Selectivity, shape of the class, etc.
2. Implications for faculty and academic programs
 - a. Faculty development issues
 - b. Curricular development
3. Implications for Residential Life
 - a. Campus intimacy
 - b. Dining/Campus Center facilities
 - c. Residential Facilities
4. Campus Master Plan
 - a. Organization of Residential and Academic Program
 - b. Density / Open Space impacts
 - c. Parking and Circulation
5. Implications for Alumni and Development
6. Financial Impacts
 - a. Endowment per student
7. Impacts on the Consortium
8. Other Issues

We believe the resources of our Vice President for Planning, Office of Institutional Research, Office of the Dean of Faculty, and various faculty and college committees, under the guidance of the Board of Trustees, are sufficient to successfully carry out the planning effort we have recently agreed upon and we will report on the results of this planning effort in our Educational Effectiveness Review.

Conclusion

We believe we have a “culture of evidence” revealing considerable progress at Claremont McKenna College toward developing appropriate assessment and evaluation of student learning, and we expect to ensure that we come into much greater compliance with the Standards. We believe that the process of assessing student learning in new, more systematic ways has already enlivened the dialogue about educational effectiveness on our campus, and as the results of data gathering become available this dialogue will grow in strength and frequency.

Preparedness for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

Our EER will provide the basis for a report on our efforts to evaluate the educational effectiveness of our educational programs. In terms of our first theme, *Assessing Student Learning*, we will focus on the progress we will have made in moving ahead with our plans to have a fully operational evaluation and assessment program in place. As can be seen from the timetable in Section V below, we have actually completed much of what we set out to do in our Proposal with the exception that we accomplished it about twelve months later than we anticipated. However, the timetable we adopted in our Proposal permits us to catch up during the next academic year, 2009–2010. We fully expect to do so recognizing that there are always unanticipated hurdles along the way. Still, we have every reason to believe that we will have established educational objectives for our students, assessed their achievement of those goals and be able to demonstrate program alterations to improve effectiveness where appropriate based on the results of our evaluation efforts. This will be accomplished both at the general education level and at the departmental and program level.

Looking ahead, and based on the significant progress accomplished in the areas of both general education assessment and departmental assessment, the Steering Committee now believes that it is time to form a new Assessment Committee to take on the role of managing the College’s educational assessment program. This Committee was envisioned in the College’s Proposal, and it is expected that we will form the Committee in the Fall of 2009. The Assessment Committee, to be formed by the Dean of Faculty, will include four or five faculty members, two staff members, and two students. The Committee will be responsible for shepherding the overall educational effectiveness effort and will make periodic reports to the Faculty at its monthly meetings on the results of the College’s general education assessment and evaluation program. The Committee will be tasked, along with the Curriculum Committee, with reviewing the results of the general education assessment and will conduct evaluations of the overall student learning outcomes with the results being forwarded to the Faculty for any needed program revisions. The Committee will also receive written progress reports annually from each department on the program’s assessment and evaluation results. The Committee will ensure that departments develop an appropriate plan for assessing SLOs and that they conduct evaluation of the results on a systematic basis to ensure the program is accomplishing its intended goals. The Committee will be responsible for monitoring departments to ensure that they carry out their planned assessment and evaluation activities on a regular and sustained basis. The Assessment Committee will provide the Dean and the Faculty with an annual report on the state of the College’s assessment and evaluation program. The Assessment Committee will work closely with the WASC Steering Committee which will be responsible for preparing the College’s Educational Effectiveness Report.

We intend to meet our Proposal commitment by the end of our review process in the spring of 2011 to:

- have every program fully engaged in evaluating progress towards specific educational goals and
- demonstrate the use of our assessment results to improve program delivery and educational outcomes and
- have the results of our assessments serve as an integral part of our external program review process and
- publish the results of our assessment and evaluation efforts with respect to student learning.

As we stated in our Proposal, accomplishing these goals will permit us to supplement our current methods of evaluating student learning outcomes involving tests, papers, surveys, and class discussions with additional methods of evaluation to be developed by faculty in various departments and programs. We believe this effort will systematically involve the entire faculty in a deeper exploration of the teaching and learning process that marks our educational program. The development of effective measures of student learning will also position the College to be an active participant in the national dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness, transparency, and quality assurance.

