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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Self-Study Report follows the comprehensive model. It is submitted by the International Institute for Restorative Practices (“IIRP”) to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (hereinafter referred to as the “Commission”) as an institution-wide stock-taking of our progress in creating a sustainable and respected new Graduate School in an emerging field. It is also presented as a set of searching questions and data, which support our request to be granted initial accreditation.

The Self-Study Report is comprised of several parts: an Introduction which provides a context for understanding the IIRP and its emerging field; an iterative account of each of the Standards for Accreditation with our conclusions drawn from each Standard; an Appendices section with the many kinds of data which undergird our self-appraisal at this early moment in our development.

As we review our findings and recommendations here, at least one fact is true throughout. All of our efforts in seeking accreditation have been based on the understanding that we were brand new and quite small, so that much of our work in establishing a "culture of assessment" would not be so much correcting past practices in our collective life, but rather in establishing new procedures and tests of effectiveness and efficiency. It has been a matter for us (in continuous improvement terms) of “learning to do the right things right.”

The Introduction

In June 2006, the Pennsylvania Department of Education granted authorization to the IIRP to open a specific subject graduate school. We are therefore a new, private, nonprofit, stand-alone Graduate School operating in Bethlehem, PA. We arose from two social service agencies, which have a worldwide network and affiliations. Ten years ago these two sister agencies, Buxmont Academy and the Community Service Foundation, spun off a new venture, the world's first graduate school devoted entirely to the teaching, research, and dissemination of “restorative practices.” Our field, as well as our institution, is also developing across national and disciplinary borders. The effect of this emerging social science is to restore community in an increasingly disconnected world.

The IIRP holds the following definition: The emerging field of restorative practices is the study of restoring and developing social capital, social discipline, emotional well-being, and civic participation through participatory learning and decision making. The further development of restorative practices as a field of study requires eclectic graduate-level study and research that includes practice, reflection, scientific inquiry, and international academic collaboration. Restorative practices has grown from advances in both theory and practice. The unifying framework for all elements of restorative practices is this premise: People are happier, more cooperative, more productive, and more likely to make positive changes when those in authority do things with them, rather than to them or for them.
This leads directly to the mission of the Graduate School: The IIRP is dedicated to the advanced education of professionals at the graduate level and to the conduct of research that can develop the growing field of restorative practices, with the goal of positively influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society throughout the world.

The IIRP offers two master’s degrees in the discipline: a Master of Restorative Practices and Education (MRPE), and a Master of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling (MRPYC). While they share a common core, they differ so as to serve varied professionals—but within a unifying context to allow for study in the same discipline. The focus of the Youth Counseling program is on the application of restorative practices to individual, group, and family-based strategies. Students are also provided an overview of drug and alcohol counseling techniques and a critical review of current research. The focus of the Education program is on restorative practices applied to learning and instructional theories, school and community relationships, regular and special educational needs of students, teaching strategies, curriculum and a critical review of current research. The uniqueness of our degrees is that both programs offer a unifying framework that tie together theory, research, and practice in seemingly disparate fields, such as education, counseling, criminal justice, social work, and organizational management.

Standard One: Mission and Goals
Our analyses of the data for the elements in Standard One, Mission and Goals, all point toward a general conclusion that the key constituencies (students, faculty, staff, Board members) are united in understanding and appreciating our mission and its imperatives. We are both mission-aware and mission-driven. We recommend what is obvious: that as we grow, we continue to talk about our mission together, to appraise its relevance, and to raise the consciousness of those new and changing members of our constituencies.

Standard Two: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
The IIRP is in its third generation strategic plan. These three plans have guided us over 11 years, from being a fond hope of its group of founders to a currently functioning operation looking to graduate its fourth class of master’s candidates in restorative practices. Our data show that our planning is useful and pointed, although we do recommend the element of environmental scanning be enhanced.

The planning process is broadly based and it is a bottom-up, cooperative venture. It is linked both to budgeting and to assessment modalities. We have “closed the loop.” Allocation and need decisions are made at our unique Committee of the Whole, a combined faculty-staff decision-making body reporting its advice directly to the President. We recommend continuing to refine all these new processes and test their effectiveness over more time.

Standard Three: Institutional Resources
An unaccredited graduate school in a new field has little pull in attracting graduate students. We planned from the start to support operations and scholarships in the Graduate School with a yearly subvention of about $1 million until achievement of accreditation. The great recession has affected the strength of the Restorative Practices Foundation, our benefactor. It is clear from the data that the IIRP needs to be less dependent upon Foundation subventions originating from Buxmont Academy.
We also believe our data show us to be blessed with a professional and restorative faculty and staff and to have significant human and material resources in technology, including our electronic library. Our most important weakness is the lack of experienced, professional fund-raising staff, so we are already searching for a seasoned leader for those operations.

**Standard Four: Leadership and Governance**

Leadership and governance are everywhere critical to success in university life. Our new Institute has taken some pains to create special features of shared governance useful to us as a small entity. The first such feature is the Committee of the Whole, a form of direct, not representative, democracy in our workplace. This body puts all full-time faculty and senior administrators together in one forum, advising the President on all critical decisions in the institution. The second is the collaborative creation of a formal set of interlocking expectations, the Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities, among students, faculty, staff, and the Board. Our data show we need to develop greater awareness among current constituencies regarding the Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities. We also learned we must better integrate our adult students into our system of shared governance.

Our Board has existing policies for evaluating its members and the President; both formats have already been used and will be re-evaluated in the next round of such assessments. Also, having built these assessments on processes made available from the Association of Governing Boards, we will in the next round construct an additional evaluation assessing the Board's collective performance. Our data revealed we need more deliberate and formal means for recruiting and orienting Board members.

**Standard Five: Administration**

The administrative agenda and its collective efforts are facilitated by the fact that, save for the full-time faculty, almost all members of the IIRP came from administrative and staff appointments in one of the two antecedent organizations. They brought with them a commitment to the restorative mission, knowledge of how their colleagues worked, an understanding of fair process, and an enthusiasm sparked by a founder with worldwide renown in the restorative practices movement.

However, they also needed to learn their new jobs in the context of higher education. This demonstrates a salient fact about any faculty or staff hire at our Graduate School: two needs must be met, not just one. When we began by importing employees with needed skills from the two antecedent organizations, we could be sure of their restorative skills and mission commitments. Each, however, was on a steep learning curve to apply transportable skills and to learn to succeed in a new job or function in the Institute. Our data support the conclusion that these people did well in meeting that dual challenge.

Now, however, to replace them, we can turn to potential employees with successful university experience. We must now be careful to select those who are open to being restorative in their work practices and relationships.
Our founder, President Wachtel, has an international reputation. He and our Board have worked out a generalized plan for his eventual succession. But several of our founding faculty and administrative leaders may also retire in the next decade. Clearly, we must create a succession plan for these other key contributors as well.

**Standard Six: Integrity**
This Report has already revealed a recurring theme in that our mission drives important aspects of our organizational culture. Restorative practices derive from a commitment to treat all persons with respect. This demands interpersonal and organizational integrity in acting out our roles in the Graduate School.

Survey data confirm that our students especially experience that respect in their dealings with faculty and staff. Further, right from our first strategic plan, we have expected our President to prepare a report for the Board each year on fairness and ethical dealings. This identifies any significant incident, and its disposition, having any link to issues touching our institutional integrity.

A full range of restorative practices are employed to resolve many kinds of situations in our daily work life. Open, honest, identifiable feedback is fundamental. This means each of us must stand behind our criticisms or suggestions - we hold no secrets. Thus, for example, while every student evaluates every course every time, they, and we, sign our evaluations.

Further, adherence to these restorative principles leads to respecting academic freedom and the intellectual property of faculty, staff, or students. Normative boundaries such as those are observed. Grievance procedures are clear and employed by any complainants. Honesty and consistency in describing ourselves to various clientele are observed. In short, we walk the talk.

Our recommendations are practical – they include keeping the Board informed, endeavoring always to keep all constituencies focused on our mission and its imperatives, and communicating constantly to explain these mission-driven behaviors to new employees and students.

**Standard Seven: Institutional Assessment**
In the last two years, we engaged in a comprehensive program of workshops, meetings, and trainings to carry assessment values and processes to every unit and budget center. Faculty already had created a curriculum full of assessable measures embedded in it right from the first day of operation. We extended this mind-set to all our operations to assess institutional effectiveness. Administrative units now have their own unit plans with goals and objectives to support the Strategic Plan and student learning.

We created, operated, and evaluated one complete cycle of research data and are making refinements to continue into the future. All of this is documented; it represents a clear embrace of assessment throughout the Institute.
We have tied together planning, budgeting, and assessment of unit and institutional performance. Our future recommendations are clear: to seek institutional improvement comprehensively and continuously, to achieve greater dissemination of assessment results, and to strengthen the Strategic Plan and related plans by enhancing the element of environmental scanning and forecasting.

**Standard Eight: Student Admissions and Retention**
The Graduate School strives to recruit, admit, and retain adult learners who have the opportunity for success in both their education and their professions, “with the goal of positively influencing human behavior.” Our inquiry leads us to conclude that program information is clear and accurate, affording students the opportunity to make informed decisions about their academic program. Our admissions criteria is consistent for all applicants. The admissions requirement of a short essay describing a student’s reasons for seeking our specialized graduate education is an important tool for the Admissions Committee to evaluate prospective students’ motivation and suitability for graduate work in restorative practices. By selecting students with a demonstrable interest in restorative practices, an ability to succeed academically, and the desire to introduce new ideas into their workplaces and communities, the admissions process helps ensure that our graduates will contribute to the growth of knowledge through the application of what they learn, and thereby fulfill our first institutional goal: “We will educate a growing number of professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.”

As the Graduate School matures, more data about students will become available to analyze and shape recruitment beyond the current efforts of our continuing educational programs, and our current students and alumni. We are just beginning to compile data on student retention. Our numbers are small and our data trends are not yet consistent. However, the mechanisms are in place to track and report this data, and to ensure it is part of institutional assessment. Once our survey results are more comprehensive, we will be able to analyze them in order to enhance our decisions about admissions, recruitment, and retention. This is crucial to our continued growth and success.

**Standard Nine: Student Support Services**
The Graduate School assesses student feedback continuously. We conduct surveys of all entering students, of continuing students in their second (usually final) year, of graduating students, of discontinuing students, of alumni, and, of course, all students evaluate every course, every time. In various data collected over three years, between seventy five to one hundred percent of our students report either satisfaction or high satisfaction with us.

We do know from students, however, that they want us to publish multi-year course schedules in advance; that, if we are accredited and thus able to have opportunity for federal student aid, we will need to find a suitable aid officer; that we must stay in touch with our students continuously via our surveys to identify arising areas of need. This is our agenda of recommendations.
Standard Ten: Faculty
From the inception of the Graduate School, faculty and supporting professionals have been involved in creating, evaluating, and developing the school’s programs. Since the first academic term, faculty have met regularly to evaluate course syllabi and course materials to determine if they met course objectives and program goals and recommended changes, as needed. Since the success of the Graduate School relies on a high level of collaboration by qualified and restorative faculty and staff, great care is devoted to their selection, support, and evaluation.

As the most critical part of our new Graduate School, creating and assessing our curricula were the most important jobs of our faculty. Since 2005, the founding faculty and their successors have been deeply involved in the process of creating the institution, planning its development, and assessing its growth. This has been virtually a half-time job for them. It will be important after accreditation is attained for our faculty to take part in researching and disseminating the work of restorative practices. The faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs need to identify multiyear research goals for each faculty member, to create a professional development plan for each person, and to have a clearer shared understanding of the quality and quantity of research in which we are all interested.

Standard Eleven: Educational Offerings
Data derived from several kinds of student surveys, minutes of faculty and Committee of the Whole meetings, demonstrate that we do establish the linkages between our course objectives and our program goals with the foundation of student assessment, our learning matrices. Further, we are successful in achieving those hierarchical goals, and our adult learners know it. Finally, they know and appreciate that their graduate information needs are aided by our electronic library services. Continuous assessment must be conducted to ensure the Graduate School does not regress in these important matters.

An additional challenge is the fact that we have yet to achieve a broadly understood consensus around the notion of academic rigor. We must re-engage with our Academic Advisory Committee, three senior and respected social science professors from around the country, who last assisted us in 2008. We look to them to help develop that consensus, agree on reliable measures of assessment, and conduct an outside review of our curricula's strengths and weaknesses. This must be begun in AY 2010/11.

Standard Twelve: General Education
While the focus of general education is largely a concern of undergraduate education, our graduate school acknowledges its importance in our admissions requirements. We admit baccalaureate holders from regionally accredited institutions, so they have met general education criteria in achieving their degrees.
Standard Thirteen:  Related Educational Activities
The IIRP offers a Certificate Program and non-credit offerings that are consistent with and further its mission by educating a growing number of professionals in the field of restorative practices. The continuing education division has provided trainings and events to tens of thousands of professionals around the world. Our inquiry leads us to conclude there is a need for a more comprehensive evaluation of our trainings tied to specific learning outcomes. The faculty identified those outcomes and has designed an assessment survey to be piloted in AY 2010/11.

Courses were offered at additional locations in an effort to increase enrollment and meet the needs of students. All faculty share teaching responsibilities at the Main Campus and the additional locations. Classes at all locations utilize syllabi with the same learning objectives and learning outcomes. Both factors help to ensure that the same standards of quality, rigor, and effectiveness are maintained at all locations.

The Certificate Program was a 12-credit program but has been changed to be 18 credits to meet the new requirements by the U.S. Department of Education. The same mechanisms that are in place to assess the curricula and review the results of program goals and student surveys of the master’s programs are utilized for the Certificate Program. Therefore, the modification of the program to 18 credits is easily incorporated into existing assessment processes.

Standard Fourteen:  Assessment of Student Learning
Before we opened our doors, the faculty collaboratively created curricula, which had embedded within it assessment measures in every course and which linked the learning outcomes to one another and to the program goals and ultimately the mission. The faculty worked out a thoughtful matrix of these inter-relationships, evaluated every course every time, made factual judgments and the resulting adaptations. Our policy of evaluating every course, every time and making appropriate judgments, together with the Student Learning Matrices, enables faculty and the Committee of the Whole members to clearly see whether or not the relevant goals and objectives are being met and to take any necessary steps to enhance teaching and learning.

We started our assessment process with the faculty and the curriculum. As we gained knowledge and instituted a comprehensive assessment program, we included the administrative units as well in the assessment process. We have completed one whole cycle of assessment and have “closed one loop” at an institution-wide level. As we continue to operate and to assess our operations, we need to focus on the end user and his or her application of restorative practices in his or her work and life.
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INTRODUCTION

This Self-Study Report provides in its myriad details a story of the last few years of an 11 year effort to create a new, stand-alone Graduate School from virtually nothing save drive and commitment. The inception, creation, and the growth of our institution corresponds to a growing international movement in restorative practices. While we are still quite small, we are fully operational, having graduated our first three cohorts of master’s candidates. We have invested millions in our nonprofit Graduate School. More importantly, we have recruited and developed a talented faculty and staff united around our mission.

Since the Commission granted us candidacy status in 2008, we have turned the necessities for reaching accreditation into vehicles for extensive team learning in our new institution. We have advanced the creation of the Graduate School by establishing assessment measures everywhere, and this work has helped all of us better understand the needs of our growing institution. The results of all our efforts, care, and investment are documented in this Report.

Since both the IIRP, and this emerging field in social science, are relatively new, this introduction provides a context in which we may be better understood.

In June 2006, the Pennsylvania Department of Education granted authorization to the International Institute for Restorative Practices to open a specific subject Graduate School. We are, therefore, a new, private, nonprofit, stand-alone Graduate School operating in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. We arose from two Pennsylvania social service agencies, which have a worldwide network and affiliations. Ten years ago these two sister agencies, Buxmont Academy and the Community Service Foundation, spun off a new venture, the world's first Graduate School devoted entirely to the teaching, research, and dissemination of restorative practices. Our field, as well as our institution, is also developing across national and disciplinary borders. The effect of this emerging social science is to restore community in an increasingly disconnected world.

With approximately four thousand institutions of nonprofit, higher education already existent in the United States, there must be a very good reason to create even one more Graduate School. The process of creation has been both arduous and costly, but the Graduate School is determined to succeed in achieving a respected and successful institution. The organization’s supporters include educators, social workers, youth-serving, and criminal justice professionals from more than fifty countries. These are all people who have been trained in restorative practices. The IIRP has offices in five countries, as well as scores of licensees around the world. It has collaborated with other organizations in getting restorative justice recognized by the United Nations and the Council of Europe. In short, while we are a new, small graduate school, the organization itself has for some time been an integral part of a large international movement of scholars, policy makers, and practitioners.

The IIRP holds the following definition: The emerging field of restorative practices is the study of restoring and developing social capital, social discipline, emotional well-being, and civic participation through participatory learning and decision making. The further development of restorative practices as a field of study requires eclectic graduate-level study and research that includes practice, reflection, scientific inquiry, and international academic collaboration.
Restorative practices has grown from advances in both theory and practice. The unifying framework for all elements of restorative practices is this premise: People are happier, more cooperative, more productive, and more likely to make positive changes when those in authority do things with them, rather than to them or for them (What is Restorative Practice, Appendix A).

This leads directly to our mission: The IIRP is dedicated to the advanced education of professionals at the graduate level and to the conduct of research that can develop the growing field of restorative practices, with the goal of positively influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society throughout the world.

Pursuing this mission is the reason the IIRP spent six years getting the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania’s authorization to begin its operation as a graduate institution, established the required half-million-dollar protective endowment, and is now in its fifth year of providing master’s degree programs for graduate students. The people of the IIRP knew America needed just one more graduate school because: 1) the emerging field of restorative practices needed an intellectual home in the world; 2) restorative ideas and practices needed a public face to be seen at work; and 3) scholars and practitioners needed a center to collect and disseminate the new ideas and expanding boundaries of our studies. The establishment of the Graduate School is the logical outcome of decades of work in restorative practices by a number of pioneers around the world, among them the IIRP’s founders. The IIRP is the world’s first graduate school dedicated solely to the study and applications of restorative practices: it is mission driven.

The origins of the IIRP go back to the 1970s. Faced with the growing difficulties in student achievement and discipline in American schools and communities, two public school teachers, Ted and Susan Wachtel, searched for new solutions. They created the Community Service Foundation and, subsequently, Buxmont Academy (“CSF Buxmont”), two youth-serving agencies that provide research-proven strategies for reintegrating delinquent and at-risk young people into useful community life. These agencies provide day schools, counseling, and residential services.

Ted Wachtel is the co-author of *Toughlove* (1982), an influential and popular book whose ideas share the ethos of restorative practices. In the 1990s, the growing CSF Buxmont professional staff and like-minded scholars and practitioners elsewhere embraced an innovation from criminal justice called “restorative justice.” This set of practices allowed offenders and crime victims some possibility to repair harm caused by crime. Parallel developments in social work, education, and organizational management in those years have contributed a wealth of innovation and research into more engaging and participatory practices with clients, students and employees. These ideas and practices are characterized by “fair process,” a concept popularized in a classic Harvard Business Review article entitled *Fair Process* (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997), that calls for an authoritative, not authoritarian, approach to management that allows staff to be heard, but still does not undermine the prerogatives of administrators and managers to lead. Fair process, as a key idea in restorative practices, has implications for parents, teachers, school principals or anyone in positions of authority.
The IIRP has been the intersection of interest for many educators, social workers, youth counselors, police, prosecutors, judges, professors, researchers, policy-makers, corporate trainers, and many other professionals from nations around the world. Beginning in 1998, a dozen worldwide conferences have been held under the IIRP sponsorship in North America, Europe, and Australia with the eclectic term “restorative practices” representing the many related viewpoints. The term “international” in the title is not exaggerated. The IIRP also publishes the Restorative Practices eForum, which has almost 18,000 subscribers around the world. While the Graduate School is located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, in a pair of buildings in Bethlehem’s lovely historic district, those two buildings have become a portal to a worldwide movement of scholars, policy makers, and practitioners.

Our student population for the following academic years included these demographics: 2006/07: 74 females and 34 males for a total of 108 students; 2007/2008 was 158 females and 76 males for 234 total students; 2008/09: 271 females and 78 males for the total of 349 students; and 2009/10: 281 females and 86 males for a total of 367 students. The average age each year is between 40 and 45, and most of our students are employed as teachers or counselors. Our student population is multicultural with Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, and students of other races and ethnicities represented. While the current student numbers are small, the programs are well developed and the faculty qualified and ready to support larger numbers. The numbers are destined to remain small until the benefits of regional accreditation allow us to attract students who can utilize the financial aid available to graduate students in general to pursue their professional degrees. Attending an accredited institution can also satisfy professional development requirements for our students that attending a nonaccredited institution cannot accomplish. At present, nearly all students are fully funded by the Restorative Practices Foundation to complete their studies.

The Graduate School offers two master’s degrees in the discipline: a Master of Restorative Practices and Education (MRPE), and a Master of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling (MRPYC). While they share a common core, they differ so as to serve varied professionals—but within a unifying context to allow for study in the same discipline. The focus of the Youth Counseling program is on the application of restorative practices to individual, group, and family-based strategies. Students are also provided an overview of drug and alcohol counseling techniques and a critical review of current research. The focus of the Education program is on restorative practices applied to learning and instructional theories, school and community relationships, regular and special educational needs of students, teaching strategies, curriculum and a critical review of current research. The uniqueness of our degrees is that both programs offer a unifying framework that tie together theory, research, and practice in seemingly disparate fields, such as education, counseling, criminal justice, social work, and organizational management.

This is the context of the new Graduate School: it has been entirely conceived, created, staffed, and implemented motivated by imperatives of our mission. The Graduate School received Pennsylvania Department of Education authorization in June 2006 and accepted its first graduate students in August of that year. The 14 members of the first graduating class were celebrated in commencement in June 2008. Another 14 students graduated in June 2009, and 19 students graduated in June 2010. In opening and operating our academic programs, we believe we have
shown stability and a commitment to our mission. We believe we have also demonstrated a good deal of growth in team learning and increased sophistication as adult learners.

The nature of restorative practices leads people to be reflective practitioners, self aware of their professional actions. The people of the new Graduate School, therefore, were pre-disposed towards managing by facts. We went further, as our founding faculty spent a year together before our opening, creating curricula, which had embedded within it assessment measures in every course and linked the learning outcomes to one another and to the program. We worked out a thoughtful matrix of these inter-relationships, evaluated every course every time, made factual judgments and the resulting adaptations. We closed the loop, and we still do that continuously. But that, as we knew after achieving candidacy, was far from sufficient.

Of course we had to continue to work on our curriculum, but we also had an enormous amount of team learning to master. We taught strategic planning and assessment to all our professionals across the institution. We had unequivocal support from our Board and our senior leaders. We engaged in two years of organization-wide workshops and working group meetings, and we got plenty of good advice and excellent training from the Commission’s staff and volunteers. The result of all these efforts has been to add “assessment” to “mission-driven” as the descriptors of our Graduate School's context. The arc of the story of our last five years is this: we have grown from our practice of managing by facts to embracing a culture of assessment.

Four working groups were organized for the purpose of a comprehensive self-study. The Administration/Finance Working Group had primary responsibility for analyzing research questions developed for Standards 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the Characteristics of Excellence and determining the extent to which the IIRP’s processes and outcomes for these questions are used to support and develop any change necessary for institutional improvement. The Student Services Working Group had primary responsibility for analyzing research questions developed for Standards 8 and 9. The Instruction/Library/Training and Consulting Working Group had primary responsibility for analyzing research questions developed for Standards 10, 11, 13 and 14. The Board/President Working Group had primary responsibility for analyzing research questions developed for Standards 1, 4, and 6.

The Working Groups met from January to August 2010 to develop an outline and then gather and analyze evidence needed to address the specific research questions. Emphasis was placed on using existing data whenever practically possible. All faculty and more than half the administrative staff were involved in the process. The Working Groups submitted draft reports, which followed a prescribed template, each month to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee met monthly to review the reports and provide feedback and direction to the working group chairs, those who were also members of the Steering Committee. The Working Groups submitted final drafts to the Steering Committee in July 2010 and met after that to identify documents needed for evidence to support their submission.