Remaining challenges are to evaluate the results of the assessment tools and reflect on how they may assist us in program improvement. The first cycle will be completed by the end of 2009–2010. The collection of assessment data by departments and programs will occur during 2009–2010 and the evaluation of the results will follow in some cases during that year or, in others, in early 2010–2011. This will permit the results to be used as part of the new cycle of external program reviews.

Our EER, due in spring 2011, will document the results of our efforts. We will include in the EER all of our learning goals and student learning outcomes for general education and for major and program purposes as well as the results of the assessment our evaluation of the results and any modifications for program improvement. We will also report on the determination of assessment cycles from our departments and programs. We have already determined on an annual cycle of rotation of surveys for general education purposes with evaluation occurring every year. These combined efforts will move the College a considerable distance towards fulfilling our obligations under CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8.

As part of The Claremont Colleges Consortium, students have opportunities that are not usually available on other campuses, such as intercampus agreements that make it easy for students to take classes and even entire majors on other Claremont College campuses. In those cases, we rely on the other colleges to develop appropriate assessment and evaluation programs under WASC guidance. Neither CMC, nor its sister institutions, has yet determined a means of assessing consortium programs over which no single institution has complete control. The exception to this is the Joint Science program, in whose case we are developing an assessment and evaluation program that we intend to serve Pitzer and Scripps colleges as well. Hopefully, we can initiate conversations with our sister institutions in Claremont in 2010 or 2011 on possible methods of cooperating on assessing our intercollegiate programs.

The practice of external program reviews is well established and valued at the College and increasingly welcomed by the faculty. The next external review cycle to begin during 2009–2010 will require departments to have completed their own assessment and evaluation cycle prior to the review so that the results can be included in the self-study review completed prior to the external visiting team's arrival. This process will ensure a direct relationship between comprehensive student assessment and evaluation and program reviews scheduled for the future thus meeting the terms of CFR 2.7 directly.

The newly created strategic planning effort that is just now underway will lead to a decision regarding further institutional growth for the next five to ten years. A decision on further growth is expected to be made in May 2010. Thus, we should be able to report on this decision in our EER. This process will need to incorporate multiple constituencies in exploring challenging questions and institutional resources in defining and choosing among future options, including the effects on student learning in keeping with CFRs 4.1, 4.2. and 4.3.

Work Plan and Milestones for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

In this section, we consider what steps must occur between our CPR and EER. Faculty, staff, and Trustees will work closely with the Dean of the Faculty, the Assessment Committee, the Vice President for Planning, Treasurer, Office of Institutional Research, Information Technology Services, Student Services, the Curriculum Committee, and academic departments to move the process forward to the EER.

July 2009 through January 2010:

- Departments will conclude development of SLOs and means of assessment and, in some cases, will begin assessment efforts.
- Dean of Faculty will appoint Assessment Committee.
- College will conduct Student Life Survey and CLA test and evaluate results
- College will select general education courses that relate to SLOs
- Ad-hoc Planning Committee will collect and analyze data from master planning surveys and other sources.
- Ad hoc Planning Committee will prepare final recommendation for Board of Trustees on institutional growth.

January 2010 through June 2010:

- Departments will analyze data and use results for program changes as appropriate.
- Departments will document and archive any improvement histories.
- Board of Trustees will consider master plan final recommendations and decide on institutional growth.
- Departments will decide on frequency of assessment activities.

July 2010 through January 2011:

- Board of Trustees and college administration will work on implementation of any decision to grow the College.
- Departments will continue to conduct assessments and evaluate results with the intention of program improvement.
- College will prepare EER for Visiting Committee.
- Initial departments chosen for external review will prepare self-study reports.

January 2011 through June 2011:

- College will send EER and receive Visiting Team.
- Departments will continue next iterations of assessment and evaluation including assessment of utility of methods chosen.

Appendix I: Required Data Elements

The Western Association of Schools and Colleges requires that institutions submit a prescribed set of exhibits and data displays as part of a larger portfolio of evidence that they submit as part of the Capacity and Preparatory Review. The intent of this requirement is to move the process of accreditation toward more visible reliance on concrete evidence and allow the accreditation decision to be a more informed decision.

Claremont McKenna College has reviewed the required data elements under eight substantive categories of data. Each 'data element' consists of a basic array of data about a distinct characteristic of the College and, in combination, these data elements portray a de facto "Fact Book" of Claremont McKenna College. This document is provided separately.