The reports detailed the analytical discussion of the inquiry taken for each standard, the outcomes of that inquiry, including the strengths, challenges and recommendations for improvement. The Steering Committee reviewed all final submissions for clarity and agreement. The Steering Committee Co-Chairs created one report that was sent in draft form to the President
to review the strengths, challenges and recommendations for his concurrence. The report was then available for review and comment by the Working Groups (which included all members of the Steering Committee), the Board, students, all employees not part of a Working Group, and selected members of the community.

Finally, our Self-Study Design identified five goals for this Self-Study. We believe that our data show we accomplished each of them:

- to use the process of self-study to help us become more proficient with institutional assessment and to build institutional learning

We have completed our first whole cycle of institutional assessments in all our operations to complement our five-year record of assessing our courseware and outcomes. This required a two-year process of team learning and participation in strategic planning and assessment. We learned both cooperation and collaboration in creating a new institution.

- to refine how we attract attention in the world in terms of recruiting students, faculty, and financial supporters

This Self-Study required that we create our third generation Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and drove new related plans in marketing, administrative services, student services, and communications. Further, we clarified our strategic goals and tied them to budgeting.

- to achieve organizational maturity, financial stability, and accreditation considering our position as an emerging institution

In the examination of each Standard in our Report, we offer evidence showing the various steps we have taken and are taking for financial stability, how our collective efforts have given us shared purpose and governance, how we have matured in creating a culture of assessment.

- to ensure that restorative practices are embedded in the daily life of the institution in accordance with our mission

It is verifiably true that we walk our talk. Evidence provided in several Standards shows our people to be mission aware, mission driven, and committed to the success of our restorative Graduate School.

and

- to create a common vision of the future directions of the institution.

Over the past two years our institution-wide workshops in strategic planning and assessment, the thousands of person hours in budget units and accreditation working groups, have absorbed all of our faculty and most of our administrative staff in a consuming effort at institution building via assessment and a shared vision of success for our collective enterprise. We built on the six years of preparation to open our doors and the first four years of our operation to pull all we had learned together.
The Report that follows is a candid appraisal of how far we have come together and also of those important actions, which must be taken to make us stronger and healthier. We know and embrace the fact that we have embarked upon a never-ending process of continuous improvement.
STANDARD 1: MISSION AND GOALS

“The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.”

Introduction
The process of articulating the mission and vision of the International Institute for Restorative Practices (hereinafter, the “IIRP”) was critical in establishing the rationale for restorative practices as an emerging field of study and the need for graduate level education in this field. Due to the varied nature of the IIRP’s activities, the long history of its demonstration programs, and its recent transformation into an institution of higher education, this process of inquiry helped to bring clarity and focus to our organizational activity during a time of great change and growth.

This process of stakeholder engagement helped to clarify our mission and vision and to organize strategically around clear and measurable goals. This necessitated clear and open communication with all programs and units, including the Board of Trustees (hereinafter, the “Board”), and a conscious re-focusing to bring all of our organizational activity in line with our new institutional goals as a Graduate School.

Mission
The IIRP is dedicated to the advanced education of professionals at the graduate level and to the conduct of research that can develop the growing field of restorative practices, with the goal of positively influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society throughout the world.

Vision
Our world is changing at a breathtaking pace, driven by scientific and technological advances whose consequences challenge our ability to cope with them. Social patterns that have long characterized human life are changing dramatically around the globe, diminishing social connectedness in families, schools, workplaces, and communities. The IIRP will draw upon a wide range of fields to develop theory and practice and conduct research designed to address this global challenge.

The emerging field of restorative practices is the study of restoring and developing social capital, social discipline, emotional wellbeing and civic participation through participatory learning and decision making. The further development of restorative practices as a field of study requires eclectic and interdisciplinary graduate-level study and research that includes practice, reflection, scientific inquiry, and international academic collaboration.

Further, restorative practices can enhance our relationships and our emotional wellbeing. The Graduate School will model that potential by actualizing the principles of restorative practices in its daily operations, its dealings with students, staff, faculty, administration and trustees, and its relationships with other people and organizations.
Mission Development and Dissemination

The mission and vision are publicized to all of the institution’s members via the website (http://www.iirp.org/mission.php), the Student Handbook and Catalog 2010-2011 (hereinafter, “Student Handbook”) (Appendix F), the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E), and the Organizational Manual (Documents Room).

In early 2006, members of the Board, its consultant, Dr. Patrick McDonough, and representatives from the staff, faculty, and prospective students collaboratively developed our mission and vision statements. The mission and vision are reviewed annually at a meeting of the Board, which includes a representative group of stakeholders. (Trustee Meeting Minutes, December 2008, December 2009, Documents Room). This review is conducted in a semi-formal “circle go-around” format. All participants reflect on the relevance of the mission and vision and how their activities serve to operationalize the mission and vision. The IIRP has asked each of its employees to commit to an understanding of its missions and goals. The result is an extremely informed and dedicated workforce.

At a November 12, 2009, meeting of the Board, which included administrators, student representatives, and faculty representatives, a mission exercise was conducted in which these stakeholders were asked to respond to a series of questions regarding the mission. This survey was developed by using questions from the September 2009 MSCHE workshop entitled “Integrating Higher Education, Planning, and Assessment.” Responses are identified below in Table 1.

Table 1: Results of Survey Regarding Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our mission:</th>
<th>(n=15)</th>
<th>(n=15)</th>
<th>(n=15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clearly defines the institution’s purpose within the context of higher education.</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Presents a long-term statement of institutional values.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clearly indicates whom the institution serves.*</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Clearly indicates what the institution intends to accomplish.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is free from a high degree of “cliché language.”</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conveys a reasonable understanding of where fiscal and human resources will be allocated.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Has been developed with the involvement of my institution’s community.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Has been reviewed and updated regularly.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Guides faculty, administration, staff, and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One person (8%) did not respond to this question.
These results suggest that there is wide agreement that the mission is clearly stated and relevant to the work of the institution (See questions 1, 2, 4, 5), and that the mission was developed through a collaborative process engaging the institution’s stakeholders (See questions 7, 8).

There was found to be less confidence or knowledge in how the mission drives the work “on the ground” of the IIRP as an institution (See questions 3, 6, 9). As a new institution of higher education, this is not surprising and is reflective of the our transition into our new identity as a graduate school. As will be discussed later, all administrative units have been engaging their staff in educational activities concerning the institutional mission and how that mission drives all institutional activity.

In an interview with the Administrative Coordinator, it was discovered that while new employees are given the Organizational Manual (Documents Room) containing the mission and vision statement, it is not explicitly reviewed during their initial meeting. New employees are encouraged to read the manual. Soon after hire, they also attend select Restorative Practices trainings that include a discussion of the mission. In Standard 3, it is noted that all faculty and staff receive training (List of Restorative Practices Trainings, Documents Room) and ongoing support to function in a restorative manner in relation to each other and in the tasks of their positions. The interview process for faculty and staff does include a discussion of the mission; however, an area for improvement would be to explicitly discuss the mission and answer questions during the initial employee meeting.

**Institutional Goals**

From the above mission and vision, the IIRP has formed the following institutional goals from which all activity flows.

1. We will educate a growing number of professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.
2. We and our graduates will contribute to the growth of knowledge through our research and its applications.
3. We will disseminate the results of our theory and practice to professionals in related disciplines with the goal of positively influencing human behavior.

These goals are publicized via the Organizational Manual, Faculty Handbook (Appendix E), and Student Handbook (Appendix F).

The results of the survey discussed in Table 1 suggest that we needed to improve institutional understanding of the mission. The relationship between the mission and goals was reviewed during staff meetings and reinforced during “team-builders” (Support and Administrative Unit Meeting Minutes, May 2010, April 2010; Training and Consulting Meeting Minutes, June 2010, Documents Room). Also, every administrative unit must relate its plan back to related specific strategic goals and objectives. Each unit is involved in yearly budget, planning, and assessment days where the mission is also reaffirmed as the foundation for institutional assessment (Unit Meeting Minutes, February 2010, Documents Room).
As part of the self-study, we embarked on a second survey regarding mission awareness. That survey was sent to all faculty, staff, matriculated students, and alumni in June 2010. The following questions were adapted from measures developed by the National Survey of Student Engagement and its Mission Perception Consortium for Catholic Colleges. The survey measured stakeholders’ beliefs about the following three statements:

1. The mission of this institution is widely understood by students (or faculty, or staff);

2. The mission of this institution is reflected in its course offerings; and

3. Restorative practices are embedded in the daily practices of the IIRP.

Responses were determined through the use of a Likert scale, which included answer selections ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Table 2 indicates the percentage of staff, or faculty, or students who either agreed or strongly agreed with the above statements (Mission Awareness Survey Results, Documents Room).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Staff (n=30)</th>
<th>Faculty (n=8)</th>
<th>Students (n=67)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The mission of this institution is widely understood.</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The mission of this institution is reflected in its course offerings.</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Restorative practices are embedded in the daily practices of the IIRP.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey results demonstrate the high level of understanding that stakeholders have about the institution’s mission and their beliefs that the mission is reflected in course offerings and daily operations. Standard 8 specifically addresses institutional efforts to ensure that the Graduate School recruits students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with the mission.

**Strategic Planning**

As related in our third-generation Strategic Plan 2009-2014 (hereinafter “Strategic Plan”) (Appendix C), each strategic objective specifies actions, evidence, timeframes, budget, and responsible parties that define the assessment of progress toward our goals in support of the mission. The results of those assessments will provide routine and crucial information for the continuous improvement of the institution. The process of strategic planning and ongoing assessment are also described in detail in Standards 2 and 7, respectively.

Below is an example of a Strategic Plan measurable objective relevant to Standard 1:

*Objective 1.2 (S1)*

All academic program goals and course learning outcomes will be linked with the mission.
Action: Faculty maintains academic oversight of the curriculum and ensures the course syllabi incorporate expected learning outcomes that are congruent with program goals, institutional goals, and mission.
Evidence: Faculty minutes document that the curriculum was reviewed at least once each academic year.
Time: Annually
Person responsible: Vice President for Academic Affairs
Budget: -0-

Action: Faculty will evaluate through the final summative paper how students identify how they will positively impact society and strengthen human society through restorative practices.
Evidence: Rubric for the final summative paper will be used for evaluation.
Time: Annually
Person Responsible: Vice President for Academic Affairs meeting with the faculty
Budget: -0-

The following is another example demonstrating that the mission and vision have shaped institutional activity. During the final course entitled Final Seminar (YC 660 or ED 661), taken just prior to graduation, students complete a “restorative journey” paper in which they provide a narrative of their growth and development, combined with a reflection on how their own personal work utilizing restorative practices has impacted the world around them.

This assignment is a requirement for successful completion of graduate studies. In its first use, the rubric data (Final Seminar Rubric Results, Documents Room) shows that almost all students positively described the impact of restorative practices in the areas of influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society.

Course Learning Objectives
The founding faculty were organized a full year before we were authorized to begin operation as a graduate school. They collaboratively developed all of the courses, the learning objectives, and the Student Learning Matrices, described below. Each year since then, the faculty have reviewed the data regarding the courses, the outcomes, and the Student Learning Matrix and made corrective decisions, when necessary.

Each course learning outcome ties to a course learning objective which, in turn, ties to a program goal. The achievement of course objectives is measured through a Student Learning Matrix, also developed by the faculty (Learning Matrices, Documents Room). At the close of each course, faculty assess each student’s achievement of each course learning objective on a Student Learning Matrix and note the methods by which they were assessed (e.g., class presentations, role plays, quizzes, reflection papers). This assessment is carried out electronically via an assessment tool that then automatically stores these data. See Standard 11 for a detailed description of the linking of mission, institutional goals, program goals, and learning outcomes.

For example, in the introductory course, Basic Restorative Processes (YC/ED 500 or YC/ED 501), one of the assessed learning objectives states:
**Learning Objective**
“Describe the mission and goals of the IIRP Graduate School.”

**Methods of Assessment Used in the Fall 2009 Term**
Written Exam, Writing Assignment, Cooperative Learning Activity, and Class Participation

In the Fall 2009 term, faculty assessed all students taking this course and determined that 98.3 percent of students were proficient in meeting this objective (Learning Matrices Reports, Fall 2009, Documents Room). This is one example of how the mission is reflected in course objectives.

Student Learning Matrix Reports are generated at the end of each term. The reports are reviewed by the faculty and then reviewed by the Committee of the Whole (hereinafter, the “COW”) at the end of each term and annually. The purpose of this review is to evaluate the success of each course, to consider the student data, and to make relevant changes, as required. In this way, the loop is closed for each course, each term.

The annual cumulative data of the Student Learning Matrix Reports, which is completed at the end of each academic year, is reflected in the Program Goals Report (Program Goals Report, 2008-2009, 2009-2010, Documents Room). The Program Goals Report shows to what extent students in each master’s program and the certificate program are attaining the goals for their respective program, and ultimately that the institution is fulfilling its mission. The assessment of each piece in the hierarchy from course objectives through the program goals is thereby assessed each year by the faculty and the COW, evaluated, and adapted, as necessary. See Standard 11 for a more thorough discussion on Program Goals Reports.

**Faculty Activity Outside of the Classroom in Pursuit of Mission**
All faculty provide reports of yearly research, practice, and other scholarly activity they have participated in additional to their instructional responsibilities. In Academic Year (hereinafter, “AY”) 2008/09, full-time faculty attended nine conferences and workshops, presented at one conference and seven community events, and authored two articles that were published. In AY 2009/10, five full-time faculty attended 22 conferences and workshops, and presented at 12 conferences and one community or service related events (Faculty Activity Report, 2008/09, 2009/10, Documents Room). See Standard 10 for a more detailed discussion of faculty activity.

Since 2005, the founding faculty and their successors have been deeply involved in the process of creating the institution, planning its development, and assessing its growth. All of them have been major contributors to the Strategic Plan and to all of our assessment efforts leading to this Self-Study Report. This has been virtually a half-time job for them. We expect that if we achieve accreditation, our faculty will enthusiastically take part in researching and disseminating the work of restorative practices.

Even during this demanding period of candidacy and our initial self-study, the inquiry above demonstrates that the faculty has vigorously pursued activity outside of the classroom in support of our mission and vision.
Elements of Mission in Other Standards
The mission and vision suffuses all organizational planning and activity. In addition to the broad areas discussed in this Standard, many of the following Standards will discuss in more detail how the mission impacts other areas of planning and activity.

For example, the self-study chapter on Standard 2 relates how we have been challenged to establish a budgetary planning and allocation process that reflects the mission and goals of the Strategic Plan. This process is marked by direct engagement of stakeholders in each institutional unit to ensure that the IIRP is prepared to adequately support its mission and outcomes expectations.

The self-study chapter on Standard 3 describes how the institutional mission has influenced the management of human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources. Examples include a review of the mission for all staff and an explicit plan for the development of the library that supports our unique mission.

The self-study chapter on Standard 4 describes how the leadership and governance structures developed are supportive of the mission. Inclusive and “restorative” structures such as the COW, and the reliance on “fair process” are unique features of our shared governance structure derived directly from our institutional mission.

When authorities do things with people, whether reactively—to deal with crisis, or proactively—in the normal course of school or business, the results are almost always better. This fundamental thesis was evident in a Harvard Business Review article about the concept of “fair process” in organizations (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997). The central idea of fair process is that “…individuals are most likely to trust and cooperate freely with systems—whether they themselves win or lose by those systems—when fair process is observed.”

The three principles of fair process are:

Engagement—involve individuals in decisions that affect them by listening to their views and genuinely taking their opinions into account;

Explanation—explaining the reasoning behind a decision to everyone who has been involved or who is affected by it; and

Expectation clarity—making sure that everyone clearly understands a decision and what is expected of them in the future.

Fair process applies the restorative with domain of the social discipline window (Appendix A: What Is Restorative Practices?) to all kinds of organizations, in all kinds of disciplines and professions (O’Connell, 2002; Costello and O’Connell, 2002; Schnell, 2002). The fundamental hypothesis that people are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes in behavior when authorities do things with them, rather than to them or for them expands the restorative paradigm far beyond its origins in restorative justice.
In the self-study chapter on Standard 7, we describe in detail the plan for institutional assessment, which includes mechanisms for direct stakeholder engagement in this process. These processes reflect the restorative practices principles inherent in our mission.

The self-study chapter on Standard 8 demonstrates how our admission practices ensure that we recruit, admit, and retain students whose goals and interests are congruent with the mission. The Graduate School selects students who can not only succeed academically, but also demonstrate interest in restorative practices and in the mission.

Finally, the self-study chapter on Standard 11 demonstrates how the educational offerings and their ongoing development reflect the mission and goals of the institution. The faculty has developed clear course syllabi with learning objectives linked back to program goals, which are tied to the institution’s goals and mission.

As the world’s first graduate school wholly dedicated to the study and development of restorative practices, faculty, staff, and students exhibit a passion to make our unique mission a part of all that we do as a community of learning.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. The IIRP has collaboratively developed a clear institutional mission that informs institutional activity and is utilized to assess the effectiveness of this activity.
2. There has been an explicit institution-wide effort underway to educate all stakeholders regarding our institutional mission.
3. The mission is reflected in strategic planning and course learning objectives.
4. The mission and vision is widely known by institutional stakeholders.
5. Faculty have met the challenge of conducting research, even while making their first priority working through the process of self-study and accreditation.

**Challenges**
1. Our understanding of and commitment to our mission can fade quickly in an organization unless they are constantly attended to.
2. Mission awareness and commitment to mission need to grow as we grow.

**Recommendations**
1. The mission and vision should be reviewed during the initial employee meeting.
2. Faculty should discuss how the mission is reviewed in the introductory Basic Restorative Processes course (YC/ED 500 or YC/ED 501) as a method of ensuring that the mission is explained consistently and in-depth to all students.
3. The IIRP must regularly review the institutional mission, vision, and goals with all staff as an integral part of budget unit meetings, “team builders,” and staff development.
STANDARD 2: PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

“An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.”

Introduction

The IIRP has been involved for nearly 11 years in creating our graduate school. We spent years of preparation under the tutelage of the Pennsylvania Department of Education (hereinafter, “PDE”). As we said, we gained their authorization to open our doors in June 2006. This is the third generation of strategic planning for the Graduate School. First, we had to have a plan that took us through the authorization phase from PDE. Next, we developed a more formal and thoughtful plan, which we proposed to the Commission and which resulted in achieving candidacy status. Our third generation planning and budgeting efforts take us from the year 2009 through our hoped-for accreditation and beyond.

This Standard is focused on renewal. For us, as a brand new graduate school, it is equally important to create appropriate processes and structures in order to operate effectively and efficiently. Consequently, this Standard is not just about being more imaginative about assessable outcomes of established practices and programs, but equally about establishing those assessable programs from conception.

The IIRP has been challenged to establish a multi-year budgetary planning and allocation process during the same time period: one that would fully reflect the mission and goals of the Strategic Plan (Appendix C), and be concentrated on achieving optimum fiscal health. In addition to establishing such a system, the IIRP has created a budgetary mechanism that requires each budget unit to be knowledgeable about the goals and objectives of its sister units, thus encouraging a consensus regarding the prioritization of projects and use of resources.

Institutional assessment has been perhaps the most demanding process for the IIRP to successfully implement. While the faculty had imbedded course improvement measures in every course, the administrative units had not begun implementing similar measures. The entire leadership and staff participated in two daylong workshops with outside consultation to create a model for assessment of all units of the Institute. The IIRP now has in place a means of annually assessing administrative unit plans and the Strategic Plan, a means to report to the institutional community the results of those assessments, a means of utilizing those assessment results for institutional improvement, and a process for amending the plans as needed for future cycles of assessment. The IIRP has completed its first institution-wide process dedicated to producing explicit documentation regarding “closing the loop” or completing the cycle, from the planning stages through resource allocation and on to institutional renewal. There, our resources are utilized, and the effectiveness of our goals and objectives are utilized and measured (Evaluations of Strategic Planning Session, Documents Room).
Planning
The Strategic Plan states, in part:

In order to grow, the IIRP had to be focused on planning and outcomes. However, it had not yet entered into the kind of deeply rooted assessment, which characterizes an institution demonstrating a “culture of assessment.”

The Graduate School's first Strategic Plan had the practical effect of continuing until Pennsylvania authorization was achieved (2006). It focused on a predictable startup agenda: creating curricula, recruiting students, embedding courseware with assessable measures. The second-generation plan was focused on achieving candidacy status from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. It created or improved academic and administrative processes, instituted additional instructional locations and introduced the Restorative Practices Foundation’s universal scholarship program. The third plan outlined here is more sophisticated, more thorough, and its reach is intended to extend beyond the hoped-for full accreditation by the Commission. It does, in fact, also relate to nine subsidiary plans, identified in Section VII linkages. Most importantly, it facilitates a much more comprehensive commitment to creating that culture of assessment which will guide the IIRP in future decision making.

This third-generation strategic plan required a good deal more institutional sophistication among staff and faculty before it could be attempted. Therefore, in 2009 the IIRP undertook a major team learning process. That has involved all of the faculty and more than half of the professional staff and administrators, a huge commitment of people power in this small Graduate School. Focused, widely-attended workshops on assessment and on strategic planning were held in 2009. Many new working processes were introduced and existing ones made more assessable as a result. A dozen of the IIRP’s trained, critical faculty, staff and administrators, and the Steering Committee, continue to oversee the combined processes of planning, budgeting and assessment.

Planning and assessment are linked, not only to each other, but also to budget creation and allocation in a yearly cycle (See Related Plans: Administrative Services, Communications, Enrollment, Facilities, Library, Marketing, Staffing, Technology, Training and Consulting, Documents Room). The result is a bottom-up set of efforts involving large numbers of the stakeholders.

Our Strategic Plan recognized that this third-generation effort was the first to have an environmental scan as an integral part of it. That first scan yielded useful results, but obviously needs to be expanded and deepened.

The newly conceived Strategic Plan and related plans were submitted, along with the Interim Report (Documents Room) to the Middle States consultant in October 2009. Though vastly improved, the Strategic Plan and related plans still lacked the necessary mechanisms to measure some objectives. A small committee representing all units began working with a consultant to
learn how best to revise and reword this new Strategic Plan. The goal was to rewrite objectives to be explicit and measurable without changing the overall content of the document created by the community. Additional meetings to support the individual units in further refining their plans and educated additional staff members about planning and assessment were held. All the unit plans are now interrelated and exist to reinforce the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan. This Strategic Plan was presented with the related plans to the Board for formal approval in June 2010 (Trustee Minutes, June 2010, Documents Room). This concentration on planning and assessment accelerated and integrated the knowledge of the entire community to create the base for the culture of assessment that now exists.

In our next planning process, we will follow a similar development path as in the current Strategic Plan. This critical exercise will include examining quantitative and qualitative external and internal data relevant to the institution. The analysis of external and internal data will then determine the effect these factors and trends will have concerning future strategic planning. Whatever data is gathered will require the IIRP to analyze how these “drivers” may compel us to change 1) the way we communicate our message; 2) the way we package our courses; or 3) the elimination of offerings that are no longer meeting the demands of our students. Some of the critical data to be studied, and those with the greatest potential to affect our decision making in the future, will include such things as the results of the 2010 census and occupational data, the seemingly unstoppable built-in obsolescence of some technologies and the unforeseeable economic upturns and downturns.

The next part of the assessment cycle is determining the resource allocations needed to meet planned objectives. The IIRP recognizes that planning is critical to effective resource allocation and has integrated these processes institution-wide. The planning process has been integrated with the budget process to ensure that we allocate resources to those priorities identified in the plans.

**Allocation**

The budget process follows a specified annual chronology of events, beginning with addressing budget planning parameters (Budget Chronology, Documents Room). Administrative review and resulting decisions are made using specific budget variables—those items that will allow budget unit directors to prepare their budgets. Factors in the planning mix include a review of unit goals and objectives, revenue enhancements, expense increases, and the units’ relationships to strategic planning goals (Summary Report of Academic and Administrative Outcomes, September 2010, Documents Room). Upon the determination of these budget planning assumptions, the COW then endorses the plans for distribution to the budget unit directors, enabling them then to start preparing their budget requests (COW Meeting Minutes February 2009, March 2010, September 2010, Documents Room).

The budget unit directors meet as a group with the Vice Presidents to discuss and clarify items contained in the planning parameters. The group meeting is intended to provide communication throughout the organization with regard to 1) unit goals and objectives; 2) status on current budget objectives; and 3) the strategic-plan-initiative status report. Any major changes resulting from this group discussion are returned to the COW for endorsement or rejection. To ensure that communication about review of activities and outcomes analysis includes input from all
constituents, in preparation, unit budget directors meet with unit staff to discuss the goals and objectives and make a request for budget funds determination. The budget request is processed through the appropriate Vice President and is compiled by the finance department for the Graduate School. Once completed, the President and COW review and present it to the Finance Committee of the Board, which recommends approval by the entire Board (Finance and Operations Committee Minutes, April 2010; Trustee Meeting Minutes, June 2010, Documents Room).