Section 1. Admissions and Student Preparation

Data Exhibit 1.1 Admissions Activities by Level

Data Exhibit 1.2 Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students

Data Exhibit 1.3 Admission by Gender

Data Exhibit 1.4 Admissions by Race/Ethnicity

Section 2. Student Enrollments

Data Exhibit 2.1 Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective

Data Exhibit 2.2 Headcount Enrollments by Gender

Data Exhibit 2.3 Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity

Data Exhibit 2.4 Students Receiving Financial Aid

Section 3. Degrees Awarded

Data Exhibit 3.1 Degrees Granted by Degree-Level and Program

Section 4. Faculty and Staff Composition

Data Exhibit 4.1 Faculty Composition

Data Exhibit 4.2 Faculty Headcount by Department/Program

Data Exhibit 4.3 Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Data Exhibit 4.4 Full-time Faculty and Staff Turnover During the Last 5 Years

Section 5. Fiscal Resources

Data Exhibit 5.1b Sources of Revenue: Private Institutions

Data Exhibit 5.2b Operating Expenditures: Private Institutions

Data Exhibit 5.3b Private Institutions Assets and Liabilities

Data Exhibit 5.4 Capital Investments/ Valuations

Data Exhibit 5.5 Endowment Values and Performance

Section 6 Institutional Operating Efficiency

Data Exhibit 6.1 Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios

Data Exhibit 6.2 Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios

Data Exhibit 6.3 Key Financial Ratios

Section 7. Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Data Exhibit 7.1 Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Section 8. Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

Data Exhibit 8.1 Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

Appendix II: Stipulated Policies

WASC requires that an institution publish and make publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission. The Claremont McKenna College policies referred to in the body of this report are specifically noted here in this appendix.

Institutional Integrity

- A widely disseminated, written policy statement of commitment to integrity and academic freedom in teaching, learning, research, publication, and oral presentation: [Faculty Handbook 4.1-2](#); [Statement On Harassment, Free Speech, And Academic Freedom](#); [Statement of Academic Integrity](#)
- Due process procedures that demonstrate faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth: [Faculty Handbook 3.4](#); Students' Right of Access to the Academic Standards Committee and Appeal to the Dean of the Faculty, [Academic Standards Committee](#)
- Written policies on due process and grievance procedures for faculty, staff and students: [Faculty Handbook 4.4](#), [Staff Grievance Policy](#), and [website on grievances specific to students](#).
- A clear statement of institutional policies, requirements, and expectations to current and prospective employees: [Human Resources Policy Website](#)
- Institutionally developed and published non-discrimination, equal opportunity, and affirmative action policies, including individuals with Disabilities: [Statement On Non-Discrimination, Equal Employment Opportunity, And Related Laws](#)
- Clearly written policies on conflict of interest for board, administration, faculty, and staff, including appropriate limitations on the relations of business, industry, government, and private donors to research in the institution: [Faculty Handbook 10.2](#); for Board of Trustees policy, see Additional Documentation.

Faculty

- Explicit and equitable faculty personnel policies and procedures: [Faculty Handbook Chapter 3: Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure](#)
- Policies on salaries and benefits: [Human Resources Benefits Website](#)
- Policies for faculty and staff regarding privacy and accessibility of information: Policy on [Use of Internet Services and Network Resources](#)

Students

- Policies on student rights and responsibilities, including the rights of due process and redress of grievances: [Academic Standards Committee](#)
- Publications that include policies and rules defining inappropriate student conduct: [Basic Rule of Student Conduct](#)

Appendix III: Additional Documentation

1. Reaccreditation

- a. WASC Letter of Reaccreditation March 10, 2000
- b. Institutional Proposal for Reaffirmation of Accreditation, May 15, 2007
- c. Approval of Proposal by WASC, July 5, 2007
- d. WASC/ACSCU SUMMARY DATA
- e. WASC Data Exhibits for CPR Review

2. Substantive Change

- a. WASC Substantive Change Proposal for RDS MA in Finance 2008-2011, 09-16-08
- b. WASC Substantive Change C Action Report for RDS MA in Finance, 12-04-08
- c. WASC Structural Change C Approval for RDS MA in Finance, 03-19-09
- d. RDS Addendum Response to WASC Approval 04-21-09