As the new budget year begins, each unit director receives a quarterly financial statement for his or her unit. The reports are discussed with the appropriate Vice President, and adjustments are made as needed. Budget directors are responsible to review quarterly financial statements and unit plans during the year and report changes as needed to ensure successful attainment of a specific strategic goal. These changes may come about by a responsible officer or director’s request for increased budget funds (e.g., for additional positions, or other). Allocations associated therewith must be related to the Strategic Plan or the unit plan(s) and be integral to accomplishing each goal.

In addition to establishing such a system, the IIRP has created a budgetary process that requires each budget unit to be knowledgeable about the goals and objectives of its sister units. This encourages a consensus regarding the prioritization of projects and use of resources. Unit levels created distinct mission, vision, and goals in the Spring 2008 and became involved in the budget process. Verbal feedback from directors indicating a lack of comprehensive understanding of planning, budgeting, and assessment resulted in educational and work sessions like the budget, planning, and assessment day that took place in February 2010. Faculty and the leadership of all budget units participated. Each unit’s agenda included the review of current year expenditures and revenues (where appropriate), a review of the unit’s assessment to date and any changes to the unit’s plan and goals, a review of its budget needs for implementing these objectives, and connection to related plans and to the Strategic Plan. As each budget unit is accountable for justifying its budget-allocation request, the units reported on how needs were being met or not met for development of its budgets for fiscal year 2010-11.

This successful budget forum allowed for an exchange of ideas between administrative units; each group was encouraged to ask the other groups for input or clarification about something that might affect its own unit’s budget, plan, or assessment. By the end of the session, each unit became aware of its relation to the other units, to the five-year strategic goal, and ultimately to the mission (Unit Budget Meeting Minutes, February 2010, Documents Room). This institution-wide day will be replicated each fall and spring to continue to cultivate the connection of planning, budgeting, and assessment.

Institutional Renewal
From the Board to individual staff members, each entity is responsible for assessing its outcomes and using those outcomes to effectuate positive change. It has entailed a great deal of trial and error and education in the assessment process to reach the degree of awareness and need to proactively address our challenges. Our restorative practices culture has always instilled a process of questioning, growth, and renewal. But new to this process has been regular means of
assessment and precise documentation. We have been driven to take new measures by the process.

The second-generation Strategic Plan 2006-2011 was almost totally operational (Strategic Plan 2006-2011, Documents Room). The plan was developed with input from the Board and administrators. Objectives were of a binary nature – they were either completed or they were not. This made for limited measurement and assessment. The Strategic Plan 2006-2011 served the purpose of putting processes in place for the emergence of our new graduate school.

An assessment analysis of the Strategic Plan 2006-2011 shows that the following goals were accomplished: involving the whole community in planning and allocation; creating a five-year budget to present to the Board; and planning and providing support for an appropriate library to meet faculty and student needs. While a few goals were deferred, these became measurable objectives with future timelines (e.g., development and fund-raising activities). This original plan, then, served as the foundation for growth and change within the institution, and analysis of this plan provided the direction for future institutional renewal and planning.

The Annual Unit Assessment reports from administrative units, submitted for the first time in July 2010, were sent to the Assessment Committee and the Vice Presidents (Assessment Activity Flow Chart, Documents Room). Each report addressed the unit’s respective objectives, results of data collected, and recommendations for future planning (Annual Unit Assessment Reports, Documents Room). Like the Strategic Plan, unit plans predominantly revolve around goals and objectives that put processes in place for the functioning of the Graduate School. As the Graduate School matures, unit plans will begin to reflect goals and assessments that improve processes instead of building upon existing systems and addressing challenges in a developing institution. The Assessment Committee, in its review of these reports, evaluates the assessment processes and make recommendations for improvement in its summary report presented to the COW (Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes, September 2009, August 2010, Documents Room). The President informs the Board of the resulting administrative and student outcomes and recommendations from the summary report. The Board then utilizes these sources to update the Strategic Plan, as needed. As this later step occurs in December of each year, the administrative units will have, in the meantime, used the July reports to assess the past year and plan for the upcoming years with new or revised objectives and resulting actions and timelines.

This annual assessment of the administrative unit plans and the Strategic Plan closes the loop from initial planning though resource allocation to institutional renewal. Following this process, the Assessment Committee presented the Summary Report of Academic and Administrative Outcomes for AY 2008/09 (Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes; COW Meeting Minutes, November 2009, Documents Room) to the COW. The Assessment Committee noted there were no budgetary implications based on its review of the academic and administrative annual outcome reports. The Assessment Committee did note the following in terms of assessment needs: 1) there is a need to set benchmarks or indicators for measurements; 2) the faculty need to define with lecturers how to complete the learning matrix for a course and have a discussion about grading consistency; and 3) the institution needs to define what we want to know about our students and the type of student we expect to attract to the Graduate School. These items were completed during AY 2009/10, and influenced the creation of the Strategic Plan.
The Assessment Committee repeated this process in July 2010. This report was submitted to the COW in September 2010. The report stated no red flags were noted with regard to any of the units’ work. Units seemed to have adequate support and staff to carry out their responsibilities. Every report indicates that the units are focusing on the mission. There will need to be more clarification to the unit directors about how to prepare the reports using measurable objectives and providing measurable outcomes for next year, as the reports should have less narrative and more evidence (Summary of Academic and Administrative Outcomes, Documents Room).

The eager participation of all constituents to partake in the planning and assessment of all aspects of the institution is a great strength. With this wide inclusion, all concerns are communicated. A future challenge may emerge as the institution grows to maintain the same level of constituent participation. The restorative practices culture and the newly acquired process of assessment will keep this challenge in the forefront of concern.

**The Role of the Committee of the Whole**

As noted throughout this Self-Study, all of the systemic planning, resource allocation, and assessment mechanisms are monitored and reviewed in terms of measurable outcomes by the COW. The COW provides a unique tool of shared governance to the Graduate School’s administrative structure. Comprised of the President, all full-time faculty, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, Librarian, Registrar, Vice President for Administration, Director of Finance, and Director of the Training and Consulting Division, the COW is the designated forum where communication, collaboration, and strategizing between faculty and administrative senior staff occurs.

The COW, as the Institute’s highest internal deliberative body, is also the custodian of the Institute’s Strategic Plan. It is the COW that conducts the final evaluation of all planning outcomes and has the final say on how these assessment results will influence further strategic planning and future improvements. The other planning and assessment mechanisms, created to address these same activities at varying stages of the activity cycle, end up in the COW’s definitive review and serve to strengthen the Institute’s planning and assessment loop.

Information regarding changes that may impact unit goals and objectives and how these goals support the Strategic Plan, is then disseminated to unit directors.

The COW is also the most significant means for assessing the effectiveness of structures and services specific to the day-to-day operation of the Graduate School. It is responsible for continuously reviewing how units are performing and initiates whatever action may be necessary, including the revising of unit goals and objectives, to maintain the Strategic Plan’s viability (Assessment Activity Flow Chart, Documents Room).

Upon review by the COW (and possible recommendations by the Assessment Committee), plans requiring revision due to budgeting concerns, the need for clarification of goals and objectives, and the desire for improved assessment processes are returned to the unit level for appropriate action. This monitoring of the unit plans at this stage provides for ongoing constituent input, a chain of accountability, and encourages continual upgrading of current procedures.
Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal

Strengths
1. Faculty and senior staff meet together in the Committee of the Whole. This is the highest deliberative body in our institution. Our minutes reflect that we are achieving a very high degree of consensus and focus in our work together.
2. We have engaged in widespread activities in institutional learning so as to create articulated systems of assessment, planning, budgeting, and communication. We have completed one full cycle of assessment data on these systems.

Challenges
1. Conduct our work together in a restorative way so as to retain our collegiality.
2. Our cycles of assessment for planning, budgeting, and communication are still in their formative years and need to grow over time.
3. Enhance and expand our current environmental scan.
4. Retain IIRP’s unique shared governance model as the institution increases in size.

Recommendations
1. Continue to use our restorative processes within the membership of the Committee of the Whole to assure its continued collegiality.
2. Enhance our strategic planning processes, especially the environmental scan, in future editions of the Strategic Plan.
3. Operate additional yearly cycles of our assessment so as to make them more sophisticated and useful.
STANDARD 3: INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

“The human, financial, technical, physical facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.”

Introduction
Because the IIRP is a relatively new institution and small in size, the staff of the administrative units can support, access, and work directly with each other. The five identified resource areas for our initial self-study – financial, human, technology, facilities and library – are interrelated by planning, budgeting, and service to students, faculty, and staff. The ability for the administrative units responsible for the management of these resources to meet not only individually, but at times as a group, keeps the lines of communication open among these units, encouraging cooperation and collaboration with areas needing assistance. All decision-making processes regarding the allocation of institutional resources are connected to the Strategic Plan and the annual budget process. These in turn feed into the ongoing outcomes assessment process.

Financial Resources
One salient feature of this organization that needs to be understood in order to fully comprehend the Graduate School and this Self-Study Report is the relationship of the IIRP with the Restorative Practices Foundation and Buxmont Academy. In brief, the Graduate School, earns income from tuition, fees, and materials, but also receives a yearly subvention from the Restorative Practices Foundation of about $1 million. The source of that fund are the assets and operating surpluses of Buxmont Academy. The IIRP Board and its members are on the Board of the Foundation and of Buxmont Academy, thereby assuring that asset flow. The Board has controlling membership on the Foundation Board. In turn, the Restorative Practices Foundation receives funds from the operating surpluses and assets of Buxmont Academy, whose board is also controlled by the IIRP (Historical Asset Chart of Buxmont Academy, Appendix G). This is the stream of income assured to the Graduate School until its hoped-for accreditation enables it to charge tuition.

Common financial indicators such as total assets/total liabilities illustrate these funding resources are adequate and stable, although challenged by the current economic situation.

In Table 1 below, note that fiscal year 2007 was an anomaly because it was the first year of operation. Assets were limited to the $500,000 permanently restricted net asset, and deferred revenues were very small. Adjusting the permanent restricted net assets from the remaining net assets provides a set of consistent figures. The plan is to maintain total assets equal to two times total liabilities.
Table 1: Assets/Liabilities Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total Assets/Total Liabilities</th>
<th>Adjusted Total Assets/Total Liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 (unaudited)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As self-study started, there was a question of the stability of revenue. In fact, the revenue stream has grown over the fiscal years as a result of increased student enrollments in the Graduate School and increased revenues from continuing education activities (i.e., Training and Consulting), as identified in Tables 2 and 3, below.

Table 2: Revenues, 2007-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010 (unaudited)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (% increase)</td>
<td>$153,921 (116%)</td>
<td>$332,165 (70%)</td>
<td>$565,381 (19%)</td>
<td>$670,000 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Consulting</td>
<td>$311,807 (18%)</td>
<td>$366,702 (40%)</td>
<td>$513,120 (17%)</td>
<td>$600,000 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Projected Revenues, 2011-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition (% increase)</td>
<td>$720,000 (10%)</td>
<td>$792,000 (10%)</td>
<td>$871,000 (10%)</td>
<td>958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Consulting</td>
<td>$630,000 (5%)</td>
<td>$661,500 (5%)</td>
<td>$694,575 (5%)</td>
<td>$729,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While current revenue streams have grown, they are not adequate to cover expenses. The funds coming from the Restorative Practices Foundation increased to support the added expenditures of the Graduate School, primarily in salaries and benefits for faculty and staff. There is a plan to resolve the question of stability. The IIRP has a planned deficit program for 2010 and 2011 to level revenue streams to 2008-09 levels. In other words, the IIRP plans a small deficit of operations for the two years before it returns to a positive mode of financing in 2012. The increased tuition and fees paid by students will result in a reduction in Restorative Practices Foundation support of the Graduate School. In the long term, the IIRP expects to be subsidized by the Restorative Practices Foundation in the amount of $500,000 per year, with stabilized enrollments and tuitions assuming other costs as per the Enrollment Plan (Documents Room).

In measuring the instructional expenditures of the Graduate School as a percent of adjusted total expenditures, one has to remove support service fees that do not relate directly to the Graduate School. Instructional expenditures for the Graduate School and continuing education through Training and Consulting comprise 47 percent of the adjusted expenditures (Financial Data for the Commission Self-Study, Appendix H).
The Board controls both the Restorative Practices Foundation and Buxmont Academy. Through Buxmont Academy, there are financial reserves pledged to support the Graduate School. Those reserves have been built through the acquisition of facilities and rental income from those facilities. The primary source of Buxmont Academy’s revenues is for services from public school districts (Buxmont Academy Year-end Audits; Restorative Practices Foundation By-laws, Documents Room).

Buxmont Academy’s revenues were challenged in 2009 and 2010. Since school districts depend heavily on tax revenues, which decreased because of the national economic crisis, they referred fewer students to Buxmont Academy. Despite decreased revenues, Buxmont Academy continued to provide financing through the Foundation for the Graduate School at its required level of operation. Buxmont Academy took steps to stabilize itself by selling properties, refinancing debt, and consolidating banking operations. Simultaneously, the IIRP increased revenue through Training and Consulting, which helped reduce its reliance on Foundation dollars.

As noted in the Strategic Plan (Appendix C), to contribute to financial stability, the IIRP must make a success of its Marketing Plan (Documents Room) and increase fundraising by the Restorative Practices Foundation. The marketing plan identifies the challenge of increased enrollment. Collection of data and analysis of target markets to customize messages to specific populations is one component crucial to attaining enrollment goals. Fundraising efforts will be enhanced over time as the Graduate School creates a donor base. The Restorative Practices Foundation is seeking to enhance its Board and its development mechanisms. As the Foundation evolves, there will be a need to develop a case for support to seek scholarships and grants. In calendar year 2009, there was a successful launch of a campaign drive. The Si Lewen Art Museum opened in November 2009, with a collection valued at $500,000. The Lewen collection of more than 4,000 works was a gift to the Foundation in recognition of the IIRP’s humanistic values, and in the hope that the sale of some of the works of art would aid the financial improvement of the Graduate School.

Financial Audit
The audit is prepared annually by an independent firm approved by the Board. The audits are conducted in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. The audit includes examination, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements and includes assessing the accounting principles used, and significant estimates made by management. The audit evaluates the overall financial statement presentation (IIRP Year-end Audits, Documents Room).

Institutional Controls
The entire budget process is described in Standard 2. Most resource allocation questions are finalized in the COW with the collective input of faculty, administrators, and other staff. This direct involvement of stakeholders ensures an allocation approach with involvement of adequate faculty and staff to support the institution’s mission and outcomes expectations. Allocations are reviewed in light of the Strategic Plan and how they will fit into the assessment process to assure institutional improvement.
Once the budget has been approved by the Board and communicated to the various administrative units and faculty, it is the responsibility of the unit’s respective director to monitor expenditures. The Director of Finance sends quarterly financial reports detailing expenses and revenue, where applicable, to the unit director. The Director of Finance reviews financials monthly, and if a deviation is noted from the approved budget, notifies the Vice President for Administration. The unit director is then contacted for an explanation. A unit director may contact either the Vice President for Academic Affairs or the Vice President for Administration to discuss expenditures not in the approved budget. Those expenditures are reviewed with the Director of Finance and the President prior to approval. A unit director is responsible for approving all purchases in advance for that respective unit.

Twice a year, the Director of Finance and the Vice President for Administration meet with the unit leaders to review expenditures and forecasts (IIRP Multi-year Budgets, Documents Room). In Spring 2010, these meetings were changed from individual unit meetings to an institution-wide budget, planning, and assessment day. On that day, each unit meets in a circle inside the larger circle of all other unit leaders to review its unit’s mission, objectives, expenditures, and forecasts for the upcoming year. An empty chair in the center circle afforded any other unit member an opportunity to join that unit with input or to ask for clarification. Surveys completed by the participants indicated the concept was a success. Participants appreciated being a part of all unit budget meetings and were able to identify connections between units. This process provides for annual budget and multi-year budget projections, both institution-wide and among administrative units, utilizes results of assessment in planning, and addresses resource allocation (Evaluations from Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day, February 2010, Documents Room).

**Human Resources**

The IIRP is staffed with a faculty and administration hired and retained to advance the field of restorative practices through the education of professionals and the conduct and support of research. As a new, small, and specialized Graduate School, the IIRP faced the dual challenge of obtaining faculty and staff, both skilled in their new jobs and knowledgeable in restorative practices.

The sharing of staff with the demonstration programs of the Community Service Foundation and Buxmont Academy has provided a pool of available support, financial, technology, marketing, and management personnel ready to accommodate the needs of the Graduate School. Some staff from the consortium of organizations (Community Service Foundation, Buxmont Academy, and the IIRP) enrolled and obtained a graduate degree from the IIRP. Five of our most experienced restorative practitioners also sought and achieved our master’s degree. They have been hired as part-time faculty adjuncts. We titled them “lecturers.”

All faculty and staff receive training (List of Restorative Practices Trainings, Documents Room). We also engage in ongoing support of employees to function in a restorative manner. Organization information, job descriptions, personnel guidelines, and by-laws in the Organizational Manual (Documents Room) are updated as needed and reviewed annually. The Organizational Chart (Appendix D) graphs the reporting structure for designation of support and participation in the institutional processes. These documents are posted on the password-protected private website accessible to faculty and staff at any time. All staff members meet
regularly with a supervisor for support, direction, and growth in their position. An annual self-evaluation summarizes each employee’s past year’s performance and states goals for the upcoming year (Evaluations Forms and Guidelines, Documents Room).

Our staff of 32 full-time and 15 part-time highly qualified employees includes five full-time faculty members and five lecturers. According to enrollment projections in the Enrollment Plan (Documents Room), this number of faculty is sufficient to handle enrollment through 2016. The Staffing Plan (Documents Room) indicates there are full-time faculty and staff members who may retire within the next ten years. A hiring strategy is already defined to ensure qualified individuals who embrace restorative practices are selected as replacements. An increase in workload may accompany approval from the Student and Exchange Visitor Program to accept international students. Also, upon receipt of accreditation from the Commission, we need to determine staffing needs to facilitate student financial aid.

There may be a need to support faculty during the Graduate School’s non-traditional hours of instruction, and existing staff positions may be realigned and/or some additional staff hours assigned to cover weekend and evening responsibilities. The Vice President for Administration and unit directors will monitor the need for additional staff hours.

**Technology Resources**

The technology unit of the Communications and Technology Division (hereinafter, “Communications and Technology”), supports the Graduate School by planning, implementing, supporting, and acting as liaison in the implementation and maintenance of technology, data, website, equipment, and audiovisual systems. Communications and Technology keeps current on technology trends and makes use of new technologies, when appropriate, to better support the mission, to optimize the learning experience for its students, and to increase the productivity of its faculty, students, and staff (Technology Plan, Documents Room).

Data and documents are electronically accessible at any time for students, faculty, and staff. Students and faculty have electronic access to their respective student and faculty portal around the clock. The individual student portal provides students access to all necessary functions from applying to a program to completing course requirements. The faculty portal provides one location for faculty to manage all teaching and advising responsibilities. Staff has electronic access to documents and databases needed to carry out the basic administrative and support functions. Future plans include combining these functions into a staff portal.

We evaluated the results of student surveys (Second Year Student Surveys, Student Exit Surveys, Documents Room) and determined a high degree of student satisfaction with the electronic and web-based nature of many processes of the Graduate School. For all years evaluated, more than 90 percent of the students were satisfied with all electronic aspects, with the exception of access to the internet. Student dissatisfaction with internet access, while small in numbers, was four of the 15 respondents (26.7 percent) in AY 2008/09. This issue was discussed at the June 2009 COW meeting (COW Meeting Minutes, June 2009, Documents Room). It was determined that, during class, students often had difficulty accessing the wireless internet connection from their personal laptops. The technology department was immediately contacted and resolved the problem by adding a PC router to all locations where classes are taught. In AY
2009/10, student survey results indicated a drop in dissatisfaction with internet access availability from 26.7 percent the prior year, to 10.5 percent (Second Year Student Surveys, Aggregate Results AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10; Student Exit Surveys, Aggregate Results AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

To further support instruction, the technology unit supported the transition to Moodle, a course management system, beginning in the Winter 2010 Term. As part of the self-study, the faculty was surveyed by email about the new course management system (Moodle Survey, Documents Room). Faculty reported that the most useful features of Moodle include the option of organizing courses in advance and greatly reducing photocopying. Once course information is loaded onto Moodle, students have immediate access to course documents and information (e.g., course syllabi, deadlines).

Because faculty travels to additional locations to teach, each faculty member was provided his or her own portable audiovisual kit for efficient classroom instruction. Each kit includes a projector, DVD player, necessary adaptor cords, speakers, and electronic pointers. The technology staff color coded cables and provided an instruction sheet for ease of hook up. Members of Communication and Technology communicate with professors at the beginning and end of each term to assess equipment needs and support issues. The equipment replacement schedule is updated annually.

Facilities Resources
The IIRP rents classroom and office space from Buxmont Academy, a nonprofit educational organization controlled by the IIRP. The IIRP leases Buxmont’s facilities and has priority use of Buxmont Academy facilities. The IIRP does not plan to purchase classroom facilities. All of Buxmont’s school facilities meet Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry Occupancy B standards for schools with children, one of the most demanding building standards, and all State and local safety requirements. All classroom locations have wireless internet access, adequate lighting, and are completely furnished. All locations have small offices where faculty could have one-on-one meetings with students, if necessary. All locations have sufficient parking options; some have on-site parking available (Facility Assessment Reports, 2009-10, Documents Room).

To ensure rented Buxmont facilities meet the IIRP’s goal of high standards for maintenance and safety, in 2009 the Director of Operations developed a Facility Assessment Report (Documents Room). Each term, the Director of Operations visits the locations to complete a standard check on items such as the heating/cooling systems, lighting, cleanliness, and fire and security systems. All items are inspected and evaluated. Any item requiring maintenance is attended to immediately. To further support instruction, the Director of Operations interviews each faculty member to assess their needs and observations about the facilities. Feedback received for both of these measures (inspections and interviews) have been commendable (Facility Assessment Report, 2009-10, Documents Room). All decision-making processes regarding the Buxmont facilities are connected to the institutional planning process and the budget plan.
The Entering Student Survey, Second Year Student Survey, and Student Exit Survey (AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Aggregate Results, Documents Room) include questions relating to the Facilities Plan (Documents Room) by assessing student input about facilities. Review of these surveys shows that student responses are consistent with those of faculty. This leads us to believe that the way in which we review the quality of the facilities is adequate and will continue.

**Library Resources**

The library is effectively supported so as to meet the objectives of student learning, both on campus and at a distance. The library contains learning resources fundamental to all educational and research programs offered at the graduate school. The vision of the Graduate School library is to build a primarily electronic library that serves its patrons in a variety of formats without being place-specific. The library also anticipates becoming a resource to the larger academic and non-academic community as a specialized library in the field of restorative practices (Library Plan, Documents Room).

In April 2009, the library relocated to the ground floor of the IIRP’s new building at 531 Main Street in Bethlehem. The move into this space, complete with a student study room, has made the library more visible and user-friendly to students and other visitors. It has also provided more opportunities for founding librarian, Margaret Murray, to meet students and receive critical feedback about library resources and student needs.

The library utilizes inter-institutional collaboration and resource sharing rather than direct membership in other networks. The Librarian has secured reciprocal relationships so students and faculty have access to other academic libraries in the region (i.e., Lehigh University and Moravian College), as well as those at Rutgers University, Temple University and Pennsylvania State University (Letters of Understanding, Documents Room). The Librarian participates in continuing education, through conferences and online workshops, in order to provide information and product demonstration on new trends in Web 2.0 technology.

Acquisitions are made based on faculty, staff, and student recommendations, the Librarian’s membership on LISTSERV, which provides frequent announcements of new books or materials in the area of restorative justice, and regular book-catalog reviews by faculty. Students make recommendations in person or by using the Suggest a Resource link on the library’s webpage.

The library assesses students’ perceived ease of access and satisfaction with the library’s electronic resources, including databases, online catalogue and internet availability via the Second Year Student Survey and the Student Exit Survey. The results are analyzed annually at the end of the academic year (Second Year Student Survey, Aggregate Results AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10; Student Exit Survey, Aggregate Results AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10 Documents Room).

In AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10, students completing these assessment surveys registered a greater than 77 percent satisfaction level in terms of staff assistance, the ease of obtaining needed information (both on-site and via the library’s website), access to electronic resources, the level of the library’s holdings for their area of study, and the merit of the library’s instructional tools.
The assessment surveys also provide a valid snapshot of the effectiveness of library and internet resources. These “consumer” responses inform the inter-related strategic planning/budget process in determining the need for additional library offerings and in allocating total financial and physical needs. In its current Library Plan (Documents Room), the IIRP sets an 80 percent student satisfaction rate with library services as a strategic indicator.

The level of support designated in the annual operating budget for library resource allocation is adequate to accomplish the objectives of student learning. The annual budget allotment has, to date, exceeded library expenditures (Administrative Library Unit Budget 2008, 2009, 2010, Documents Room). All decision-making processes regarding the library assets and its growth are connected to the institutional planning and outcomes assessment processes (Assessment Activity Flow Chart, Documents Room).

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. The evolution of the Graduate School stemming from the existing model programs of Community Service Foundation and Buxmont Academy enabled an already restorative work force to concentrate on mastering the tasks of their jobs in the Graduate School.
2. Access to Buxmont Academy’s facilities, assets, and financial stability allow the IIRP to expand and grow without taxing financial resources of a new organization.

**Challenges**
1. The IIRP relies heavily on Buxmont Academy support and needs to plan strategically for the future to rely less on Buxmont Academy funding and more on other sources, including tuition.
2. Fund-raising plans and activities are not well defined or fully understood.
3. Future hirings in faculty and staff will need to continue our efforts to have employees who are restorative in practice and skilled in their jobs.

**Recommendations**
1. Since tuition continues to play a large role in our financial picture, we must provide for it by implementing and expanding our new marketing plan.
2. Begin the work in 2011 of creating a fully functioning development office by 2013, and design a comprehensive development plan to guide planning and resource allocation towards meeting the mission and goals.
3. In a small organization like ours, each new employee is a precious resource. Carefully hire people for any new position who have both skills and a restorative orientation.
**STANDARD 4: LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE**

“The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.”

**Introduction**

The shared governance model of the IIRP is explicitly grounded in restorative practices. By definition, restorative practices encourages those who govern to engage with all of the institution’s constituencies to ensure reliable communication and feedback among those in leadership and governance roles and those who work in or receive the educational services of the institution. The governance structure of the IIRP is marked by openness, transparency, trust, and respect and reflects the participatory philosophy of restorative practices.

**Governance Inclusive of Constituents and Consistent with Mission**

The COW is a shared governance structure unique to the IIRP. It is the highest internal deliberative body advising the President on all critical matters such as budget, policy, and hiring decisions of faculty and senior staff, and which he relies on to advise him before bringing matters to the Board (COW minutes, Documents Room). The COW is composed of all full-time faculty, plus the Librarian, the President, the Vice President for Administration, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Students, the Registrar, the Director of Finance, and the Director of Training and Consulting. Other staff may be invited to attend when relevant issues arise (Faculty Handbook, Appendix E).

The COW is not a representative governance structure. Rather, it is a form of direct democracy, made possible by the institution’s small size, that reflects the mission and commitment to shared governance and fair process.

When authorities do things with people, whether reactively—to deal with crisis, or proactively—in the normal course of school or business, the results are almost always better. This fundamental thesis was evident in a Harvard Business Review article about the concept of “fair process” in organizations (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997). The central idea of fair process is that “…individuals are most likely to trust and cooperate freely with systems—whether they themselves win or lose by those systems—when fair process is observed.”

The three principles of fair process are:

*Engagement*—involving individuals in decisions that affect them by listening to their views and genuinely taking their opinions into account;

*Explanation*—explaining the reasoning behind a decision to everyone who has been involved or who is affected by it; and

*Expectation clarity*—making sure that everyone clearly understands a decision and what is expected of them in the future.
Fair process applies the restorative “with” domain of the social discipline window (Appendix A: What Is Restorative Practices?) to all kinds of organizations, in all kinds of disciplines and professions (O’Connell, 2002; Costello and O’Connell, 2002; Schnell, 2002). The fundamental hypothesis that people are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes in behavior when authorities do things with them, rather than to them or for them, expands the restorative paradigm far beyond its origins in restorative justice.

Listed below are the other institutional entities, which, through the collaboration of faculty, administration and other staff, carry out critical functions of the Graduate School.

Admissions Committee consists of three rotating faculty members and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Dean of Students who approve applications for admission to the master’s degree programs.

Institutional Review Board (hereinafter, “IRB”) consists of two faculty members as well as Dr. Rodney Skager, Professor Emeritus, University of California, and Dr. Gale Burford, Professor and Director of the Department of Social Work at the University of Vermont. These members set guidelines and review proposals for research involving human subjects (IRB Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

The following statements, taken from the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) form the remainder of our governance structure:

Faculty Governance

1. Curriculum and instruction are considered to be the purview of the faculty, with administration deferring to the faculty in such matters. The faculty has primary responsibility for curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, standards and procedures for graduation of students, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.

2. The faculty sets the degree requirements, in consultation with the administration, and determines when the requirements have been met, and otherwise qualifies students and recommends them to the President and Board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

3. The faculty shall participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing compensation of faculty. At the outset, IIRP will make no formal distinctions in faculty status, such as full or associate or assistant professor, nor will tenure be available. Initially each faculty member will have an individual annual contract negotiated privately. However, these practices will be subject to review as the new institution gets underway and faculty will be directly involved in such discussions (see Committee of the Whole below).
4. Budgetary policies and decisions directly affecting those areas for which the faculty has primary responsibility such as, but not limited to, curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, admission of students and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, shall be made by the administration in concert with the faculty.

5. Faculty must exercise diligence and provide oversight to ensure that its committees act in accord with institutional policies.

6. The faculty shall establish the responsibilities and authority of each academic governance entity. This applies to the lines of decision-making authority in relation to curriculum, admission requirements, graduation requirements, and operating procedures such as committee organization and committee appointments.

7. Faculty shall, in collaboration with the administration, define appropriate faculty development programming, including continuing education, conference attendance and publication.

Regularly scheduled meetings with the faculty, including the lecturers, are held. In addition, the faculty meet on occasion by itself to discuss their own particular interests. All of the recommendations of the faculty are made to the COW. The Vice President for Academic Affairs makes his own recommendation on these matters, and the President has the final decision. Faculty serve on all standing committees of the Board in a non-voting role (Board of Trustee Members and Committee Assignments, Documents Room).

In a shared governance system in established colleges and universities, roles and responsibilities are often understood through long custom as well as through formal documents. As a brand new institution, IIRP created its first formal understanding of the Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities (Documents Room) of students, staff, faculty, and Board. Although the statement was developed collegially among Board members, staff, student representatives, and faculty, and is widely disseminated in our publications, conversations during this self-study with various constituencies revealed that few were aware of its existence. Obviously, we need to disseminate it better. We are scheduled to review its efficacy and usefulness in 2012 (Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities, Documents Room).

Our students are given an opportunity to serve on standing Board committees (e.g., Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Finance and Operations) in an advisory capacity but do not have a vote. Students participate in strategic planning, annual discussions of mission, and serve on working groups for the Commission self-study. It is our observation through conversations that students do not know who their peer representatives are. This is an area that needs improvement. Students are given numerous opportunities to provide input about individual courses and the overall Graduate School via instruments such as course improvement forms, go-rounds in the classroom setting, and various student surveys. At this point in the development of the Graduate School, students do not have a governance structure of their own (Board of Trustee Members and Committee Assignments, email correspondence, Course Improvement Forms, all Student Survey Reports, Documents Room).
The Board is guided by its by-laws (Documents Room), most recently amended in December 2009:

Article I, Section 1 sets forth: The Board of Trustees shall have and exercise those corporate powers prescribed by law. Its ultimate authority is affirmed through its general, academic, and financial policy-making functions and its responsibility for the corporation's financial health and welfare. The board of trustees shall exercise ultimate institutional authority as set forth in these bylaws and in such other policy documents it deems to be appropriate. These bylaws and other board policy statements shall take precedence over all other institutional statement, documents, and policies.

The way the Board committee meetings are conducted is helpful in building a shared understanding of the new institution and its activities among trustees, faculty, and students. The Board committees (whose members include faculty and students) meet in succession on the same day. Rather than holding sequestered separate committee meetings, the entire Board openly observes each committee meeting.

Restorative practices consistent with our mission are embedded in the daily shared-governance activities. For example, all meetings within the organization open and close with a circle go-around, provisions are made for all grievances to be dealt with in a restorative manner, and the exchange of positive and negative feedback is an encouraged practice which, in turn, creates a transparent and open environment in which to learn, lead, and work.

Governance of the Restorative Practices Foundation and Buxmont Academy
The Board has two unique governance relationships, one with the Restorative Practices Foundation and the other with Buxmont Academy.

The Restorative Practices Foundation is the fundraising arm of the IIRP and is controlled by the Board.

Article II, Section 1 of the Restorative Practices Foundation’s By-Laws (Documents Room) describes the governance responsibilities delegated by the Institute and its Board to the Foundation:

a. The Institute shall appoint the directors of the Foundation, with the right to remove the same, without cause;

b. The Institute shall decide the number of directors;

c. The Institute must approve the operating and capital budgets and strategic plans of the Foundation and any unbudgeted expenses in excess of $10,000;

d. The Institute must approve all borrowing by the Foundation; and
e. The Institute must approve any other action not in the ordinary course of the Foundation’s business.

The IIRP’s relationship with Buxmont Academy (a sister organization of the IIRP) is critical because Buxmont Academy owns all the buildings used by the IIRP and provides the vast majority of the revenue donated to the Restorative Practices Foundation to underwrite the new Graduate School (Buxmont Audits, Documents Room). When we were seeking approval by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, they asked how it could be assured the Buxmont Academy would continue to support the Graduate School. Buxmont Academy responded by changing its Articles of Incorporation and filing Articles of Amendment (Documents Room) with the Department of State in Harrisburg, which state that:

A. Buxmont Academy elects to become a supporting organization of the International Institute for Restorative Practices, a Pennsylvania nonprofit corporation (“IIRP”) to provide resources to IIRP and to serve as demonstration schools for IIRP activities.”

B. Buxmont Academy shall be controlled by IIRP in that at least fifty percent (50%) of the members of the Board of Trustees must be members of the Board of Trustees of IIRP, at all times.

In effect, the IIRP “owns” Buxmont Academy and may avail itself of its resources, as needed. In practice, to ensure smooth functioning of this consortium, Buxmont Academy contracts for all of its financial and operational functions, with the exception of programming, from the IIRP. Stephen Moyer, Board Chair, and Ted Wachtel, President, serve as two of the three trustees on the Board of Buxmont Academy. Judy Happ, Vice President for Administration serves as the President of Buxmont Academy as well.

Buxmont Academy allows the Graduate School to operate by providing most of its financial and physical resources. The Graduate School must become significantly more financially independent. The ability to accept international students (granted to the IIRP June 17, 2010 by the Department of Homeland Security after a four and a half year delay) and the increase in student population, which is anticipated if the IIRP is accredited by the Commission will be a considerable step in that direction (Enrollment Plan, Documents Room).

An Effective and Independent Governing Board
The Board understands its critical role in leading the institution, not only appointing the President and assessing his or her performance, but establishing its independence from the President and asserting itself as the ultimate authority in the institution. Article VII, Section 2 of the By-Laws provides the President with an active role, but defines important limits; “The President serves as an ex-officio member of all Board committees but may not serve on the audit committee which ensures fiscal integrity.” Another example from Section 2 is that, “The President may serve as a trustee, but may not serve as the chair, vice-chair, secretary, or treasurer of the Board,” reserving those offices for the other trustees. The President is a voting member of the Board.
The Board routinely demonstrates its independence from the President in discussions and actions. The Board has created ad hoc committees initiated by independent concerns of individual Board members. The committee on autonomy and accountability reported and summarized the essential responsibility of the Board to maintain its autonomy and the accountability of the President to that Board. A committee on succession planning reported its ideas on how the Board would carry out a planned succession and also discussed how it would deal with an unexpected succession (Ad Hoc Committee Reports: Succession Report; Autonomy and Accountability Report, Documents Room).

In order to determine if this Board is an effective governance structure, we delineated the responsibilities of the trustees as outlined in Article I, Board Authority and Responsibilities, Section 2 of the By-laws (Documents Room), and compared those responsibilities to the actions of the Board as recorded in meeting minutes (Trustee Responsibility Grid, Documents Room). The Board is meeting all of its responsibilities with the exception of the following: “Establish the terms of employment of other key institutional officers who serve at the pleasure of the president (in consultation with the board as may be appropriate).” Minutes indicate that the President has not had a need to consult with the trustees for this action, as such employees have been transferred from within the institution and its related entities for the creation of the Graduate School. The contracting of the services of the current Vice President for Academic Affairs was reviewed with the Board. (Trustee Minutes May 2006, Documents Room).

**Selection of Trustees**

President Wachtel is the founder of Buxmont Academy, the Community Service Foundation, and the IIRP. He is well known as the face of restorative practices across the nation and across the world. In his interactions with people sympathetic to the notion of restorative practices, he has been able to bring to the attention of the Board potential candidates who share our interests. The Board Chair, in turn, contacts and interviews prospective trustees to ascertain their suitability and their level of interest. The Chair presents a candidate to the Board, and the candidate is nominated and voted upon. In June 2009 the trustees discussed and affirmed this process, and trustees were encouraged to make their own recommendations to the Chair. In the future, other trustees should become more active in expanding the Board.

As an example of the trustee selection process, during a series of conferences and trainings in both Jamaica and in the United States beginning in 2005, the President had numerous interactions with Carol Palmer, J.P., who, at the time was the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Justice (now retired) for Jamaica. Ms. Palmer possesses a clear understanding of what restorative practices are and was instrumental in their introduction to the Jamaican Justice System. President Wachtel spoke to her, she expressed a desire to serve as a trustee, and the selection process moved forward as described above.

While many Boards are comprised of successful corporate executives, professionals, and community leaders, the emphasis in selection for our Board has been an understanding and commitment to the concept of restorative practices, which is at the heart of this new institution. Yet even with that emphasis, our current Board brings many different perspectives and experiences in fields such law, higher education, public education, private foundations, government relations, management, and child welfare (Board of Trustee Members/Committee
Assignments, Documents Room). Board minutes reveal that the Board continues to seek diversity in background, experiences, and skills that might assist the Board in its oversight and duties. We specifically need a trustee with deeper financial knowledge than currently exists in the membership of the Board.

In the distant future, the Board will need to recruit individuals who can help make the IIRP more visible and linked to the local community.

**Orientation and Engagement of Trustees**
The Board hired Patrick McDonough, Ph.D., who also serves as the Graduate School’s Vice President for Academic Affairs, as its advisor to the Board. As a tenured faculty member and experienced administrator in many higher education institutions including President of Marietta College, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning for the California State University system, and Program Director, W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Dr. McDonough has provided critical guidance in higher education governance for both long-serving and new trustees.

Board meetings conducted during the past four years have been accompanied by an educational component, often using Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges publications, as well as freestanding educational sessions on areas of importance (Trustee Meeting Minutes, 2006-10, Documents Room).

Our trustees have made a conscientious effort to engage in a meaningful understanding of restorative practices itself. Many trustees have attended our international conferences (particularly conferences held in Bethlehem, PA in 2006 and 2009) and trainings offered by Training and Consulting. Joseph Roy, Ed.D., was the principal at the first public school where we introduced restorative practices in 1999. Dr. Muriel Berkeley’s Baltimore Curriculum Project hired the IIRP to introduce restorative practices in her charter schools. Dr. Carol Palmer was Permanent Secretary of Justice in Jamaica where we collaborated in holding an international conference and provided trainings. Sharon Lewis assisted us by authoring a major IIRP school research publication entitled, “Improving School Climate: Findings from Schools Implementing Restorative Practices.” Trustees also participate in the annual commencement which is an unusually participatory program given the small number of graduates, so that they can get a revealing perspective from those students (Commencement, Restorative Practices eForum, Documents Room).

Trustees participate directly in strategic planning and budgeting, both when new plans are formulated and in the routine annual updates at Board meetings.

In a discussion with the secretary to the Board, she noted that trustees do not have a formal orientation program. This needs to be developed so that orientation is consistent and allows new trustees to get “up to speed” quickly as the Board grows and changes. In June 2010 the Board created an Ad Hoc Committee to advance this need and the Ad Hoc Committee has circulated the information requested by the Board for orientation.
**Evaluation**
The Board carries out a bi-annual evaluation of the President after interviewing faculty, staff, and students and preparing a report. This report documented that the Board Chair presented and discussed the favorable outcome of the evaluation with the President. The Board repeated this process in 2010 (Trustee Meeting Minutes, December 2009, June 2010, Documents Room).

In 2009, the trustees designed their own self-evaluation assessment to measure individual trustees performance (Documents Room). This evaluation is shared with the Board Chair, and trustees are invited to discuss areas of concern. This evaluative process of self-assessment is similar to evaluations of faculty, staff, and administration.

Trustees have begun to implement a process of evaluation of the Board performance as a whole. Action steps in that direction are evidenced by meetings in March and April 2010 in which trustees lead a discussion of their performance based on “Improving the Performance of Governing Boards,” published by the American Council on Education for the purpose of a participatory group discussion by trustees (Trustee Meeting Minutes, 2010, Documents Room).

While these evaluative processes are new and in development, they incorporate critical elements of institutional creation and renewal. Discussions about these evaluative processes, trustees’ role in recruiting new trustees and in developing a succession plan, and participation in strategic planning, are all part of the reflective process that ensures the governing body’s role in the continuous improvement of the institution.

**Conflict of Interest**
Article XIV of the By-Laws (Documents Room) specifically defines a conflict of interest and asks that:

> All trustees shall disclose to the board any possible conflict of interest at the earliest practical time. Further, the trustee shall absent himself or herself from discussions of, and abstain from voting on, such matters under consideration by the board of trustees or its committees. The minutes of such meeting shall reflect that a disclosure was made and that the trustee who is uncertain as to whether a conflict of interest may exist in any matter may request that the board or committee resolve the question in his or her absence by majority vote.

In addition to its presence in the By-Laws, the conflict of interest provision is raised and discussed annually at the December Board meeting when trustees and directors complete a disclosure form (Trustee Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). This topic is discussed more fully in Standard 6.

**Generating Resources**
The Board reached consensus in December 2008 (Trustee Meeting Minutes, December 2008, Documents Room) and voted that each trustee must make an annual donation to the Restorative Practices Foundation. The amount of the donation is not prescribed, but the rationale for the requirement will allow fundraising efforts to cite 100 percent participation from the trustees themselves. A review of trustee donations for AY 2009/10 shows a 100 percent compliance rate.
The Graduate School, which is a 501(c)(3) organization approved by the Internal Revenue Service, created the Restorative Practices Foundation, also a 501(c)(3), to support the Graduate School and its related activities. Binny Silverman, Stephen Moyer, and June Rothkopf are trustees who also serve on the Foundation Board. Ted Wachtel serves as an ex officio member (Foundation Directors List, Documents Room).

The Restorative Practices Foundation has granted generous full-tuition scholarships to students. Scholarship recipients are informed that the IIRP has an expectation that, over time, the student will repay some or all of the monies so other students may benefit from scholarships.

The Foundation hired a consultant in 2009 to help identify and cultivate potential sources of funding. Fundraising has begun with three Board members initiating cultivation activities. Board members have also assisted in the development of the Si Lewen Art Museum, which opened in November 2009 and includes an extensive collection of paintings that will gradually be sold to generate revenue. The Foundation will engage in its second appeal campaign in the fall of 2010 (See Foundation Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

Trustees of the Graduate School and directors of the Foundation are newcomers to fundraising. Helping Board members become more comfortable and proficient at fundraising is a critical challenge.

**Written Policies**
Written policies that guide the IIRP in its daily interactions are included in the detailed Organizational Manual (Documents Room) and Faculty Handbook (Appendix E), updated versions of which are always available to administrators, staff, faculty, and trustees through our private website. Policies are reviewed annually by the administration and brought to the COW and trustees if changes or modifications are necessary. The Organizational Manual and Faculty Handbook include academic programs, the organizational chart, and job descriptions that outline the governance responsibilities of the President, his administration, and the faculty. They also include personnel guidelines, institutional policies, and the By-Laws that delineate the duties and responsibilities of the governing Board, its trustees, and officers.

Student-oriented policies are available on our public website, in the Student Handbook (Appendix F), the existence of which students are asked to acknowledge when they register. The handbook provides students with access to written policies and procedures and other resources.

**Trustees Certification of the IIRP’s Compliance to the Commission**
The Statement of Compliance has been completed and sent to Middle States with the appropriate submissions.
Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal

Strengths
1. The restorative nature of the IIRP’s meetings and processes fosters shared governance that is consistent with the institution’s mission and meets the challenges of a fledgling graduate school.
2. The active interest and enthusiasm of our trustees and their manifest support for our mission is a great asset for the institution.

Challenges
1. Although students serve on Board committees, other students do not know who those students are or how to use them to convey their input to Board representatives. The institution should find ways to engage students in governance in a more meaningful way.
2. There is no formal orientation program for trustees.
3. The community is not fully aware of the Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities.
4. Trustees and foundation directors are not comfortable and proficient at fundraising. This is a critical challenge.

Recommendations
1. The Committee of the Whole should create a process that informs students of who their student representatives are and how to reach them.
2. The Board needs to formalize the process of seeking new trustees and orienting them.
3. The statement on Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities should be disseminated much more widely through each administrative unit, with faculty, and with trustees. The statement should be brought to the attention of students when they are accepted to a degree program.
4. Find a new trustee or trustees who have substantial financial and/or business experience to bring to the Board.
5. Continue to encourage trustees to recruit other candidates more widely.
STANDARD 5: ADMINISTRATION

“The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution’s organization and governance.”

Introduction
The chief executive officer (i.e., the President) has primary responsibility to lead the institution. The chief executive brings to his job a combination of academic background, professional training and other qualities and professional characteristics appropriate to an institution of higher learning and the institution’s mission. The IIRP also possesses administrative leaders with appropriate skills, degrees, and training to carry out their responsibilities and functions (Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities, Documents Room). The IIRP maintains a sufficient number of well-qualified administrative staff, faculty, and support staff to provide quality programs and services. Roles, expectations, and relationships are clearly defined and evaluated (Job descriptions from Organizational Manual, Documents Room). There are adequate information and decision-making systems in place to support the work of the administrative leaders as well as a methodology to periodically assess the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.

Chief Executive
At his inauguration, founding President Wachtel was charged by the Board with three primary responsibilities:

…to ensure the academic integrity of the institution to make sure we are always centered on our learners and that we demonstrate high standards in teaching, research and service; to ensure its financial viability, to make sure this young institution finds strength to survive the inevitable hard times and most importantly to protect and defend our mission. This Board looks to you most of all to protect the special nature of restorative practices in what we say and what we do (Inaugural Charge from the Board, Documents Room).

President Wachtel accomplishes these objectives by maintaining a clear focus on the Institute’s mission and directing systematic planning in support of that mission. His efforts during the past 11 years have assured the availability of sufficient financial and physical resources for the IIRP, a new institution in a new field in challenging economic times. At the same time, with the support of a highly qualified administrative leadership team, President Wachtel has developed Board and administrative processes, capacities, policies, and standards essential to a well-run institution.

President Wachtel is the founder of the IIRP and reports directly to the Board. They exercise the ultimate governance role for the institution and periodically evaluate the President on his institutional vision and leadership. It has been the Board’s policy to evaluate the performance of the President every two years. The Board Chair, having received the results of the evaluation, counsels the President in support of his performance. The evaluation process begins with an Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Board Chair. This Committee meets with all faculty and a cross
representation of staff and students and asks a series of questions that assess the President’s continuing commitment to his inaugural charge. A written evaluation is presented to the Board Chair, who reviews its content with the President. The President then is given the opportunity to assess his own performance. He takes appropriate actions in response to the recommendations. Both the President’s and the Board’s self-evaluations are subsequently filed in the office of the attorney for the Board (Trustee Meeting Minutes, June 2008, June 2010, Documents Room).