3. CMC Planning

- a. 1. CMC Strategic Plan: A Vision for 2002-2012, March 15, 2002
CMC Strategic Plan 2002 Appendix VI
2. CMC Strategic Plan 2001 – Curriculum Final Report
- b. CMC Master Plan, December 14, 1993
- c. CMC Strategic Indicators Report 2008
- d. 1. CMC Fact Book 2007
2. CMC Fact Book 2008

4. Evaluations

- a. 1. CMC Student Life Survey Results 2006
2. CMC Student Life Survey Results 2007
- b. 1. Freshman Survey (UCLA – HERI) 2006
2. Freshman Survey (UCLA – HERI) 2007
3. Freshman Survey (UCLA) – HERI) 2008
- c. 1. Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI) 2006
2. Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI) 2007
3. Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI) 2008
- d. CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment) Fall 2008 Interim Report – CMC
- e. NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement) 2008 Mean and Frequency Reports
- f. CMC Alumni Survey Summary 02-16-09
- g. IPEDS Data Feedback Report 2008

5. Academic Review

- a. Proposals for New (or Revised) Courses (see also Curriculum Committee and Faculty Meeting Materials)
 - o *FHS 10. Problems in the History of Christianity*
 - o *Fin 306. Asset Pricing and Derivatives*
 - o *Hist 185. Junior Seminar*
 - o *Biol 83jt. Science, Management and Technology: Neuropharmacology*
 - o *Phys 79L. Energy and the Environment*
- b. Course Evaluation
 1. Student Opinion Survey (Course Evaluation Form and scantron)
 2. Individual Averages Spring 2009 (sample)
 3. Departmental Averages Spring 2009 (sample)
 4. College Average Spring 2009
- c. Programs:
 1. External Review Guidelines (May 2000)
 2. Overview of the Department of Economics
 3. Assessment of the CMC Economics and Economics Major, April 2005
 4. CMS (Joint Department) Athletics Self-Study for External Review
 5. CMS External Review Report
 6. CMS Summary of External Review Recommendations
 7. CMC Response to External Review
 8. Board of Trustees - Research Institute Survey Report, 2005
- d. Student Learning Outcomes Examples:
 1. Literature Department Learning Goals 2009
 2. Robert Day School (RDS) Learning Goals 04-21-09
- e. Faculty:
 1. (Sample Miller) Promotion and Tenure Report from Department
 2. (Sample Williams) Promotion and Tenure Letter from Outside Reviewer
 3. (Sample Williams) Promotion and Tenure Report from Department

6. Committees

- a. Faculty Meeting: Pertinent Materials from 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09
- b. Curriculum Committee: Sample Materials from 2008-09
- c. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (APT): Sample Materials

- d. Board of Trustees (BOT): Pertinent Agendas and Minutes 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 including:
 - 1. *CMC General Education Assessment Goals and Learning Outcomes (May 14, 2009)*
 - 2. *Academic Programming Initiatives (March 13, 2009)*
 - 5. *Conflict of Interest Policies (March 14, 2008)*
 - 6. *Globalization at CMC (March 14, 2008)*
 - 6. *Achieving CMC's Commitment to International Education (March 14, 2008)*
 - 8. *Strategic Indicators Related to Growth (September 28, 2007)*
 - 21. 2002 Strategic Plan Tracking Report (June 18, 2009)
 - 22. 2009-2010 Strategic Planning Framework (June 18, 2009)
 - 26. Governance Questionnaires, 2002, 2004
 - 30. BOT 2008-09 Annual Board Composition and Profile
- e. Academic Affairs Committee (of the Board of Trustees): Pertinent Agendas and Minutes 2008-09, including
 - 5. AAC Annual Report to Board of Trustees, 04-30-09
 - 6. Projects and Objectives 2008-09
- f. Senior Staff: Sample Materials from 2008-09
 - 7. Goals Senior Staff Members
 - 20. Organizational Chart
 - 12. CV's Vice Presidents
- g. Diversity Committee: Sample Agendas 2008-09
 - 4. Invitation to Faculty and Staff to Apply for Mini-Grant 04-27-07
 - 5. Diversity and the Mission of Claremont McKenna College (Faculty Meeting 04-27-07)
- h. Administration Committee: Sample materials 2006-07. 2007-08, 2008-09 (for details and decisions, see Faculty Meeting materials)