It is President Wachtel’s vision and leadership skills that led to the creation of the Graduate School in 2006. The Graduate School is the realization of President Wachtel’s long-held vision of creating a graduate-level institution that would disseminate knowledge and stimulate research in restorative practices to professionals and practitioners around the world. President Wachtel is recognized as a global expert in the field of restorative practices and is counted among the major voices of this emerging discipline. He has also proven himself to be an innovative and experienced chief executive with the requisite combination of academic background and professional training. President Wachtel successfully established a number of nonprofit organizations and programs in the United States and internationally. The President and his wife, Susan Wachtel, founded the two organizations that underlie the IIRP and provide its restorative practices demonstration programs, the Community Service Foundation and Buxmont Academy.

President Wachtel is the author and co-author of a number of books, including *Real Justice* and the *Restorative Practices Handbook*, has written numerous articles on restorative practices, and has been a guest speaker at conferences on restorative practices around the world. President Wachtel also co-authored *Toughlove*, a best-selling book for parents of troubled adolescents (President Wachtel’s Bibliography, Documents Room). He was awarded a Master of Arts degree in education from Lehigh University and was a candidate for a doctoral degree in educational media in the 1970s. He co-teaches the capstone course for the graduating classes of the master’s degree programs.

**Administration and Senior Staffing**

The Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Patrick McDonough, brings 45 years of higher-education academic and administrative experience to the IIRP. With just five full-time faculty members, a full time Vice President for Academic Affairs and a full time Associate Dean for Academic Affairs are not required. Dr. McDonough performs his duties year round, but part time. He attends faculty, COW, and Board meetings in person and participates in some faculty meetings and other committee meetings via conference call and electronic communication. Unlike other senior administrators at the Graduate School, he has no additional responsibilities at CSF Buxmont.

Dean of Students, Susan Wachtel, is responsible for all non-curricular aspects of the student experience. She coordinates faculty advising, oversees the admission process, directs and coordinates students, advises them before they matriculate, and coordinates referrals for the needs of adult learners. Dean Wachtel has a master’s degree in education and over thirty years of experience as a teacher, counselor, and administrator in the CSF Buxmont organizations. She also serves as part time Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, assisting Dr. McDonough by providing on-site administration of Academic Affairs. She facilitates the faculty decision making
process and supports Dr. McDonough in forming academic policy. She also follows up on academic matters and policies.

Vice President for Administration, Judy Happ, has served in key administrative roles in CSF Buxmont for more than a decade. During that time, President Wachtel and Vice President Happ built an effective infrastructure for financial, personnel, training, public relations, marketing, video and print services, computer systems, building maintenance, and other operational functions for CSF Buxmont and its more than two hundred employees and five hundred adolescent clients. That infrastructure has now been expanded and adapted to serve the Graduate School, while maintaining full support services for the CSF Buxmont demonstration programs. Vice President Happ is the key intersection for coordinating the interests of the IIRP, Buxmont Academy, and the Community Service Foundation. Vice President Happ has earned master’s degrees in criminal justice and in restorative practices and education.

President Wachtel, Dean Wachtel, and Vice President Happ each bring a high level of combined expertise to their current administrative roles at the IIRP. Each has actively sought guidance and mentoring from expert consultants to adapt their roles to higher education. All hold memberships in appropriate professional organizations, have read extensively on their individual areas of responsibilities, and attend relevant meetings and seminars on a regular basis.

Director of Finance, Gordon Howatt, who brings more than four decades of experience in higher education to the IIRP, assists Vice President Happ in administration. Director Howatt is responsible for the budget, daily accounting, and annual audit and has a master’s degree in business administration. A number of other experienced administrators and managers complete the roster of senior staff (Organizational Chart, Appendix D; Organizational Manual, Documents Room).

Shared Governance
Aiding the President in the decision-making process is the membership of the COW. The COW is a form of direct democracy, made possible by virtue of the Institute’s small size. As discussed in Standards 4 and 5 in this document, the COW provides a unique tool of shared governance to the Graduate School’s administrative structure. It is the Institute’s highest internal deliberative body and advises the President on such critical matters as budget, policy, and hiring decisions of faculty and senior staff. The COW is comprised of the President, all full-time faculty, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, the Librarian, Registrar, Vice President for Administration, Director of Finance, and Director of the Training and Consulting Division. It is in this collegial body where collaboration between faculty and administration takes place on a regular basis. All members are kept abreast of the state of operations of the Institute, specific community objectives, and the emerging needs of students and faculty.

The COW reflects the mission and commitment to shared governance and fair process. The COW has proven to be an effective decision-making system for the Graduate School, including supporting the work of its administrative leaders (See Standard 2, Assessment and The Role of the COW). The COW is also the most significant tool for assessing the effectiveness of structures and services specific to the day-to-day operations of the Graduate School.
Administrative Philosophy
The Graduate School is driven by its mission. An important element of our administrative philosophy is found in the principle of fair process.

When authorities do things with people, whether reactively—to deal with crisis, or proactively—in the normal course of school or business, the results are almost always better. This fundamental thesis was evident in a Harvard Business Review article about the concept of “fair process” in organizations (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997). The central idea of fair process is that “…individuals are most likely to trust and cooperate freely with systems—whether they themselves win or lose by those systems—when fair process is observed.”

The three principles of fair process are:

- **Engagement**—involving individuals in decisions that affect them by listening to their views and genuinely taking their opinions into account;

- **Explanation**—explaining the reasoning behind a decision to everyone who has been involved or who is affected by it; and

- **Expectation clarity**—making sure that everyone clearly understands a decision and what is expected of them in the future.

Fair process applies the restorative with domain of the social discipline window (Appendix A: What Is Restorative Practices?) to all kinds of organizations, in all kinds of disciplines and professions (O’Connell, 2002; Costello and O’Connell, 2002; Schnell, 2001). The fundamental hypothesis that people are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes in behavior when authorities do things with them, rather than to them or for them expands the restorative paradigm far beyond its origins in restorative justice.

Qualified Staffing
The Graduate School is staffed with a faculty and administration hired and retained to advance the field of restorative practices through the education of professionals and the conduct and support of research. As a new, small, and specialized graduate institution, the IIRP faced the dual challenge of obtaining faculty and staff, both skilled in their new jobs and knowledgeable in restorative practices.

Where the Graduate School hired from the existing talent pool in the two beginning organizations, they were able to select employees with a high degree of commitment to restorative practices. These experienced individuals transported their talents to the field of higher education. Since that transfer, they have received numerous in-service and continuing education programs on the culture and practices of higher education, specifically graduate education. This pragmatic staffing solution provided the IIRP with knowledgeable, abundant, and consistent human resources (COW Survey, April 2010, Documents Room).
Performance evaluations of administrators and support staff are carried out annually through a self-assessment written by the individual and reviewed with the supervisor. Self-evaluations are an important part of the restorative culture at the IIRP (Evaluation Guidelines and Forms, Documents Room).

The President reviews annually the evaluations of his executive staff. These individuals, in turn, review each other’s evaluations and provide feedback. Productive discussion ensues as a part of this process.

**Hiring and Training Processes**

The search process for staff is begun with an analysis of job responsibilities. Then, a review of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for a position are decided. Open or new positions are made known to current employees, and advertisements are placed in local and national markets to generate an applicant pool. A team of individuals evaluates the résumés and chooses the best candidates to interview. The unit director conducts the interview. The identified hire must undergo a reference and background check (Reference Questions Form, Documents Room). Those conducting the interviews, well trained in the restorative practices philosophy, are able to ascertain by asking a series of questions of the potential hire, whether or not the candidate has the skills and qualities most likely to function best in the restorative milieu (Interview Questions, Documents Room). Human resources procedural documents, job descriptions and other personnel guidelines are updated as needed and reviewed annually (Organizational Manual, Documents Room).

The hiring of faculty is one of the most critical jobs of the organization. Our interests and procedures are outlined fully in Standard 10.

All faculty and staff receive training (List of Restorative Practices Trainings, Documents Room) and ongoing support to function in a restorative manner in relation to each other and the tasks of their positions. A fair process approach to addressing internal issues keeps the staff equally involved in problem solving. Staffing in administrative positions has remained consistent since 2006, with the exception of one turnover in the Director of Finance position. Strong leadership carries the IIRP through staff turnover in support positions. There have been some recent reductions in support staffing due to budget constraints, almost all occurring in part-time positions. However, a part-time institutional research specialist position has been created to meet the data needs of the Graduate School, and the transition of one employee formerly in a support staff position into the role of Assistant Registrar has been implemented to ensure that the needs of students are being met.

The Board and the administration are also cognizant of the challenges inherent in the aging of its current senior leadership. The President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and Director of Finance are planning retirement within the next five to 10 years (Staffing Plan, Documents Room). These individuals will need to be replaced with administrators who are capable of driving the mission and vision of the institution. The Strategic Plan (Appendix C) also calls for the hiring of a development professional so that the goal of financial independence can be achieved through the efforts of the Restorative Practices Foundation.
Information and Decision-Making Systems and Assessment

The administrative structure collectively guides the IIRP in achieving its goals. The Organizational Chart (Appendix D) provides clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority. The planning, budget, and assessment processes provide the structure for information and decision-making systems and takes future needs into account.

The staff, working with experienced higher-education consultants over the past six years in areas such as planning, assessment, and institutional research, has developed and continues to enhance sophisticated information and decision-making systems. These are all designed to support the work of the institute’s leaders and staff. The information and decision-making systems are periodically scrutinized to measure their effectiveness and to affirm that each is meeting and managing the demands of running a Graduate School on a daily basis.

As described previously, the COW is the primary internal deliberative body. A meeting may find its members addressing a variety of topics, including how individual courses are progressing; student issues that require the administration’s counsel or action; assessment of student learning and administrative structures; budget or staffing needs; rule changes in higher education and how they impact the institution; assessment of services and structures and how they are operating; new programming; and the refinement of existing and planned-for strategies. The COW meetings provide a centralized forum for the discussion and resolution of matters concerning students, staff, library services, and academics.

An internal survey showed the COW rates current staffing as meeting the needs of the institution (COW Survey Results, Documents Room). COW members noted that as institutional needs change, staff is hired when needed, or current staff is reallocated to meet the needs. The IIRP recognizes, however, that in order for the Graduate School to realize its future goals, staff in some specialized areas will be helpful. These include Advancement, grant preparation, financial aid, assessment, institutional research, marketing, and administrative support.

All respondents noted that the individual information and technological resources they depend upon are, at present, more than sufficient. Responders to the survey wrote that many of the decision-making systems put members of the COW in regular contact with each other and help them, “make decisions to move things forward.” A common thread among the COW members is the desire to see the fair process philosophy persist, as it is an essential component of information sharing and decision making in the restorative culture.

In terms of access to information, faculty and staff can electronically access documents and data at all times from their offices and homes. The IIRP has embedded key functions and databases, including the assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness, into its web-based systems. The result is dramatically improved productivity and accessibility. Faculty portals linked from the main page of the website also provide user-friendly access to critical functions and information such as grading, roster review, and student contact information.
Information is also disseminated via scheduled reporting, either written or oral. A weekly update report (Samples of Weekly Update Reports, Documents Room) to the COW provides current registration and admission information. Term reports, with current term, prior term, and prior-year data (typically outlining credits generated and admissions information) are sent to the President, Vice-Presidents, and Director of Finance.

The structure and timing of these reports vary with the particular function. Mandated by the COW during the initial development of computer information systems, these reports include assessments of enrollment, communications, finance, student records, payroll, faculty administrative support, and Graduate School relations. In this way, the COW systematically and continuously reviews all major functions of the Graduate School.

Board committee meetings and bi-annual institution-wide unit meetings provide other mechanisms for review of enrollment data. These meetings also provide time for discussion of strengths, challenges and areas needing improvement, including planning and assessment activities. In future years, reporting will need to be enhanced for trend data as the IIRP transitions from a new institution to an established, specialized graduate school serving students from around the world.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. Our founder is a nationally and internationally recognized expert in the field of restorative practices and heads a network that reaches 20 nations in the world.
2. Our commitment to fair process fits well within our shared governance structure and drives a culture of useful resolution of disputes, and clarification of misunderstanding.
3. We pay close attention to the continuing education of our staff.
4. We have low turnover in the senior staff, which produces stability.
5. With the importation of many professionals from the two founding organizations into the Graduate School, we assured a high degree of commitment toward the restorative mission.

**Challenges**
1. While the Board has a succession plan for the President, the administration must consider one for the retirement of other senior leaders.
2. Future hirings must always be informed by the need to add qualified personnel who have a restorative orientation.

**Recommendations**
1. The administration must take up a plan for the succession of its senior leaders.
2. The staffing plan must be accompanied by commitment to finding qualified people with a restorative orientation.
STANDARD 6: INTEGRITY

“In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.”

Introduction
The policies and practices of the IIRP create a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, trustees, and administration. Our culture of restorative practices demands transparency, honesty, and openness. Further, restorative practices can enhance relationships and emotional wellbeing. The Graduate School models that potential by actualizing the principles of restorative practices in its daily operations, its dealings with the community, and its relationships with other people and organizations.

We believe that every human being has intrinsic value, deserves to be treated with respect, is capable of changing and growing, and is inherently motivated to learn. We also believe that learning occurs best within a participatory learning community with students actively engaged in their own learning and interacting with their fellow students, faculty, and staff, and that learning should not only build capacity for the future, but should address current problems and challenges facing individuals and society.

Fair and Equitable Treatment
The concept of fair and equitable treatment is so critical to the core of this institution that as part of the institution’s first Strategic Plan (Appendix C), the Board set forth a requirement that the President deliver a focused confidential report that assesses the climate of fairness and the disposition of personnel, student, or other issues based on fair and equitable treatment to the Trustees. (Trustee Meeting Minutes December 2007, December 2008, December 2009, Documents Room). This requirement of the President is now part of the Board calendar. The written version of this confidential report is maintained in the office of the IIRP’s attorney.

When authorities do things with people, whether reactively—to deal with crisis, or proactively—in the normal course of school or business, the results are almost always better. This fundamental thesis was evident in a Harvard Business Review article about the concept of “fair process” in organizations (Kim and Mauborgne, 1997). The central idea of fair process is that “…individuals are most likely to trust and cooperate freely with systems—whether they themselves win or lose by those systems—when fair process is observed.”

The three principles of fair process are:

Engagement—involving individuals in decisions that affect them by listening to their views and genuinely taking their opinions into account;

Explanation—explaining the reasoning behind a decision to everyone who has been involved or who is affected by it; and
Expectation clarity—making sure that everyone clearly understands a decision and what is expected of them in the future.

Fair process applies the restorative with domain of the social discipline window (Appendix A: What Is Restorative Practices?) to all kinds of organizations, in all kinds of disciplines and professions (O’Connell, 2002; Costello and O’Connell, 2002; Schnell, 2002). The fundamental hypothesis that people are happier, more cooperative and productive, and more likely to make positive changes in behavior when authorities do things with them, rather than to them or for them expands the restorative paradigm far beyond its origins in restorative justice.

We have developed explicit and balanced expectations for faculty, staff and trustees, as well as for our students. In 2008, the Board and representative stakeholders met to develop a statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities (Documents Room) that outlines the expectations we think we have of each other. We recommend that the Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities be more effectively disseminated.

Surveys are administered to students at various times in their academic career to assess a host of different measures. The Second Year Student Survey indicates that in AY 2008/09, 100 percent of students reported that they either strongly agreed or agreed that interactions with students and faculty were characterized by mutual respect. In AY 2009/10, this number was 96.7 percent (Second Year Student Surveys, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). The Student Exit Surveys indicates that of those students reporting, 100 percent (in each of AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10) strongly agreed or agreed with that statement (Student Exit Survey, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). All of our classes are conducted in a restorative manner. They utilize check-in/check-out circles, multiple written reflection assignments, and provide ample time for students to openly share ideas and concerns. Finally, faculty and students are routinely engaged in exchanging feedback.

We believe that we are virtually alone in higher education in asking our students to identify themselves when completing course evaluations or student surveys by using their student number. However, knowing students’ concerns gives us opportunities to clear up any misunderstandings and get further feedback from them. The faculty reaffirmed its commitment to this open and transparent practice in January 2009 (Faculty Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). An interview with faculty who teach the 500-level courses indicated that they introduce the concept and inform students that this practice is restorative and that their feedback is important to us. We see the process as a “with” event that enables us to resolve concerns or learn more about a situation. Students do question this but according to the Dean of Students, they appear to understand our position that we view feedback as healthy and as an opportunity for positive change. As a result of this self-study, the section in the Student Handbook (Appendix F) on Student Feedback has been enhanced, as we realized we did not state this practice in writing.

As an example of the attention we bring to ethical dealings, we cite the fact that we have a no-gift policy (No Gift Policy, Documents Room). This policy is published in all of our handbooks and manuals with regard to gifts among employees and between staff or faculty and students. Students may not give staff or faculty gifts, or vice versa (including paying for dinners or other expressions of appreciation with a financial implication), in the interest of avoiding potential conflicts of interest or other ethical dilemmas. We ask students to honor this policy so as to avoid
placing staff or faculty in an awkward situation where they must then refuse or return a gift. The Registrar reminds all students of this policy via email at the holiday season, and candidates for degrees are reminded of this policy approximately one month prior to graduation (Email Sample and Letter to Degree Candidates, Documents Room).

Annual reviews of policies and procedures are conducted by the faculty and staff, and modifications are proposed to the COW and approved by the Board, where necessary.

Grievances
Processes for addressing student grievances restoratively are published in the Student Handbook (Appendix F), as follows:

The International Institute for Restorative Practices, consistent with its name and mission, will use restorative processes, whenever possible, in dealing with wrongdoing and conflict among students, staff, faculty, and administration. Restorative processes focus on restoring the harm done by conflict and wrongdoing.

Of course, if a restorative process fails to alleviate the grievance, a formal process is part of the grievance policy (Grievance Policy, Documents Room).

A separate policy addresses the procedure to be followed when a student wishes formally to challenge an instructor’s evaluation of their work (Student Handbook, Appendix F). According to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, only one such appeal has reached her office to date.

In order to draw explicit attention to our grievance policy as well as other critical policies, we require that when a student first creates his or her student portal and each time they register for a course, the student is required to affirm that: “By checking this box, I acknowledge that I am aware that the Student Handbook is available at www.iirp.org and contains policies and procedures, such as safety and security, grievances, academic records and appealing an instructor’s evaluation of student work” (Copy of Student Portal, Documents Room).

According to the Dean of Students, three students have entered the grievance process since we opened in 2006. None of those cases have gone beyond the level of Associate Dean for Academic Affairs/Dean of Students. In speaking with the Dean of Students and faculty members, numerous student issues from simple to complex have been recognized and resolved by the faculty and the Dean by using restorative processes. The faculty are highly skilled practitioners in the use of restorative processes in resolving conflicts and proactively build positive and trusting relationships with their students.

The Student Code of Conduct and sanctions for violating that code are published in the Student Handbook (Appendix F). During this Self-Study, an interview with faculty showed they are aware of the Code of Conduct and the grievance procedure and are able to guide students to their location in the Student Handbook.
Catalogs
The Student Handbook is available to the general public on the website, and hard copies are kept in the faculty office and the library. The Student Handbook (Appendix F) is updated at least annually and the administration maintains an electronic archive of previous editions. Students, faculty, and appropriate staff are notified by email of any changes made to the publication (Copies of Emails to Students, Documents Room).

Research Involving Human Subjects
The IIRP seeks to maintain a high ethical standard with respect to research. The Institutional Review Board (“IRB”) evaluates any behavioral research such as class field study. All faculty members took the online training provided by the National Institute of Health (NIH) and received certification that ensures they are able to guide their students in this critical area (Certificates of Completion, Documents Room). All students enrolled in the research course (YC 610 and ED 611) are required to complete the online certification course with the NIH that provides each student with knowledge about protecting human participants in research. The policy on Human Research is published in the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) and in the Student Handbook (Appendix F).

The chair of the IRB reports that there has been overwhelming cooperation from faculty and students in its first year of operation and no problems have been encountered as the IRB has developed.

Conflict of Interest
The Board has included in their by-laws an amendment addressing conflict of interest (IIRP By-laws, Documents Room). Following up on Board education issues in 2008, the trustees began an annual discussion of the disclosure of any involvement that might cause a conflict of interest in their roles as guardians of the IIRP. The revision of the IRS Form 990 further illuminated this issue and in 2009, the Board approved a distinct Conflict of Interest policy. They had a form designed for all Board members and directors or senior staff to complete annually, disclosing any conflicts of interest (Conflict of Interest Policy and Form; Trustee Meeting Minutes December 2008, December 2009, Documents Room). When a member of the Board or staff is unsure whether a conflict or affiliation exists, he or she shall disclose the relevant facts to the President or to the Board and shall abide by the decision of the President or the Board as to the existence of a conflict or an affiliation.

Scheduling
A matriculated student has a maximum of five years to complete his or her graduate degree. If enrolled in our FastTrack program, a student can complete a degree in 12 months. An analysis of the schedules (Documents Room) provides evidence of our offerings of courses generally occurring on alternate weekend days each year (e.g., if YC 630 was offered on Saturdays for AY 2008/09, it would be offered on Sunday for AY 2009/10). Multiple sections of core curriculum courses (500 level) are provided in different locations and on various start dates during a term. All 600-level courses are offered only in Bethlehem. The alternate weekend day scheduling is also conducted to respect the religious diversity of our student community.
The AY 2007/08 Second Year Student Survey indicates that 66.7 percent of our students who answered the survey either agreed or strongly agreed that courses were offered frequently enough for timely completion of a degree. In the AY 2008/09 survey, that number increased to an 81.8 percent satisfaction rate, and in AY 2009/10 the number of students reporting satisfaction was 77 percent (Second Year Student Surveys, Documents Room).

Student Exit Survey results for AY 2008/09 (the first year administered) reflects that 88.2 percent of our exiting students who completed the survey agreed or strongly agreed that courses were offered frequently enough for timely completion of a degree. In AY 2009/10, that number was 90 percent (Student Exit Survey, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

As a young institution lacking a track record in course enrollment numbers, course schedules have been designed annually. It is the institution’s intent to begin to produce multi-year schedules beginning with AY 2011/12. This will assist students further in their independent academic planning.

Academic Freedom
Restorative practices, by its very nature, demands academic and intellectual freedom. We have widely disseminated policies regarding academic and intellectual freedom. The Student Handbook (Appendix F) and the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) clearly articulate policies protecting academic inquiry and freedom of expression for students and faculty. We have yet to find a violation of academic or intellectual freedom.

We encourage free discussion, inquiry, and expression in the classroom; the structure of our classes demands this expression. Students are free to take exception to data or views offered in any class but are responsible for learning the content of any course of study. The IIRP adheres to the statement on academic freedom endorsed by the American Association of University Professors (Faculty Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

Academic Integrity and Intellectual Property
The IIRP recognizes and supports the importance of intellectual property in academic endeavors. The curriculum is embedded with the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education created by the American Association of College & Research Libraries (Division of American Library Association) and endorsed by the American Association for Higher Education & Accreditation and the Council of Independent Colleges. One of the goals of the Standards is to ensure that students know how to use information appropriately which includes citing sources accurately and fully understanding what constitutes plagiarism.

In the first three introductory courses, for example, one of the learning outcomes require that students “write a reflection paper in APA format.” As students begin their studies, there is a clear expectation from the first courses taken that the proper attribution of sources is mandatory and will continue throughout their course work. The library’s website provides links to APA Guidelines and a second more comprehensive link to citation issues as well as a link to the Information Literacy Standards, all provided to assist students in citing their papers properly.
All course syllabi readings follow APA citation formatting to acknowledge authors and sources and to provide an example to students.

We have an Academic Integrity policy, which is distributed via the Student Handbook (Appendix F). The policy deals with cheating, plagiarism, helping or hindering others, fair use violations, damage to library, and copyright violations. Students who violate the Academic Integrity policy are behaving in a manner inconsistent with the essential values of our community. Sanctions for violating any part of the academic integrity policy are clearly stated within the policy. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs reports that two students have been identified as having violated the Academic Integrity Policy. In each instance, faculty members issued failing grades for the work submitted, and the Dean spoke with the students in question. Although this is a small sample, it appears that faculty members are applying this policy and its related procedures in a consistent manner.

Permission to use articles and other materials in class is sought and purchased each term for each course using the Copyright Clearinghouse Center (“CCC”), the primary provider of copyright permissions in the U.S. For those sources that are provided by CCC, authors or publishers are contacted directly by the Librarian to obtain permission and pay costs.