7. Miscellaneous

- a. New Faculty Orientation, 2008
- b. New Faculty Workshop (intercollegiate), 2009
- c. Marian Miner Cook Athenaeum Programs 2006, 2007, 2008
- d. Constitution of The Claremont Colleges
- e. Claremont Singapore Proposal – Ministry of Education, March 2009
- f. 5-Year Financial Model
- g. Preliminary Campaign Progress Report May 6, 2009

Appendix IV: Response to Previous WASC Accreditation

A. Recommendations of the Previous WASC Re-accreditation March 10, 2000

As noted in our Proposal, the Commission's letter to President Gann of March 10, 2000 (*Doc 01a. WASC Letter of Reaccreditation, March 10, 2000*) identified six visiting team recommendations including (1) balancing the liberal arts with the College's special focus; (2) continuing its efforts to develop an educational outcomes and assessment program and enhancing institutional research capacity; (3) developing a culture and mechanisms for enhanced faculty governance; (4) giving increased attention to diversity among the Board and faculty and to the experience of women, minority students, faculty, and staff; (5) giving greater attention to program reviews and external reviewers; and (6) making greater use of the consortium of The Claremont Colleges. In addition, the Commission "highlighted three areas warranting special attention," several of which emanate from the six recommendations. The three areas are educational effectiveness, diversity, and faculty governance.

(1) The Commission urged the College to "manage its major dilemma of balancing the broader liberal arts (especially in the humanities) with the special focus on government, business, and the professions." While the College would not concur entirely with the assertion that the balance between its principle academic emphasis and the humanities is a "major dilemma," we concede this is an important situation to monitor. We can point to the establishment of our new Freshman Humanities Program, creation of an Arabic language program, and the establishment of separate departments of Philosophy and of Religious Studies as examples that we do not undervalue the Humanities. We also note our success in recruiting away from Harvard University the internationally renowned author Jamaica Kincaid. Professor Kincaid will assume the Josephine Olph Weeks Chair in our Literature Department in the Fall of 2009, and she will launch a major writing initiative for our students as a tenured full professor of Literature. And, as noted in our Proposal, the program of the Marian Miner Cook Athenaeum (MMCA) remains a unique bridge linking the liberal arts and our special mission. (*Doc 07c. 2006–2007, 2007–2008, and 2008–2009 MMCA Programs*) This program brings distinguished speakers and programs to the campus four nights a week and encourages student, faculty, and staff interaction over a meal. The MMCA also encourages faculty to meet with their students over lunch or dinner in one of smaller private dining rooms and provides opportunities for many other student-oriented events during the week. The Athenaeum program is highly important to a majority of our students – 89% of 480 students responding to a question in our Spring 2007 Student Life Survey rated the Athenaeum program important or very important. (*Doc 04a-2. Student Life Survey Results 2007*) In the last three years, it has included programs with 17 historians, 15 authors (including Gore Vidal and two Nobel Laureates, Orhan Pamuk and Shirin Ebadi), 8 poets (including Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Billy Collins and Bei Dao), as well as 20 concerts and 11 theater productions in addition to programs that serve our special mission.

(2) The second recommendation relates to student learning outcomes and the establishment of a comprehensive assessment and evaluation program that "must be continued, expanded, and institutionalized." In its letter, "The Commission encourages the College...to create a system for assessment that fits the particular ethos and resources of [CMC]...account[ing] for identifying student learning outcomes, assessing learning against those outcomes, regularly reviewing the effectiveness of program curriculum and pedagogy, and cycling the results from assessment and program review into efforts for improvement in curriculum and pedagogy." We completely concur with this recommendation. Creating a system of assessment has been a very important area for the College and

in as much as this is the topic of one of our two themes for our Capacity and Preparatory Review, we have sought to address this in depth via our Essay on Theme 1: Assessing Student Learning.

(3) The Commission also urged the College to seek “continued commitment to full faculty participation in governance.” This recommendation was crafted at the end of a nearly thirty-year long presidency marked by strong presidential leadership. The faculty now is clearly responsible for the oversight of the academic program, including the approval of all new courses and programs and faculty personnel matters through its standing Committees and its monthly meetings. (See Agenda and other materials of the Faculty Meeting (*Doc 06a*), the Curriculum Committee (*Doc 06b*) and the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (*Doc 06c*). President Gann has utilized the elected Administration Committee of the Faculty as a principal sounding board for new initiatives and has brought important issues to it for dialogue and decision following the announcement of the Robert Day gift. (*Doc 06h 1 through 6. Administration Committee Agendas 05-05-09; 02-18-09; 02-03-09; 04-17-08; 12-11-07*) The President also has sought faculty advice and counsel by means of special meetings with all interested faculty during the Globalization initiative (see above) and provided for dialogues between faculty and Trustees at the 2008 Board retreat. (*Doc 06d-6. Board of Trustees Agenda and Minutes, 03-14-08*) During 2008–2009, she has used a number of informal sessions with faculty to discuss the implications of the recent financial downturn and its effects on the College’s financial situation to ensure that faculty have an appreciation for the institution’s position and the opportunity to make recommendations on how to address it.

(4) The Commission identified diversity as an area that requires persistent efforts, and encouraged “giving attention to the experience of women faculty and students from ‘minority’ backgrounds.” The Commission recommended that, “CMC regularly assess the culture of the campus in terms of the extent to which it welcomes and supports diverse populations of students, staff and faculty.” The College accepts the importance of this recommendation, and has attended to numerous issues of concern to women faculty. For example, in 2007, after a number of women faculty expressed concern regarding the existing parental leave policy, the College adopted a new family friendly [parental leave policy](#). The College has also adopted a new [Back-up Care Program](#) sought by women faculty and administrators as an important new benefit to provide assistance at home so employees can be at work when dependents need care.

The Board of Trustees and the Faculty confirmed their awareness of the need to encourage diversity when the College adopted a new [Diversity Statement](#) (*Doc 6a-11. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes 4-10-07*) and added the following paragraph at the end of our Mission Statement in the [Faculty Handbook](#): “To execute our mission, we seek to enroll a diverse student body, to recruit a diverse faculty and staff, and to place great value on respect for differences.”

As indicated in our Proposal, the College regularly assesses the culture on the campus regarding diversity issues through the Student Life Survey, most recently conducted in 2007. (*Doc 4a-2. Student Life Survey Results 2007*) The findings indicate that only 5.1% of 466 students responding disagreed with the statement that faculty at CMC treat students fairly regardless of their ethnicity/race. A total of 9.7% percent disagreed with the statement that students at CMC treat other students fairly regardless of their ethnicity/race. Moreover, nearly a quarter of those responding disagreed with the statement that the CMC campus is free of tension related to ethnicity/race, and 14% indicated that they had personally experienced discrimination at CMC because of their ethnicity/race. While we are not pleased with this percentage, we believe these statistics may partially stem from the fact that we house students in far more diverse residence halls than is typically the case in comparable institutions. For example, 65.8% of our seniors in the 2008 Senior Survey indicated they had had a roommate of a different race or ethnicity. (*Doc 4c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA-HERI)*) By contrast, only 35.9% in all other private four-year colleges reported having had a roommate of a different race. Data from the

2008 Senior Survey indicated that the same percentage of respondents who experienced personalized discrimination, 14%, felt that there was a lot of racial tension on campus. This figure is similar to the 16.9% reported at all other four year private colleges. Of particular interest are data that demonstrate that our students are far more likely to come into contact with students of different racial and ethnic groups either in social settings: 78.6% at CMC, compared to 44% at all other private four-year colleges, 81.6% at meals at CMC, compared to just 48.2% elsewhere, and through studying together (65.5% at CMC, compared with 39.2% at all other private four-year colleges). The close contacts clearly provide far greater opportunities for “meaningful and honest discussions about racial/ethnic relations,” which is reflected in the same study: 65.6 % of CMC seniors reported such discussions, compared with just 34.3% at all other four-year private colleges. Nevertheless, these mitigating factors aside, Claremont McKenna College will continue to develop programs aggressively to ensure that our campus is a welcoming environment for all students. One means we seek to popularize are various orientation programs and other efforts sponsored by the Diversity Committee and the Office of the Dean of Students, the College. Thus far, our Senior Survey of 2008 indicates that 19.2% of our seniors had participated in a racial/cultural awareness workshop, compared with 25.5% of seniors in all other private four-year colleges. We believe we can and should increase our student participation in these workshops. (*Doc 6g-1 & 2 & 3. Diversity Committee Agendas 10-13-08; 11-21-08; 2-19-09; Doc 04c-3. 2008 Senior Survey (UCLA – HERI)*)