We obtain proper permissions (releases) from those individuals who appear in IIRP produced films and on our website. The Assistant Director of Communications and Technology is responsible for these releases (Photography/Video Consent Agreement, Documents Room).

**Honesty in Materials**
All marketing publications are jointly edited for accuracy and veracity by Communications and Technology, the Registrar, the Assistant to the Administration, and the Vice President for Administration. Changes to the website undergo a similar vetting process. A potential student acquires all admissions requirements, course descriptions, and schedules through the website.

**Employees**
The workplace operates in a restorative climate. Units conduct circles and team builders on a regular basis. Faculty and COW meetings provide ample opportunity for the exchange of ideas and concerns (Faculty Meeting Minutes; COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). Employees are made aware of policies, which guide our employment practices, such as Equal Opportunity, Affirmative Action, Americans with Disability Act, nepotism, and dismissal. These policies are disseminated through the Organizational Manual (Documents Room). Staff reviews the Organizational Manual with new employees as part of their orientations. The work environment is one where candid feedback is given and received freely and frequently and fair process is utilized. The grievance policy is universal to students and employees.

Faculty recruitment and employment policies are covered in Standard 10.

**Disclosure of Information**
The IIRP discloses significant changes in a timely manner to the institution’s community, to the Commission, the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and to any other appropriate regulatory body.
Students, the Board, faculty, and staff have been invited to be part of the Self-Study and also helped create the Design for Self-Study (Email record, Documents Room). The Vice President for Administration updates the employees on our Commission status. We maintain an internal website for faculty and staff to readily access information. The IIRP maintains a dynamic public website where information about relevant institutional assessments are readily found. First published in 2009, our Factbook contains information such as admissions, graduates, student demographics, program information, and financial data. It is published annually by the Assessment Committee and then presented to the COW for approval (COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). Our Factbook is accessed from the main webpage. The website is updated as necessary and is reviewed on a regular basis by the Office of the Vice President for Administration for accuracy and timeliness (Factbook, 2009, 2010, Documents Room).

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. The principles of restorative practices encourage daily interactions among students, staff, and trustees, which are open and honest.
2. The President’s yearly report on fairness and ethical dealings and the absence of any challenges that exhausted the opportunities for appeal, taken together, suggest that integrity is interwoven into our practices.
3. Our restorative principles urge us to believe that every human being has intrinsic value, deserves to be treated with respect, is capable of changing and growing, and is inherently motivated to learn.

**Challenges**
1. Our commitment to a policy of identifiable feedback and critique needs constant reminder and justification as new students join us.
2. Integrity cannot be taken for granted. We must work at it constantly to maintain it.
3. Our current inability to produce a multi-year schedule of classes has created some problems for faculty and students.

**Recommendations**
1. Introduce the idea of student identification to students in the earliest courses of their program. We need to ensure that students understand our rationale.
2. The Board must continue to place high value and attention on the President’s yearly report of fairness and ethical dealings.
3. We need to produce multi-year academic schedules beginning in AY 2011/12.
STANDARD 7: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

“The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.”

Introduction
The nature of restorative practices leads people to be reflective practitioners, who are self aware of professional actions. The people of the new Graduate School, therefore, were predisposed towards “managing by facts.” We went further, as the founding faculty spent a year together before our opening, creating curricula, which had embedded within it assessment measures in every course and linked the learning outcomes to one another and to the program. We worked out a thoughtful matrix of these interrelationships, evaluated every course, every term, made factual judgments and the resulting adaptations. We closed the loop, and we still do that continuously. But that, as we knew after achieving candidacy, was not yet sufficient.

This manner of operation demonstrates a history of utilizing assessment mechanisms as the basis of planning and change. What is new to the IIRP is a transition from the informal nature of these processes to the formal methods now being implemented throughout the organization to thoroughly document these assessment methods, including the creation of a calendar of assessment to track processes. These actions ensure that the assessment loop is organized, systematized, and sustained. The overall goal is a rigorous measurement and analysis of outcomes, both qualitative and quantitative. The goals and objectives contained in the Strategic Plan (Appendix C) also reflect this move to formalization. Units are now secure with the expectations and focus of their activities. Planning, particularly at the unit level, has achieved a greater level of proficiency during the past year and is more systematic throughout the institution. Along with a strong commitment to our mission by faculty, staff, and student constituents, these innovations point to a sound foundation for our future.

The Assessment Process
As a result of two years of effort shared by faculty and staff, the IIRP has a working Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Appendix B), which describes the means of annually assessing its Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and the administrative unit plans, to report the results to the institutional community, and a way of utilizing those assessment results for planning purposes and for amending plans accordingly (Assessment Timeline, Documents Room). This process has been integrated into and operating across the institution since the Spring of 2009, although the assessment of student learning and student services has been in place since the first year of operation (AY 2006/07). All decision-making processes regarding the allocation of institutional resources are now connected to its Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and the annual budget process. These in turn help develop the ongoing outcomes assessment process. Among our assessment tools are data from annual financial audits, student surveys, staff self-evaluation forms, Program Goal Reports, Course Improvement Forms, enrollment, admission and retention data, and individual unit quarterly and end-of-year reports and committee meeting minutes (IIRP Audits; Student Surveys; Evaluation Guidelines and Forms; Program Goal Reports 2008/09, 2009/10; Course Improvement Survey Results; Data Book; Unit Quarterly and Annual Reports; Assessment Committee Meeting Minutes; Student by Credit Term Reports, Documents Room).
The annual budget is the result of a systematic and fixed process, one geared towards addressing the institution’s missions and goals. In addition, the Finance Office utilizes results of the prior year’s assessments to guide upcoming budget decisions. An independent auditing firm annually analyzes and evaluates the overall statement presentation of its financial resources and renders an opinion.

The assessment process begins each year with a review of the Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and the unit plans (Documents Room). Updates and revisions are proposed by the COW to the President and the Board. This stage allows the mutual expectations of the Board and the President to be organized and prioritized. Changes are communicated to unit directors who then meet with their staff to discuss updating a unit’s goals and objectives ensuring that all revisions continue to support the mission, student learning, and strategic goals. Individual unit plans are shared with the vice-presidents.

To facilitate the ongoing assessment process of these plans further, we have designed a practice that requires each budget unit to be aware of the goals and objectives of its sister units. This facilitates a consensus about the prioritization of projects and use of resources. The integration of the planning process with the budget process ensures that resources are allocated to those priorities identified in the plans (COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). This enhanced interaction was first employed in the institution-wide budget, planning, and assessment day initiated in February 2010 (Unit Meeting Minutes, February 2010, Documents Room). This annual forum will continue to give faculty and all unit representatives an overview of budget allocations for the upcoming fiscal year.

Another critical phase of the annual assessment process is the completion of quarterly assessment reports by all administrative units (Unit Quarterly Reports, Documents Room). The reports describe progress on achievement of objectives, provide summaries of data collected, and indicate action steps needed. Up-to-date indicators of a unit’s strengths and weaknesses, these documents become the tools that the units use for their yearly assessment and that the administration uses for planning purposes. Unit directors, in turn, are responsible for reviewing quarterly financial statements and unit plans during the year. The directors inform the administration about any changes needed to attain a specific strategic goal. Any new projected allocations must be related to the Strategic Plan (Appendix C) or the unit plans and must be considered integral to accomplishing a necessary goal.

New unit budget requests are then processed through the appropriate Vice President and are compiled by the Finance Office. Once completed, the President and the other members of the COW review the requests. This process may also be augmented by recommendations from the Assessment Committee. The request is subsequently presented to the Finance Committee of the Board, which recommends approval by the entire Board.

As noted above, each unit annually submits a report to the Vice Presidents and the Assessment Committee Co-chairs with their annual assessment of their unit’s performance with the methodology used and changes needed for the upcoming year (Unit Annual Reports, Documents Room). The Assessment Committee provides feedback on the assessment processes to each unit.
and communicates recommendations to the COW. Plans that require revision due to budgeting concerns, the need to clarify goals and objectives, the desire for improved assessment processes are returned to the unit level for appropriate action. The monitoring of the unit plans at this stage provides for ongoing constituent input, a chain of accountability, and encourages the upgrade of current procedures. The COW formalizes the final recommendations to the President who presents the overall assessment of these plans and the Strategic Plan (Appendix C) to the Board. Thus, the annual cycle begins again with the Strategic Plan being reviewed and updated as necessary (Assessment Activity Flow Chart, Documents Room).

Academic assessment has been focused on student learning since the Graduate School opened. Faculty collaboratively created course syllabi at the outset, tied the course learning objectives to the program goals, and linked them to the mission. After each term, detailed results of all course evaluations are reviewed by the faculty and the COW. Judgments are made about the data, and corrective actions are taken if warranted (COW Meeting Minutes; Faculty Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

After attainment of candidacy, it became clear that the area of assessment of student learning was strong, but our area of need was institutional assessment. We acted on this judgment by creating the comprehensive process we have described. We have implemented that process and completed one full cycle and now are examining its results.

The commitment to assessment from our Board, President, senior staff, and faculty is documented in everything that we have done over the past couple of years. Reports from units and committee meeting minutes reflect the progress of each administrative unit understanding the linkage between assessment data and change as well as planning and budgeting, all in support of student learning. The Assessment Timeline is clear, simple, and straightforward (Assessment Timeline, Documents Room).

**Evaluating Units’ Effectiveness**

The IIRP has created a methodology to periodically assess the effectiveness of administrative structures and services. It also now has adequate information and decision-making systems in place in all units to support the work of the administrative leaders (COW Survey Results, Documents Room). Furthermore, faculty and staff have a heightened awareness of how significant the ongoing assessment process is to the long-term success and continued growth of the institution.

To this end, financial resources are monitored and measured on a regular basis. Once the annual budget is approved by the Board and communicated to the various administrative units and faculty, it is the responsibility of each unit’s respective director to monitor expenditures. Quarterly financial reports detailing expenses and revenue are generated by the Director of Finance and sent to unit directors. The Director of Finance reviews financials monthly, and if a deviation is noted from the approved budget, notifies the Vice President for Administration. The unit director is then contacted for an explanation. Expenditure variations are reviewed with the Director of Finance and the President prior to approval.
Similarly, the administrative staff, new to the field of higher education, has grasped the concepts and action steps of assessment. Data from its unit assessment reports show that the staff has also become more mindful of integrating the mission tenets into its daily routine. Staff development is dealt with further in ongoing meetings, trainings, and supervision. Action steps leading to the accomplishment of objectives are discussed at these sessions. There is an expectation that these forums will give the administrative staff the opportunity to become well versed in the mechanisms of higher education, and most especially, assessment.

The IIRP began with a basic strategic plan that simply provided the steps to opening its doors. The Strategic Plan (Appendix C) was later revised to incorporate the actions needed to attain accreditation. The most recent version begins to take the institution beyond operational levels toward future growth. Each step, while including some representative stakeholders, broadened the inclusion of stakeholders thereby making the plan a living document for all faculty and administrative units. Unit directors became involved in planning and monitoring their own budgets. The economic downturn and the resulting financial constraints meant systems had to be put in place for directors to approve all expenditures and contact the respective Vice President or President when circumstances required a purchase outside budget parameters. Directors informally commented the new processes were simple and more efficient and raised awareness. They also initiated activities with their staff to educate them about the IIRP and its mission and to create thoughtful, focused unit plans in support of the Strategic Plan (Appendix C).

We made changes throughout the institution where it was evident that the student survey results indicated necessary improvement. Assessment of the educational offering begins with the Student Surveys (including the Second Year Surveys, Student Exit Surveys, Discontinuing Student Surveys, and Alumni Surveys forms, Documents Room). Students provide feedback through the latter document at the end of every course; the surveys occur at regular intervals throughout the student’s Graduate School experience. In addition to supplying the faculty with insights for their own self-evaluations, the surveys give the faculty an opportunity to analyze survey data in terms of the quality of lecturers’ teaching skills and any apparent curricula review needed. Faculty have routinely used the Course Improvement Forms (Documents Room) in conjunction with the Student Learning Matrix Reports (Documents Room) to make changes in the curricula, each term if necessary, resulting in a strong core curriculum. The Librarian worked with the Assessment Committee to change the questions on the Second Year and Student Exiting Survey forms when the results did not provide adequate data for her to make informed recommendations for the future of the library. The Dean of Students and the Registrar’s Office, in consultation with the faculty, reviewed Course Improvement Forms and other student survey data. Their review resulted in the preparation of electronically available resources for students.

Administrative units utilize a variety of means to monitor institutional effectiveness. The IIRP completes IPEDS as required and obtained its first peer evaluation report (IPEDS Peer Evaluation Report, Documents Room). The report was shared with the Assessment Committee and the Vice Presidents who determined no changes were warranted based on one report and because the Graduate School is relatively young. The creation of the first Factbook for AY 2008/09 (Documents Room) provides a baseline for institutional data on enrollment, admission, retention, program completion, and the continuing education unit, Training and Consulting. The second Factbook (2010 Factbook, Documents Room) was enhanced to incorporate the new data.
trend reports produced by the newly hired Institutional Research Specialist. We have baseline data for comparison and monitoring purposes. We are pleased with enrollment trends, the diversity of our students, retention and admission, and program completion data. We are exceeding our expectations as a young institution. Monthly financials and the annual audit provide the IIRP’s financial assessment. The creation and implementation of the task management system allows the Office of the Vice President for Administration, the Registrar’s Office and the Assistant to the Administration to accomplish tasks and maintain oversight of such things as routine assessment of policies, and annual review of handbooks to flow in a timely and systematic manner. The process of self-study accelerated the creation of a website for documents and reports accessible to stakeholders. While this website has much room for improvement, its existence has improved efficiency by having all documents and reports available electronically and in one place.

Annual Process for Assessment of Individual Employees
Self-evaluations are an important part of our restorative culture, and all members of the administrative staff take part in a standardized annual self-evaluation (Organizational Manual; Evaluation Forms and Guidelines for Evaluation, Documents Room). Work evaluations of administrators and support staff are carried out through a self-assessment written by the individual and reviewed with a supervisor. In addition, employees have the opportunity to take part in restorative practices such as team builders, a process that helps them to build relationships with coworkers and identify and address their individual areas of strengths and weaknesses. Feedback from all staff is encouraged on a daily basis and is supported by teaching and practicing feedback methods. These activities promote compliance with the mission and goals. The President reviews the evaluations of his chief deputies annually. The deputies, in turn, have access to each other’s evaluations. Productive discussion ensues as a part of this process, and all staff incorporates personal and professional changes based on feedback as warranted.

In much the same way, annual faculty self-evaluations summarize the individual’s activities for the past year and state goals for the upcoming year. This is the first part of a discussion aimed at seeking agreement between academic administrators and faculty for objectives in the upcoming years. These evaluations are based first on the three classical notions of teaching, research, and service and also on the sixteen characteristics of teaching in a restorative milieu (Faculty Handbook, Appendix E). These sixteen characteristics were developed within the faculty as a means of self-accountability. Evaluation and activities reviews are conducted with each faculty member by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Objectives for the coming year are decided.

The Graduate School has five full-time faculty and five part-time faculty, identified as lecturers. These lecturers are also evaluated annually on the same criteria as the full time faculty with a considerably lower expectation for research and service. See further discussion in Standard 10.

While evaluations are confidential, the process itself demonstrates that, annually, the faculty is held accountable for individual professional growth activities, and that an expectation exists that the faculty pursue professional growth. The Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) clearly documents the expectations, roles, and responsibilities for faculty with regard to excellence and professional
growth. Faculty conference/training forms (Documents Room) document attendance and value of workshops and conferences.

**Dissemination and Use of Assessment Results**
The website with various reports is available to faculty, unit directors, staff members involved in self-study, and the Board. Minutes and quarterly unit reports are kept by all units and shared with the respective Vice President. The two budget, planning, and assessment days held each year ensure the assessment efforts of units are integrated with each other. The Vice Presidents and the Assessment Committee receive and evaluate the end-of-year unit reports and provide the summary report with recommendations to the COW. The COW membership includes the President, all full-time faculty, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Students, the Librarian, Registrar, Vice President for Administration, Director of Finance, and Director of Training and Consulting. The President informs the Board of results and recommends changes. Thus, all stakeholders are well informed as to the institution’s progress on its Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and have the information necessary to effect both programmatic and institution-level change.

The COW reviews end-of-term data and annual report data on enrollment, admissions, finances and staffing and utilizes the data to support strategic plan goals. Because of its broad representation, COW meetings provide a centralized forum for the discussion and resolution of matters concerning students, staff, library services, and administrative support. Discussions may involve assessment of student learning and administrative structures; budget; staffing needs; rule changes in higher education and how they impact the institution; assessment of services and structures and how they are operating; new programming; and the refinement of existing and planned-for strategies. The faculty and COW also annually review and measure the effectiveness of the educational offerings.

**Fulfilling the Mission**
The IIRP strives to recruit, admit and retain, “professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.” We seek to attract and retain students who will have the opportunity for success in both their education and their professions, “with the goal of positively influencing human behavior.” See Standard 8 for a full discussion of student admissions and retention.

Educational offerings fulfill the institutional mission by providing graduate level courses in the field of restorative practices. The founding faculty created the course syllabi in accordance with the mission and identified goals and objectives for each of the two master’s degree programs. The linked program goals, learning objectives and learning outcomes combine to form the Student Learning Matrix (Documents Room) for each course. Each learning outcome is linked to a specific institutional goal, which, in turn, is linked to the institutional mission. See Standard 11.

The annual Program Goals Report (Documents Room) cites the achievement of program goals. The results are evaluated by the faculty with an eye to needed changes. The outcomes indicate that the Graduate School is achieving its program goals, and thus, its mission.
The Alumni Survey results show that more than 95 percent of students who have completed a degree program believed that courses were relevant to their professional goals and objectives; that there have been opportunities to use what they learned in their professional practice; and that they have been able to apply theories and concepts learned to practical problems (Alumni Survey, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

The IIRP is driven by its mission.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. The restorative practices culture of being self-aware, managing by facts, and making positive change creates a predisposition towards continual assessment and improvement.
2. The current Strategic Plan, the third in our history, was created and improved and enhanced with input from a broad institutional constituency. It is clearly more comprehensive and assessable than in previous versions.
3. Our adoption of a systemic and comprehensive set of objectives and assessments has moved us toward creating a culture of assessment. This system is organized bottom to top; it is transparent; and it is open in its allocation of resources.

**Challenges**
1. Assessment processes and tools are new and need to be refined. Additional years of data need to be collected in order to demonstrate trends and opportunities for institutional improvement.
2. We need to experience future cycles of our assessment activities in order to be more comfortable with making decisions based on the evaluation of data.

**Recommendations**
1. Continue to support the comprehensive effort of the assessment in demonstrating trends and opportunities for institutional improvement.
2. Task the Assessment Committee in years 2011, 2012, and 2013 with working with the COW and unit directors to enhance utilization of assessment results.
STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION

“The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students’ educational goals.”

Introduction
The IIRP strives to recruit, admit, and retain “professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.” We recruit students through a variety of means, including Training and Consulting, current students, and alumni to spread the word about our specialized Graduate School. Our admissions process ensures all students are well informed and supported as they make decisions about their educational program. We seek to attract and retain students who will have the opportunity for success in both their education and their professions, “with the goal of positively influencing human behavior.” Through the efforts of our faculty, administration and staff, and our students, themselves, we expect that our students will realize their potential, reach their goals and “contribute to the growth of knowledge” of restorative practices.

Admissions
Prospective students seeking admission to the Graduate School are provided with accurate and ample information to make informed decisions about our educational programs through the website and Student Handbook (Appendix F). The website is informative and user-friendly and provides students with information about admissions policies, course schedules and descriptions, faculty biographies, transfer credits, tuition and fees, financial aid, and scholarship opportunities (http://www.iirp.org). The Student Handbook (Appendix F) is available to all students through the website and provides complete information for students on institutional policy. Knowledgeable staff members, including the Registrar, the Assistant Registrar, and the Dean of Students are also available to ensure that any questions from prospective students are answered promptly. The Registrar, the Dean of Students, and the administration continuously assess that accurate and comprehensive information is available and updated as needed via the avenues listed above.

It is clearly stated on the website and in the Student Handbook (Appendix F) that, “Due to the specialized nature of the Institute’s programs, transfer credits will not be accepted.”

Program goals for each master’s degree are prominently displayed on the website and are in the Student Handbook (Appendix F). The faculty have ensured that program goals link with the three institutional goals, which then link to the mission. The IIRP has its first complete set of data on program goals for AY 2009/10. The data show that program goals for both master’s programs exceeded faculty benchmarks (Program Goals Report 2009-10, Documents Room). The institutional goals are being met, and the IIRP is achieving its mission. This report is produced at the end of each academic year and is reviewed by the faculty and the COW. These data are available to students upon request.

During the opening class of the first course offering, Basic Restorative Processes (YC/ED 500 or YC/ED 501), which is a prerequisite for any other course, all students are asked to complete the Graduate School Entering Graduate Student Survey (Documents Room). In that survey, students
are asked several questions about their satisfaction regarding registering for the course. The survey reports on prospective students’ experiences employing the information-gathering methods cited above. In AY 2008/09, 98.4 percent of students indicated they were satisfied or somewhat satisfied in response to the question: “How satisfied are you about answers to your questions?” Data indicates that students are receiving accurate and complete information prior to enrolling in classes. In AY 2009/10, 100 percent of students were satisfied or somewhat satisfied (Entering Student Survey, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

The admissions criteria are consistent for all applicants. Prospective students complete an admissions application and submit all transcripts from undergraduate and graduate schools attended, three letters of recommendation, a short essay, and results from standardized tests (GRE, MAT or PPST). Required minimum grade point averages, as reflected in undergraduate transcripts and results from standardized tests help assure prospective students’ success. All admissions criteria are taken into account by the Admissions Committee before admissions decisions are made. Since students may take up to 12 credits prior to admission to the Graduate School, the quality of their work during these 12 credits is also taken into consideration during the admissions process.

The Admissions Committee can make one of three recommendations for any student: 1) to admit, 2) to decline to admit, or 3) to admit with provisions. The Dean of Students can help students who need remediation in some particular area to get appropriate referrals for help.

Admitted students who marginally meet or do not meet the Institute’s qualifications are handled on a case-by-case basis. Students who encounter difficulty with mathematics, statistics, computer skills, or writing are encouraged to speak with their course professor or with their student advisor for guidance.

In addition to the above-listed application requirements, prospective international students must also submit results of TOEFL or IELTS standardized tests. The IIRP was approved to accept international students in June 2010. A formal announcement to prospective students was made in August 2010.

One of the criteria for admission, a two-page essay describing a student’s reasons for seeking our specialized graduate education, is an important tool for the Admissions Committee to evaluate prospective students’ motivation, writing ability, and suitability for graduate work in restorative practices. A survey of the Admissions Committee revealed that all the committee’s members are clearly using these essays to evaluate students’ writing ability and to gain insight into students’ reasons for and commitment to applying restorative practices in their future professional and personal lives.

Most matriculated students are employed in the field as educators or youth counselors, as indicated in Table 1, below:
Table 1: Data on Student Occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Total Students Admitted</th>
<th>Student identifies occupation as educator or counselor</th>
<th>Student identifies occupation as other than educator or counselor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20 (83%)</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30 (71%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26 (70%)</td>
<td>11 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To increase enrollment, the faculty is considering courses to accommodate students who identify themselves in the “Other” category but who still have strong interest in restorative practices.

By selecting students with a demonstrable interest in restorative practices, an ability to succeed academically and the desire to introduce new ideas into their workplaces and communities, the admissions process helps ensure that our graduates will contribute to the growth of knowledge through the application of what they learn, and thereby fulfill the above-mentioned first institutional goal: “We will educate a growing number of professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.”

Students agree that the program goals are relevant to the graduate program, as indicated in data from the Alumni Surveys (Documents Room). In AY 2008/09, 100 percent of students either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “Courses were relevant to my professional goals and objectives.” In AY 2009/10, that figure was 95.5 percent.

Recruitment/Enrollment Management

Training and Consulting is an important component in marketing and promoting the Graduate School, as are students and alumni who introduce and recommend friends and colleagues to graduate courses. The Restorative Practices Foundation offers a tuition-free scholarship for the introductory course in an effort to foster the awareness of restorative practices and attract new students to the Graduate School. We are just beginning to gather the data, which show that 29.3 percent of new students who enroll in the introductory courses matriculate. As our new field has no undergraduate feeder program, we are inclined to feel positive with almost one-third of those who “try us out” continuing the process to become admitted to a master’s program.

The “How You Heard About Us” Report (Documents Room) is produced after every summer, fall, and spring term. Data shows that a majority of students who create a student portal and take courses learn about the Graduate School through friends, colleagues, students, alumni, or training, as shown in Table 2, below.

The total number of students who created a Student Portal for AY 2008/09 was 256; and for AY 2009/10, the total was 255. The total number of students enrolled in the first introductory course (YC/ED 500 or YC/ED 501) in AY 2008/09 was 141; and for AY 2009/10, the total was 125.
Table 2: Results from How You Heard About Us Inquiry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data from New Student Portals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Data from YC/ED 500 or YC/ED 501 Enrollments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY 2008/09</td>
<td>AY 2009/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumnus/Student</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Colleague</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Enrollment Plan (Documents Room) focuses on marketing and recruiting students who are:

- Educators looking to expand their learning, meet their continuing education requirements, and enhance their practice with young people.
- Professionals who work with young people and their families who are looking to enhance their learning, meet their continuing education requirements, broaden their understanding of restorative practices and enhance their practice with young people.
- Educators and other professionals who want to enhance their practice in their schools, organizations and communities.
- Any adult learners who want to further their knowledge in the field of restorative practices.

As the IIRP matures, more data about students will become available to analyze and shape recruitment efforts beyond Training and Consulting, current students, and alumni. Assessment processes are in place that will provide the data to faculty and staff to use for recruitment and retention purposes.

Prospective students are provided with ample information to make informed decisions about their educational program through the website and the Student Handbook (Appendix F). Prospective students often begin contact with the Graduate School by email, using the website’s “Request Info” link. The Office of the Registrar replies to emails within three business days via phone, email, or both. They are also available to meet personally with students upon request. Informational materials can also be mailed to prospective students upon request.

Information from all prospective students is entered into a contact management system. The Office of the Registrar follows up via phone and email with the prospective students for a minimum of two terms from the first inquiry date to ensure that they have the information they need in order to make informed decisions about their educational programs.
Retention
We are a brand new institution in a new and emerging field. There are no undergraduate majors anywhere in America in restorative practices. Therefore, any graduate student who comes to our doors is trying out both our field and our school. Our normal expectation is that a certain number of those students will decide we are not for them, and we are content with their judgment.

We are just beginning to compile data on student retention. Recent data regarding all students indicate that an average of 35.2 percent who begin classes are enrolled one year later. This percentage refers to all students, not just those who have applied and been accepted into the master’s degree programs. Since the Graduate School opened its doors, admitted students total 42 in the education program and 84 in the youth counseling program. The Graduate School has had a total of 46 students graduate since 2008: 14 with a Master’s of Restorative Practices and Education and 32 with a Master’s of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling. At this point, numbers to assess retention are small and inconsistent from year to year. However, the mechanisms are in place to track and report this data to ensure it is part of institutional assessment.

Since 2006, only six admitted students have failed to continue their graduate studies. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs analyzed the situations of these six students and concluded that there was no common cause for the withdrawals. We recognize the need for our assessment efforts to analyze the characteristics of those many students who continue with us. We hope to improve our marketing and retention efforts.

Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal

Strengths
1. Admission requirements, procedures and policies are easily accessible on the website. Great care is taken to ensure the website is up to date and user-friendly.
2. The IIRP has rolling admissions; it does not have a deadline for admissions application. Students can apply for admission year round, and the Admissions Committee reviews applicants for admission year round.
3. Students are able to take the prerequisite courses in the fall, spring, or summer terms, affording them the opportunity to begin their program at any time. Students are permitted to take up to 12 credits before matriculating giving them ample time to make an informed decision on the program before applying for admission or continuing in a graduate program. (This does not apply to international students.)

Challenges
1. Our numbers are small, so our data trends cannot yet be considered consistent.
2. The current size of our enrollment and the state of our tuition income are a problem. We anticipate our enrollment will grow and tuition income will follow.
Recommendations

1. As we complete more cycles of data, and therefore achieve more comprehensive data, we need to refine our utilization of our data management system to enhance decision making.

2. We need to grow by following the recommendations of our Enrollment Plan, which result in a 333 unduplicated head count by the AY 2016/17.
STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

“The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students.”

Introduction
The Dean of Students works closely with faculty and the Registrar’s Office to ensure that complete and correct information is supplied to students to aid them in making the best decisions for successful completion of their educational program. The Dean of Students provides leadership for the Registrar’s Office. This allows for continuity of services between faculty and staff for working adult learners in the support service areas of student advisement, course scheduling, registration and degree audits, student complaints and grievances, student records, and diverse student populations. The Registrar’s Office is adequately staffed with a Registrar and an Assistant Registrar. Student input gathered from conversations, email, and survey results, combined with faculty input, influences decisions regarding services provided and the allocation of institutional resources.

Student Advisement
The goal of student support services is to ensure that students are advised well from before they enroll in their first class until they complete their degree. Advisement is provided by the Registrar’s Office, the Dean of Students, and full-time faculty. In this way, students are accurately informed and are able to make decisions concerning their academic program.

The Registrar’s Office advises both prospective and current students regarding course schedules, registration, and financial aid. Because students can take up to 12 credits before matriculating into the master’s program, the Registrar’s Office often develops strong relationships with non-matriculated students. When a non-matriculated student has a more involved or sensitive issue to address, they are referred to the Dean of Students, Susan Wachtel, whose 30-plus year background in restorative counseling makes her particularly well-qualified to advise students.

Students are very satisfied with help provided by student support services, as indicated in data from the Second Year Student Surveys (Documents Room). In AY 2007/08 and AY 2008/09, 100 percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that staff was very helpful. In AY 2009/10, that figure was 96.7 percent. That figure was 100 percent in the Student Exit Survey for both AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10 (Student Exit Surveys, Documents Room).

Upon acceptance into the program, all matriculated students are assigned an academic advisor from among the full-time faculty. Students receive notification of their advisor by email and regular mail along with their acceptance into the master’s program. Students can also find their advisors’ contact information in their Student Portal, under the admission tab. Faculty advisors provide support and guidance in an effort to empower students to be successful in their academic development. Faculty advisors are available to communicate with students in person, by telephone, or via email.

The faculty discuss student issues with each other in faculty meetings, thereby deriving support and ideas of how to better support or help all students in the Graduate School. Faculty speak with
the Dean of Students if they have concerns about a student. The Dean of Students communicates with the Registrar’s Office should issues arise regarding course scheduling and registration.

Students report being very satisfied with the support they receive from faculty, as indicated in data from the Second Year Student Surveys (Documents Room). In AY 2007/08, 88.9 percent of students said they either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Faculty were supportive in students’ welfare and professional development.” In AY 2008/09, that figure was 100 percent; and in AY 2009/10, it was 96.4 percent.

Students also report being very satisfied with their advisement services, as indicated by Student Exit Survey data for AYs 2007/08, 2008/09, and 2009/10 (See Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Student services (admissions, counseling, advising) (Answered “Satisfied to Very Satisfied”)</th>
<th>“Mentoring (guidance in gaining professional competencies)” (Answered “Satisfied to Very Satisfied”)</th>
<th>“Sufficient and timely academic advising.” (Answered “Agree” to “Strongly Agree”)</th>
<th>Faculty were supportive in student’s welfare and professional development. (Answered “Agree” to “Strongly Agree”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics regarding student satisfaction with faculty advisement services generally exceeds our expectations. The results from AY 2009/10 in the areas of student services and sufficient and timely academic advising are below the expectation of 90 percent for the Registrar’s Office. The Registrar’s Office and Dean of Students will examine each survey and contact the individual students, if necessary, for clarification or to ascertain specific areas for improvement.

**Course Scheduling, Registration, and Degree Audits**

All information and processes related to course scheduling and registration are available to students at any time through their Student Portal on the website. The Registrar’s Office ensures that course schedules are also posted on the public website as soon as they are available so students can make timely decisions about their academic programs.

Data from student surveys indicate that students are satisfied with registration processes and course schedules. In AY 2007/08 and AY 2008/09, data from the Second Year Student Survey (Documents Room) show that 100 percent of students were either satisfied or highly satisfied with the overall process of registering for classes. For AY 2009/10, the result was 96.7 percent. The statistics regarding student satisfaction with registration processes and course schedules exceeds our expectations.
At this time, multi-year schedules projecting into the future are not yet available to students. Also at this time, some 600-level courses are offered only once each academic year. For both these reasons, the Registrar’s Office provides reminders to students to ensure their awareness of the availability of courses needed to complete their respective programs. The Registrar sends an email to all students two weeks prior to the registration start date of each term notifying them of the date they may register for courses. Then, six weeks prior to the class start date, the Registrar’s Office makes follow-up phone calls to matriculated students who have not yet registered for classes. Our busy working adult students have commented that this service has been a very helpful reminder. Since we are still a small institution, it is not a problem for the Registrar’s Office to perform this task, but it may prove to be a challenge as we grow.

Another way we have addressed the aforementioned issues is through our degree audit service. The degree audit is available on each student’s Student Portal and the Faculty Portal for faculty advisors. The degree audit shows completed courses and remaining courses needed to fulfill the program requirements. The Dean of Students, the Registrar, and the Assistant Registrar review the degree audit on all matriculated students twice yearly, once in the fall and once in the spring. Students are then emailed information pertaining to course schedule options as well as suggestions for their targeted year of completion. Included also are the number of credits students need to take per term to finish their degrees in a timely manner.

Data in the Student Exit Survey (Documents Room) for AY 2007/08 indicate that 92.9 percent of students either agreed or strongly agreed that courses were offered frequently enough for timely completion of the degree. In AY 2008/09, that percentage was 88.2 percent; and it was 90 percent for AY 2009/10. The statistics regarding student satisfaction with frequency of courses offered exceeds our expectations.

**Student Complaints and Grievances**

The IIRP, consistent with its name and mission, employs restorative practices in dealing with complaints and grievances. Faculty are skilled in the use of restorative practices to resolve conflicts and work hard to build positive and trusting relationships with their students. We are proactive in dealing with grievances and take steps to ensure that matters are resolved before they escalate. The Dean of Students responds to concerns in a timely manner, via phone or in person, and keeps records of all conversations or student interactions.

All policies and procedures related to complaints and grievances are published in the Student Handbook (Appendix F), which can be downloaded from the website at http://www.iirp.org/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf. Students must check a box indicating that they are aware of the Student Handbook, which outlines the grievance policy, every time they register for a course.

We have had few formal grievances to date, and we credit this to our proactive approach and the use of informal restorative practices. Any records of student grievances, the way they are handled, and their resolution are kept in student’s files.
The same grievance policies are also outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) and in the Organizational Manual (Documents Room) for trustees, administrators, and staff. As such, the same grievance policies apply to every person in the organization including students, faculty, staff, administration, and trustees. After being hired, all employees must sign a statement acknowledging receipt of this handbook.

We encourage students to voice their concerns or problems. Should a concern result in a grievance, it is first addressed informally, through discussions with the appropriate parties or with a restorative circle. A restorative circle provides every person involved an opportunity to be heard and express feelings in a safe environment. If no solution is reached, a student can appeal their issue in writing to the President.

An example of an informal approach occurred when a student had complaints about a course and about the faculty teaching it. When the student was unable to reach a resolution with her professor, the professor directed her to the Dean of Students. After the Dean of Students spoke to the student, a decision was made to conduct a circle involving the student, the two faculty members teaching the course, and the Dean of Students. The purpose of the circle was to give everyone a shared understanding of the student’s concerns. By the end of the circle, the student expressed that she felt heard and that her problem had been resolved.

As discussed in Standard 6, our student surveys are not anonymous. Faculty who read these forms can identify problems and try to resolve them directly with the student. The Dean of Students also reads these surveys and acts on any expressed concerns by contacting either the faculty member or the student, or both, to gain further information or clarification. We believe this proactive approach prevents issues from becoming formal grievances.

**Student Records**

The institution protects the privacy of its students and their educational records and the release of records, complying with the rules as stated in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974.

This protection of privacy begins when a student creates his or her Student Portal. The electronic information in the Student Portal is password protected, and knowledge of each student’s unique password is limited to a small number of employees. Among these employees, there are different levels of accessibility to students’ electronic records. For example, the Registrar and the Assistant Registrar have a higher level of access than faculty based on needs and responsibilities.

All hard copies of student records are kept in a locked, fireproof filing cabinet in the Registrar’s Office. In November 2009, in an effort to increase security in the Registrar’s Office, the lock to that room was changed from all other doors in the Graduate School; only the Registrar, the Assistant Registrar, and limited select administrators have access to this room.

All information pertaining to student admissions is emailed securely, with password protection, to the Admissions Committee. The Admissions Committee deletes all records pertaining to student applications after admissions decisions have been made. The expectation to delete all
records is reiterated at each committee meeting (Admissions Committee Meeting Minutes September 2009, Documents Room).

The Student Handbook (Appendix F) publishes details on implemented policies for the release of student information, including the release of student records, rights of inspection, request for review, waiver of student rights, consent provisions, and exceptions to the consent policy.

In addition to complying with routine official requests for transcripts, our policy was recently tested and proved to be effective when, in February 2010, a Special Agent of the Federal Investigative Services came to the Graduate School and presented an Authorization for Release of Information form for a particular student to the Assistant Registrar. The Assistant Registrar referred to our procedures and contacted the Vice President for Administration and the Dean of Students regarding the matter. Our policy, in accordance with FERPA states:

No person outside of IIRP shall have access to nor shall IIRP disclose any personally identifiable information from students’ educational records without the written consent of the student. The consent must specify the records to be released, the purpose of the disclosure and the party or class of parties to whom disclosure may be made. Consent must be signed and dated by the student (Student Handbook, Appendix F).

To verify that the consent was valid, the student was called, and she confirmed that she had signed such a release. The agent was given the requested information (unofficial transcript, period of enrollment, and verbal verification by the Dean of Students that there had been no disciplinary actions regarding the student). We then made a copy of the request and put it on file.

The Registrar’s Office also submitted this information to a professional listserv offered by Georgia State University to confirm that the actions taken were in compliance with FERPA, since this was the first such experience for the Graduate School. Responses received from this inquiry confirmed that all actions taken were appropriate and in compliance with FERPA.

**Diverse Student Populations**

*International Students* - It is congruent with the mission and goals of the Graduate School to admit and educate students from all over the world. In June 2010, the Graduate School was approved by the United States Department of Homeland Security to admit international students. International students who had expressed an interest in the Graduate School were formally informed of the approval in August 2010 by the Office of the Registrar.

We recognize that international students will have different needs than U.S. students. Accordingly we have discussed and researched several topics relating to international students, including application requirements, health insurance, student visas, student accommodations and transportation, community orientation, practicum opportunities at the IIRP demonstration programs (CSF Buxmont) and employment. We are taking all necessary steps to be prepared for international students including obtaining the necessary training with the Student and Exchange Visitor Program.
Race and Ethnicity – The student population has become more diverse. In the first year of operation, 90.7 percent of students reported their race and ethnicity as White; 2.8 percent reported their race as Black; 2.8 percent selected other; and 3.7 percent were unspecified. In AY 2009/10, 49 percent of students self-identified as White; 30.8 percent as Black; 16.9 percent unspecified; and the remaining 3.3 percent as either American Indian, Hispanic, or Multiple (Data Book, Documents Room).


Students are encouraged to call and notify the Registrar’s Office should special accommodations be needed. As a new and small institution, we have only one experience with a student with disabilities who needed special parking arrangements. The Director of Operations was notified in this case, and accommodations were made for this individual student.

We realize that we may need to handle other such challenges in the future and will consider reasonable accommodations.

Other Services
Athletic Activities - The IIRP has no athletic programs.

Financial Aid – Students are unable to apply for federal financial aid until the IIRP is granted accreditation by the Commission. In the interim, the Restorative Practices Foundation offers generous scholarships to students to assist with tuition costs. The process by which students access scholarship dollars is uncomplicated and is managed by the Registrar’s Office. The IIRP recognizes that when it receives accreditation, we will need staff knowledgeable about financial aid.

Library – The library is open from Monday through Thursday from 11:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. with a Librarian available for consultation in person or by phone and email. Individual appointments can also be made with the Librarian if stated hours are not convenient for students. As a new school with limited library hours, library service is supplemented with an introductory video on the library’s webpage which provides a brief tour and instruction on web resources, tip sheets on how to use specific library resources such as SocINDEX distributed by faculty in appropriate courses, and instructional sessions by the Librarian during class time, as requested. The cumulative Student Exit Survey (AY 2009/10, Documents Room) indicates that responding students are satisfied or very satisfied with library services, broken down as follows: In-person (92.9%); Using library website (85%); Using Catalog/databases (80%); Video (100%); Staff assistance (100%).

Student Activities – The IIRP provides the basic student services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students. We have not yet determined what if any non-academic activities would help our adult students connect with one another outside of class. As the Graduate School matures, we will explore this issue by gathering student feedback.
We anticipate that this exploration will also help us provide needed services for international students and alumni.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**
1. The staff in the Registrar’s Office develops and maintains strong relationships with students. Surveys report student appreciation of their treatment.
2. Faculty are committed to student success and are willing to work with students to fulfill their potential. Surveys report the appreciation students have for faculty commitment towards students.

**Challenges**
1. When we expand our anticipated financial aid opportunities for students, we will need more knowledgeable staff to accommodate it.
2. Stay in touch with the needs of our enrolled students, our alumni, and our international students and identify areas of improvement or additional services.

**Recommendations**
1. Identify the knowledge, skills, and abilities of a potential financial-aid employee.
2. Look for ways to respond effectively and economically to newly articulated needs of our adult learners.
STANDARD 10: FACULTY

“The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.”

Introduction
From the inception of the Graduate School, faculty and supporting professionals have been involved in creating, evaluating, and developing the school’s programs. Founding faculty, the Dean of Students, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the President were employed with IIRP while the school was in its planning stages and participated in the design of the curricula and assessment tools. The Librarian was hired nine months before the Graduate School began offering courses and participated in identifying and locating course materials, incorporating information literacy standards into course syllabi, selecting library resources, and creating a library webpage, http://www.iirp.org/library.php. Communications and Technology, in conjunction with the Registrar’s Office, created print materials and a web presence to provide program and admissions information to prospective students and for online registration, admissions, and grade reporting. Communications and Technology also assisted in selecting a cataloging provider for the library and created the library’s webpage, one of the main student venues for information retrieval in support of course work. From the first academic term, faculty met regularly to evaluate course syllabi and course materials to determine if they met course objectives and program goals and recommended changes, as needed. This model of faculty and staff involvement in developing and monitoring the programs of the Graduate School continues as we enter our fifth year. This model has extended to include the research and service programs of the institution (Faculty Meeting Minutes; COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

As mentioned in several previous Standards, the participation by all full time faculty members in the COW gives them a voice in every major decision affecting the Graduate School.

Since the success of the Graduate School relies on a high level of collaboration by qualified and restorative faculty and staff, great care is devoted to their selection, support, and evaluation.

Selection of Qualified Faculty
In addition to traditional academic qualifications (e.g., terminal degree, previous successful higher education experience), the IIRP evaluates faculty candidates on their perceived openness to the mission and goals and their potential to support the same. A process has been created that recognizes the uniqueness of restorative practices as a new area of study in academia. To begin with, the job description for faculty includes language specific to restorative practices, and the interview process educates potential faculty members about working in a restorative educational institution and their roles and responsibilities, should they be hired. Once candidates are identified by consultation among the President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, a phone interview between the candidate and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs takes place so that further information and clarification can be shared. Prior to personal interviews, finalists are asked for a one-page response to the mission, vision, and educational philosophy. The interview introduces the candidate to a wide membership of the Graduate School community and is conducted following the restorative principles of fair process, engagement, and transparency. Since this hiring process was
implemented in 2007, the faculty has experienced no turnover (Advertisement for Faculty Position and Faculty Selection Process, Documents Room).

New faculty members participate in an orientation that includes acknowledgment of receipt of the Organizational Manual (Documents Room) and the Faculty Handbook (Appendix E). These manuals outline institutional standards and procedures. New faculty observe courses prior to being assigned to teach them and have the opportunity to consult with other faculty members prior to teaching a course themselves. In addition, new faculty are invited to attend noncredit continuing education offerings as a further orientation to the mission. Administrative office support is provided, and faculty are informed of support services available such as photocopying, technical support, and facilities support.

**Lecturers**

Our five lecturers have been selected from the ranks of our most experienced restorative practitioners. They have also been the most distinguished of our early graduates from our program. Lecturers are assigned to teach 500-level courses. They participate fully with faculty in the discussion of academic concerns, and they serve generally under the supervision of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. To date, the retention rate for lecturers is 100 percent; all lecturers are paid per course taught.

**Curriculum and Instruction**

Curriculum and instruction are considered to be the purview of the faculty, with administration deferring to the faculty on such matters (Faculty Handbook, Appendix E).

At the inception of the Graduate School, founding faculty worked collaboratively to create program goals, learning outcomes, and objectives for each course (Syllabi, Program Goals, Learning Matrices, Documents Room), all of which are linked with the institution’s mission and goals. Technical and information literacy goals are reflected in course syllabi and were informed by the participation of the Librarian and Communications and Technology. A noteworthy aspect of the Graduate School is that all faculty collectively review changes to learning outcomes and objectives. Faculty bring suggested changes to monthly faculty meetings (Faculty Meeting Minutes, December 2009, Documents Room). If approved, an updated syllabus is presented to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who informs the COW of the changes.

The teaching load for each of the five full-time faculty is 24 credit hours per year. Full-time faculty may be assigned to teach at the Main Campus in Bethlehem or at our two additional locations.

Course Improvement Forms (Documents Room), which are completed by students at the end of each course, are used by the faculty to monitor student input on issues such as course content, level of difficulty and readings. Faculty collectively review these forms at the end of each term. Each faculty member also completes a Student Learning Matrix for each student in each course to determine how well course learning objectives are being met (Learning Matrices Report, Documents Room). For a full explanation of Student Learning Matrices, see Standard 11. Additionally, faculty have established benchmarks for all indicators on the Course Improvement Forms (Benchmarks for Course Improvement, Documents Room).
**Instructional Support Staff**

The library was created simultaneously with course development for the degree programs. Consequently, the Librarian selected the library resources specifically to support course work in the two master’s degree programs. The Librarian provides in-class instruction as needed and offers individual support to students in person, or via email or telephone. She has also created tip sheets covering topics such as using specific resources for assignments, and an online tutorial on using the library in general.

Communications and Technology worked with the Librarian to create the library’s webpage and to maintain laptops for library use. Communications and Technology also created portable technology kits for faculty with all the materials necessary to support a daylong class. Items in each kit include a projector, DVD player, necessary adaptor cords, speakers, and electronic pointers. Each faculty member is provided with a laptop computer, printer/scanner/copier, cell phone, internet access, and technical support for their home offices. Audiovisual kits and computers are updated as needed. Additionally, faculty is fully supported by Communications and Technology in the use of hardware and software programs. With the addition of Moodle, an electronic course management system, in Spring 2010, Communications and Technology provided initial instruction and continuing support in its use.

The Registrar and Dean of Students/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs offer some initial guidance to students in course selection by providing information and answering preliminary questions. They perform degree audits for matriculated students to keep them apprised of their progress toward graduation. The Dean of Students acts as the advisor for all non-matriculated students and meets with them as needed to discuss their instructional or support needs.

Training and Consulting supports the instructional mission of the Graduate School by offering non-credit continuing education opportunities about restorative practices and its application. Attendees are also potential graduate students. The “How You Heard About Us Report” showing responses for AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10 indicates 29 of 143 (20.3%) responses, and 23 of 126 (18.3%) responses were that students heard about the Graduate School because of a training.

**Supporting Research: Faculty**

As the most critical part of our new Graduate School, creating and assessing our curricula were the most important jobs of our founding faculty. Since 2005, the founding faculty and their successors have been deeply involved in the process of creating the institution, planning its development, and assessing its growth. All five of them have been major contributors to the Strategic Plan (Appendix C) and to all of our assessment efforts leading to the Self-Study Report. This has been virtually a half-time job for them. We expect that if we achieve accreditation, our faculty will enthusiastically take part in researching and disseminating the work of restorative practices.