Our current faculty is also not as diverse as we would like in terms of race and ethnicity. (See Essay on Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.) However, our faculty has grown more diverse in some other respects that are important to us and our mission. In 2002, twelve members of our faculty were foreign born, providing an international perspective in the classroom and elsewhere on campus. By 2007–2008, the figure had more than doubled to 25. Further, in 2007–2008 over 70% of our courses contained international components, especially in history, government, languages, and literature. (*Doc 06d-6. Board of Trustees “Globalization at CMC,” March 2008*)

The Athenaeum (see above) has also been a valuable resource adding to our attention to diversity. In the last three years, we have sponsored seven programs on women’s issues, eight programs on Judaism, Islam, and Indian faiths, nine Latino programs including music and art, nine Afro-American programs including presentations by Tavis Smiley, Julian Bond, Jamaica Kinkaid, and Henry Gates, Jr.

(5) The College is pleased to report that it has made substantial progress in the area of external program reviews since the submission of our Proposal. As we indicated in our Proposal, the College has designed “a review process that will add value to programs and contribute to their organizational learning about curricular design and pedagogy.” At this time, we have completed the external reviews of all our academic departments, together with some other programs. We plan to reactivate the cycle of external reviews in 2010–2011 and complete them over a five to six year period.

(6) Finally, the Commission recommended that “The Claremont consortium has significant untapped potential for students and faculty that should be optimized.” As noted in our Proposal, the College makes active use of the Consortium at a level that maintains a balance with our sister institutions in Claremont. By this we mean that there is an active effort in Claremont to ensure that no institution depends too heavily on the others to support its students or academic programs. However, within those parameters, CMC actively seeks means of creating new opportunities within the Consortium for all students. Recent examples include the addition of the CMC Arabic language program with introductory language courses open to all students of the Consortium, and a new joint position for the department of Black Studies, one of several intercollegiate departments offering courses on behalf of all The Claremont Colleges. Further, several general science courses developed jointly by CMC and the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Sciences – the newest member of the Consortium – were

first offered in the 2009 Spring semester, and they will be continued in 2009–2010. (*Doc 06a-7. Faculty Meeting Agenda and Minutes, 10–24-08*) The Joint Science Department has also recently added a set of team-taught courses offered jointly by a member of the JSD and a faculty member of the Western University of Health Sciences in nearby Pomona (Biology 150L a, b). One of the newest programs has been made possible through the Robert A. Day gift. Qualified juniors from all the undergraduate colleges in Claremont are invited to apply for the [Robert Day Scholars Program](#) for Undergraduates. Known as Robert Day Scholars, the students each receive a merit scholarship toward tuition in their senior year and access to special workshops and a career consultant. And finally, as noted in our Essay on Standard 3: Engaging the Environment and Ensuring Sustainability, The Claremont Colleges have developed a joint orientation program for new incoming faculty to help new arrivals to learn more about faculty life in Claremont and especially the unique structure of and opportunities provided by the consortium. The program also helps to build bridges among new faculty members and encourages intercollegiate cooperation, which is very important for cross-registration of students and strengthening the many intercollegiate programs and majors.

B. Progress on Recommendations, Master of Arts in Finance

The March 19, 2009 letter from the Commission approving the offering of the Master of Arts degree in Finance asked the CPR team visiting CMC in the Fall of 2009 to review progress on five recommendations. As stated in our September 16, 2008 Substantive Change Application, the overarching goal of the Master of Arts Program is to produce leaders with strong analytical and financial decision-making skills, well-developed communication skills, and high ethical standards. The program builds on a liberal arts education, which provides exposure to different academic disciplines and teaches students to think critically, solve problems, and communicate intelligently and persuasively. In response to the letter from the Commission, The Robert Day School has prepared an Addendum which addresses each of the recommendations, and includes a curricular grid that connects the [learning goals](#) to the individual courses for the MA program as well as the co-curricular activities which are an integral part of the year-long program. (*Doc 02d. RDS Addendum Response to WASC Approval 04-21-09*) The grids for the program are posted on the College's website and included in the orientation material provided to entering students.