The IIRP is aware of the importance of the balance between teaching, research, and service (Organizational Manual, Documents Room; Faculty Handbook (Appendix E)) and has taken steps to support research efforts. A research committee consisting of representatives from the faculty and Training and Consulting has been established to identify research opportunities, to
develop evaluation tools to help institutions and individuals to reflect on their level of success in implementing restorative practices, and to prepare evaluation forms for the continuing education courses offered by Training and Consulting.

An Institutional Review Board has been formed that includes two professors, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and two members from outside academic institutions. The committee developed IRB forms (Documents Room) for the graduate school to be used for different types of research involving human subjects (Faculty Meeting Minutes, November 2009, Documents Room). Faculty piloted the forms, reviewed their use, and made the forms available through Moodle, where applicable. The forms were first used by students who were undertaking research projects in Fall 2009. In addition, faculty and lecturers earned certificates of completion from the National Institute of Health for their web-based training course entitled “Protecting Human Research Participants” (Certificates of Completion from NIH, Documents Room).

Faculty also recognize the importance of encouraging students to become involved in research at the graduate level. Currently, students completing a master’s degree are required to conduct at least two action research projects prior to graduation. Students are further encouraged to publish the results of their course research projects in the Restorative Practices eForum, an email information service distributed worldwide to over 17,000 subscribers, (e-Forum articles by students Deanna Webb, Kate Shapero, Mary Izabele Pautz, Documents Room). A recent result of this effort includes a research note of a former graduate (Deanna Webb, MRPE, 2009) to be published in the Restorative Practices eForum and also used in a forthcoming academic publication entitled, Changing Behaviour in School: Relationships and Wellbeing; Roffey, S., Sage Publications (2010).

Notwithstanding the obligations and commitments of all faculty to the process of creation and accreditation, our faculty have not been absent from the activities of scholarly research and presentation. In AY 2008/09, full-time faculty attended nine conferences and workshops, presented at one conference and seven community events, and had articles appear in two publications. In AY 2009/10, faculty attended 22 conferences and workshops, and presented at 12 conferences and one community event. The Faculty presentations at the conferences and community events included the following (Faculty Activity Report 2008/09, 2009/10, Documents Room):

- International Restorative Justice Conference, Oaxaca, Mexico
- Middle Atlantic State Correctional Association Conference, Annapolis, Maryland
- International Law and Society Association Conference, Chicago, Illinois
- Israeli Law and Society Annual Conference, Tel-Aviv, Israel
- The 12th World Conference of the International Institute for Restorative Practices, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania
- University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Montgomery County Office of Children and Youth, Norristown, Pennsylvania
The Support of Administrative Staff for Faculty Research
When appropriate, the administration reduces teaching workloads to enable faculty to become more involved in research, publication, or service (Course Schedules, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). The Librarian has surveyed faculty on their anticipated resource needs as they begin to create or return to their research agendas. Communications and Technology has assisted with the acquisition of software programs (e.g., SPSS) for faculty research and Communications and Technology provides technological support, as needed. The communications unit of Communications and Technology helps to identify potential publication venues for faculty and provides pre-publication assistance (e.g., editing, proofreading) (Email from Laura Mirsky regarding deadlines for publication, Documents Room).

Participation of Faculty and Staff in Supporting Service
Full-time faculty participate in almost every committee comprising the Graduate School. In addition to service through their own faculty meetings in reviewing assessment results, initiating course syllabi changes, setting benchmarks, and discussing academic rigor, faculty currently serve on one or more of the following: the COW, the Assessment Committee, the IRB, the Admissions Committee, and the Middle States Steering Committee (Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). Two have served as chairs for the Middle States working groups. Faculty are non-voting members of the standing committees of the Board (Board of Trustee Members and Committee Assignments, Documents Room).

Many administrative staff serve on committees as well, including the COW, the Middle States Steering Committee, Middle States Working Groups, the Admissions Committee, the Assessment Committee, and the Research Committee (Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). They also have attended faculty meetings when relevant (Faculty Meeting Minutes, Documents Room).

Institutional Support for Faculty and Staff
Once hired, new faculty are oriented by meeting regularly with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to review progress. Before undertaking teaching responsibilities, all faculty including lecturers, have the opportunity to observe current faculty in the classroom. The annual evaluation also provides an opportunity for the Vice President for Academic Affairs to survey faculty regarding desired supports for the coming school year.

Academic Freedom – The IIRP adheres to the statement on academic freedom endorsed by the American Association of University Professors. This statement assures faculty independence in the conduct of research and its publication in teaching and as citizens.

Faculty Rank – The founding faculty voted unanimously to seek neither tenure nor rank. Each carried the title of Professor. In June 2009, the faculty once again voted unanimously not to have tenure, but to have a system of ranks. After a discussion between the faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, a joint policy was agreed upon (Faculty Meeting Minutes, November 2009, Documents Room). The COW recommended the policy to the President, and the President recommended it to the Board. In June 2010, new ranks were established for lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor (Trustee Meeting Minutes, June 2010, Documents Room).
Academic Advisory Committee – Since the faculty is small in number, the administration created an Academic Advisory Committee in 2007 comprised of three faculty members from other higher education institutions who provide support and consultation. The Academic Advisory Committee has offered input on faculty rank and created an academic definition of restorative practices to establish it within traditional disciplines (Academic Advisory Committee Members List, Documents Room).

Budgetary Support – Budget Meeting Minutes for Instruction (February 2009, Documents Room) indicate that the Director of Finance attended and surveyed faculty about their needs for the following academic year. Faculty Meeting Minutes (March 2009, Documents Room) document that faculty were asked to create a 2009-12 budget that identifies goals and objectives. Faculty Meeting Minutes (October 2009, Documents Room) document a discussion of budgetary allowances for professional memberships. In June 2010, $300 per year was allotted to each faculty member for that purpose. Faculty also receive transportation reimbursement for travel to and from additional locations.

Faculty are expected to be aware of new research and developments related to their field and are encouraged to participate in conferences, seminars, and workshops. The current budgetary allowance of $10,000 a year supports this participation as a resource pool (Multi-year Budgets, Documents Room). Attendance at professional development events is followed by an evaluation of the event by the attendee, which is added to individual personnel files (Conference Assessment Forms, Documents Room).

Upon hire, administrative staff are provided support through regular individual meetings with a designated supervisor, in-house trainings, teambuilding activities, an annual evaluation, and opportunities to acquire additional training and professional development through attendance at workshops and conferences. Any administrator in a supervisory capacity receives management and supervision training including a specific orientation training for new supervisors, documents including Guidelines for Supervisors and Basic Concepts for Supervisors, and attend directors and coordinators meetings, which include supervision issues.

Departmental budget line items include financial support for training, workshops, and conferences for staff. Attendance at professional development events is followed by an evaluation of the event by the staff member, which is added to individual personnel files.

Evaluation of Faculty
After consultation among the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the faculty, and the President, two documents were prepared and accepted as policy in the evaluation of faculty. The first is entitled, “The Evaluation of Faculty in the IIRP Graduate School,” and lists the three traditional areas of teaching, research, and service as the integral part of a faculty member’s performance evaluation. In addition, the Graduate School is driven by its mission. Consequently, faculty created a list entitled, “Restorative Standards for Faculty Evaluation.” This, too, is critical in the understanding of a faculty person’s performance in his or her many roles. The Vice President for Academic Affairs, together with the Associate Dean, meets each year with each faculty member and lecturer to discuss that person’s performance evaluation using both of these tools. Faculty
are encouraged to bring any problems or obstacles they face into that discussion, and the administrators give candid and constructive feedback. The end result is an agreement on one or two major objectives for that person in the coming year. Both the Vice President and the faculty members realize that this set of agreed upon objectives is insufficient in length to accommodate a faculty person’s research interest, which might extend over some years. Therefore, we are currently having discussions aimed at finding an efficient way of reaching multiyear objectives.

While faculty evaluations are confidential, the process itself demonstrates that annually, faculty are held to account for individual professional growth activities, and that an expectation exists that faculty pursue professional growth. At this time, no policy exists that outlines professional development expectations; however, in the future, a policy will be developed to address this provision. The Faculty Handbook (Appendix E) clearly documents the expectations, roles, and responsibilities for faculty with regard to excellence and professional growth. Faculty Conference/Training Forms document attendance and value of workshops and conferences (Conference Assessment Forms, Documents Room). Course Improvement Forms, Student Surveys: Second Year Surveys, Exit Surveys, Discontinuing Student Surveys, and Alumni Surveys (Documents Room) are all reviewed annually and help inform faculty self-evaluation.

Lecturers are welcomed to particulate fully in all faculty meetings. All the curricular issues are open to their comment and suggestion. Lecturers are evaluated annually by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The expectations for them as far as faculty teaching and the characteristics of teaching in a restorative milieu are the same as those of full-time faculty. However, expectations for research and service for lecturers are considerably lower than those for teaching effectiveness.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**

1. Faculty and lecturer selection, orientation, and evaluation are designed to encourage restorative practices in our Graduate School. Further, communications between full-time faculty and lecturers are strong.

2. Faculty have an unusually strong voice in the whole curricula of our Graduate School. Further, the participation of all full time faculty members on the COW gives them a voice on every matter of substance at the IIRP.

3. Each step in the creation of the Graduate School has been made only by the close cooperation of faculty and staff at each stage of our development.

4. The growth of the library over the past four years represents a concerted effort on the part of our Librarian and a responsive administration to create a viable educational resource for a unique student body studying a relatively new field. The progress made in a comparatively short period of time indicates a shared commitment to offer students and faculty the most current technology and access to information, especially about restorative practices.
Challenges
1. The Committee of the Whole places all faculty and the senior administrators of the institution in one body to deliberate all of the important issues of the institution. This important collaboration cannot be allowed to fractionate as we grow in numbers and complexity.
2. As the work on initial accreditation is completed, faculty will be more available to attend to their research interests. However, we do not yet have a shared understanding among Graduate School constituencies of what the expectations for that research are.
3. Unless the broad, shared consensus and communication between our full-time faculty and lecturers is continually maintained, it could erode.

Recommendations
1. The Committee of the Whole should assess itself yearly to maintain its collaborative and restorative goals.
2. The faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs need to work collaboratively to identify multiyear research goals for each faculty person, to create a professional development plan for each person, and to have a clearer shared understanding of the quality and quantity of research in which we are all interested.
3. The full-time faculty, together with the lecturers, have a clear leading role in the development and assessment of our curriculum. We need to look for ways to expand and nurture this system of shared objectives.
STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

“The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.”

Introduction
As the first graduate school in the world devoted solely to restorative practices, our founding faculty had no other established benchmark curriculum from which to proceed in creating our first curriculum. Fortunately, the founding faculty, who were educators in other disciplines or practitioners in restorative practices, were intimately involved in translating the mission of the school into its first curricula. They brought their combined knowledge and experience to the task of creating the course syllabi to teach students sequentially how to become restorative scholar practitioners by learning the history of the field, acquiring and practicing the necessary skills, and reflecting regularly on how their new knowledge would affect their future practice.

New faculty hires have strengthened the IIRP’s ability to assess whether or not the school is achieving the learning outcomes and objectives it intended, both because new faculty are fully involved in evaluating learning outcomes and program goals and because of the particular specialties they bring to the process such as recent experience in quantitative research.

All courses were created with identified goals and objectives related to the programs and are evaluated accordingly each term against specific learning goals and objectives including information literacy. Program goals, which tie to the institutional goals, are evaluated in an annual Program Goals Report (Documents Room). Learning outcomes and objectives are made known to students in a variety of formats so that they may understand and chart their progress. Library and technical support exist to help students achieve their goals and to ensure that technical proficiency and the information literacy goals of the programs are also met.

Linking Mission, Institutional Goals, Program Goals, and Learning Outcomes
The Graduate School offers two master’s degree programs in the field of restorative practices in accordance with the institution’s dedication “to the advanced education of professionals at the graduate level and to the conduct of research that can develop the growing field of restorative practices, with the goal of positively influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society throughout the world” (Mission Statement, Documents Room). Each program offers very prescribed curricula, and elective courses are currently not offered.

As described in the “Framework for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment” section of the institution’s Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Appendix B):

In the development of the current curricula, the faculty defined program goals … for each of the two master’s degree programs … Each course was developed to fulfill the program goals with learning objectives that are matched to specific learning outcomes that articulate the expectations for each objective.
These outcomes provide direction for all instructional activity, inform students about the intentions of the faculty, and form the basis for assessment at the course, program and institutional levels. With clear and measurable statements of learning outcomes for student performance, a coherent curriculum emerged that remains a work in progress as it is informed by and refined as the result of previous assessments.

The goals of each degree program guide the development of course syllabi, learning objectives, and learning outcomes and are explicitly linked to the institutional mission and goals.

Each course objective helps to fulfill a specific program goal and is matched with one or more measurable student learning outcomes, which represent the expectation for each student’s performance in each class.

Faculty review the learning outcomes for all courses annually. Faculty meeting minutes from July 2009, for example, state that the faculty completed updating all of the 500-level courses, including course descriptions, learning objectives, learning outcomes, and required and suggested reading. Faculty reviewed and updated all 600-level courses at their December 2009 meeting (Faculty Meeting Minutes, July 2009, December 2009, Documents Room).

The linked program goals, learning objectives, and learning outcomes combine to form the Student Learning Matrix for each course. In addition, each learning objective is linked to a specific institutional goal, which is linked to the institutional mission (Learning Matrix Sample, Documents Room).

Using this framework, “…faculty guide their students toward attaining the learning outcomes for each course. By evaluating student performance through these activities, faculty provide the fundamental mechanism for assessment simply by carrying out their normal task of grading” (Comprehensive Assessment Plan, Appendix B). Faculty evaluate and assign percentages for every student on their ability to perform selected learning outcomes, based on a variety of activities such as written exams, writing assignments, presentations, and class participation.

Every academic year a Program Goals Report (Documents Room) is generated that evaluates graduates in terms of achievement of program goals. As a new school, the IIRP has thus far generated two reports on the achievement of program goals for AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10 (See Tables 1 and 2, below). The outcomes indicate that the Graduate School is achieving its program goals, and thus, its mission. Table 1 and Table 2 show averages of all students’ achievements for all learning outcomes measured. Initial generation of this report identified variations in how matrices were calculated by faculty. This issue has been rectified so that matrices are now administered consistently.
Table 1: Achievement of Program Goals for the Master of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal</th>
<th>AY 2008/09 n=4</th>
<th>AY 2009/10 n=11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verify knowledge and skill in restorative processes, from basic to advanced and from informal to formal, in crisis situations in long-term counseling.</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate the history, philosophy, theory and significant research about restorative practices and apply it appropriately depending on counseling context.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply strategies for self-evaluation and professional growth in a variety of increasingly complex situations.</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critique approaches to counseling that empower young people to take responsibility for their choices.</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply and evaluate contemporary counseling practices and theories.</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify problems experienced by young people and their families and determine an effective and efficient counseling approach.</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate proficiencies in technological capabilities and information literacy appropriate to the graduate study of restorative practices.</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Achievement of Program Goals for the Master of Restorative Practices and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal</th>
<th>AY 2008/09 N=4</th>
<th>AY 2009/10 n=2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verify knowledge and skill in restorative processes, from basic to advanced and from informal to formal within varied educational settings.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze and evaluate history, philosophy, theory and significant research about restorative practices and apply it appropriately in various educational settings.</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>89.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply strategies for self-evaluation and professional growth in a variety of teaching environments.</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and apply strategies to teaching that empowers students to take responsibility for their choices.</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply and evaluate contemporary educational practices and theories.</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify problems experienced by students and their families that are barriers to learning and propose solutions.</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate proficiencies in technological capabilities and information literacy appropriate to the graduate study of restorative practices.</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Content and Rigor
The Graduate School has not yet agreed upon reliable measures of academic rigor. We will begin to respond to that challenge in AY 2010/11 by reengaging with our Academic Advisory Committee. They are three senior and respected social science professors. With their help, we will conduct an outside assessment of our curriculum’s academic strengths and weaknesses.

Graduate courses are offered at three locations: Bethlehem, PA; Woodlyn, PA; and Lansdale, PA. All provide the same quality of teaching, administrative support, and evaluation. In the additional locations at Woodlyn, PA and Lansdale, PA, only 500-level courses are offered, with the same syllabi, goals, and learning outcomes (Course Improvement Form, Aggregate Special Report for Self-Study sorted by Term By Location, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). All assessment processes used at the Bethlehem campus are used at the additional locations. A review of this report (Report by Location/Term, Documents Room) indicates courses are scheduled so that students may complete either master’s degree in one academic year if they begin their coursework in July (FastTrack option). The FastTrack option is purely a function of class scheduling; there is no difference in course work, expectations, or assessment.

Students provide feedback regarding academic content and rigor—as well as organization, discussion, lectures/presentations, faculty attitude toward students, course materials, in-class activities, and assignments and testing—through the Course Improvement Form, which is distributed to every student at the end of every course (Course Improvement Forms, Documents Room). Faculty review aggregate reports from these forms at the end of every term to assess student perceptions of courses and help determine whether changes are needed.

An example of how this review process was used to assess academic content and rigor and make appropriate changes occurred with the dual-listed research course (YC 610/ED 611). Three questions on this survey are directly related to assessing rigor:

- How heavy/light is the workload for this course compared with other courses taken recently? (Answer options: much lighter, lighter, about the same, heavier, much heavier)
- How is the pace in this course? (Answer options: too slow, a bit slow, just right, a bit fast, too fast)
- How challenging do you find this course? (Answer options: too easy, a bit easy, just right, a bit difficult, too difficult)

When faculty reviewed the aggregated responses regarding the research course in 2009, they noticed results not in line with expectations. As documented in December 2009 faculty meeting minutes (Documents Room), the course was deemed to be more appropriate for a doctoral level program. Faculty decided to change the course so that it would be geared more towards students becoming informed consumers of research. Accordingly, faculty made changes to the course learning outcomes and objectives to create a course that better suited the program and mission goals.
Student Surveys
In addition to the Course Improvement Forms (Documents Room), four other student survey instruments have indicators regarding academic content and rigor: Second Year Student Surveys, Aggregate Results, AYs 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10; Student Exit Surveys, Aggregate Results, AYs 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10; Alumni Survey Results, AYs 2008/09, 2009/10; and Discontinuing Student Survey, Aggregate Results, AYs 2007/08, 2008/09, 2009/10 (Documents Room). At the conclusion of each term, faculty review these surveys and report to the COW. With the COW and the President, the data are evaluated, and appropriate changes are made (COW Meeting Minutes, June 2008, October 2008, February 2009, April 2009, June 2009, October, 2009, February, 2010, June 2010, Documents Room).

The Second Year Student Survey, Student Exit Survey, and Alumni Survey ask similar questions regarding academic content and rigor. The AY 2008/09 aggregate results show that 94 to 100 percent of students were satisfied or very satisfied; or agreed or strongly agreed that courses were challenging, stimulating, and valuable and were satisfied with the quality of the academic program (Student Surveys, Documents Room).

As of the end of the Winter Term 2010, 26 “F” grades were issued to students, who were thus disqualified from continuing graduate studies. Of the 26, 21 occurred in the introductory classes and two in a 600-level course. Two students had received two C’s, another potential disqualifier from our programs. Of these two students, one has retaken a course – the necessary requirement for continuation in the program. In her second attempt, the student earned a B and is able to continue at the Graduate School. The other student enrolled in the Fall 2010 term to retake a course.

Faculty and the COW review Grade Reports at the end of each term to determine if there are patterns or issues that need to be addressed (Grade Reports, February 2010, Documents Room).

Student Awareness and Understanding of the Learning Experience
The Graduate School recognizes that its students are primarily adult learners with different needs from undergraduates attending residential schools. For example, when reviewing initial class enrollments and surveys, these indicated that students would take courses if they were in more convenient locations. As a result, the IIRP added sections of 500-level courses to locations in Woodlyn, PA and Lansdale, PA. Recognizing that many of our students were returning to school years after earning undergraduate degrees, academic support services were identified in areas such as computer literacy, research and writing, and mathematics and statistics, and made known to students through their course instructors and library handouts (Academic Support Services Listing, Documents Room).

The library was created with a focus on electronic resources accessible through a webpage to ensure students could obtain materials necessary to complete course work without having to travel to Bethlehem. Information on parking, restaurants, lodging, transportation, and travel directions are provided on the website.

Graduate students, as adult learners, are made aware of the institutional goals, program goals, and learning outcomes. Beginning with the admissions process, program goals for each degree
are available on the webpage (Master’s Degree Programs (http://www.iirp.org/master_degree_programs.php and One Year Fast Track http://www.iirp.org/fast_track.php), both print and online formats (Appendix F). The Dean of Students/Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is available to discuss the programs with prospective students to assist them in identifying the more appropriate degree based on their educational objectives.

Once enrolled in the introductory course, Basic Restorative Processes (YC/ED 500 or 501), one of the learning objectives is that students understand the mission and goals, and a learning outcome for that course is that students can describe them.

In each course, students receive syllabi that clearly identify each course’s learning objectives and learning outcomes (Course Syllabi, Documents Room). For Spring 2009-10, none of the 125 respondents in any of the 501 classes reported that course objectives were unclear; two of 61 (3.3%) respondents in all 530 classes reported that course objectives were unclear. The daylong classes are structured to include different learning styles (e.g., interactive learning, small group work, large group work, individual work, lectures, peer exchange of ideas and experience, etc); to create awareness of learning by noting beginning and ending perspectives (e.g., check-in and check-out in each class); to respect and allow learners to enrich each other’s experiences through group work and shared experiences, for example; and to provide adult learners the opportunity to incorporate their professional and personal experience into the course experience (e.g., through action research projects).

Students are also asked to write a reflection paper for each of the courses they take since research shows that critical reflection helps adult learners raise their awareness of motive, intention, and practice and hence can cause them to reframe their initial assumptions (Brookfield, 1995; Palmer 2007). Through reflection, adult students can raise their self-awareness and integrate learned theories with their own experiences. The final course in both degree programs requires completion of an analytical and reflective paper entitled “Mapping Your Restorative Journey,” in which students must analyze and reflect on their individual progress throughout the program and formulate a plan for future action that ensures the continued implementation of restorative practices in their professional lives.

Finally, Course Improvement Forms and student surveys assess what students thought contributed to or hindered their learning and allow faculty to evaluate the change which had occurred in students’ knowledge and critical thinking skills from the time they entered the program to the time they exited. By practicing critical reflection, participating in a range of classroom experiences, and applying new learning to real-life scenarios, students are supported in taking ownership of their own learning.

Degree audits are performed by the Registrar, Assistant Registrar, and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs for all matriculated students to verify individual progress towards the completion of their degrees. Students are informed of the audit results that indicate which requirements are unfulfilled and alert them to any special considerations (e.g., a required course being offered only in the Fall term). In addition to an email notification (Email Sample from Registrar, Documents Room) requiring verification of receipt, the results of degree audits are
also made available on Student Portals. Students have access to their individual student records through an electronic, password-protected portal that allows them to keep track of course completion and grade results, and, in the admission stage, to determine if all application materials have been received.

**Library and Technical Support of Learning Outcomes Including Information Literacy**

The library supports students in achieving their educational goals by providing resources to help them successfully complete their course assignments. This includes a physical collection of books, journals, and other resources devoted to restorative practices for on-site use at 531 Main Street; an electronic collection via the library’s webpage that includes the catalog, subject databases, and information literacy standards; and information such as access to other libraries, how to contact the Librarian, and for academic writing. Resources were selected by the Librarian in collaboration with faculty specifically to support the graduate courses. For example, following faculty review of content (Sample Faculty Content Review, Documents Room), SocINDEX, a subscription database, was selected as the most appropriate academic database to cover disciplines related to restorative practices. Instruction in using information resources includes an online video on how to find books, articles, and other materials, class instruction by the Librarian when requested, tip sheets for specific assignments (SocINDEX Tip Sheet, Documents Room), and personal assistance via phone, email, or in person, either during regular library hours or by appointment. Information literacy goals were woven into the course syllabi when they were created, ensuring that students graduate able to locate, analyze, and use information appropriately; the successful completion of course assignments ensures information literacy goals are being met. This process of ensuring that information literacy standards are being met has been in place since the first courses were offered. However, the process has not been formally reviewed. The Librarian and faculty should review the information literacy standards regularly to maintain awareness of this component of the curriculum and their place in the student learning matrix and to identify new opportunities to enhance information literacy learning whenever the curriculum changes.

Membership in consortia and resource sharing supplement the library’s collections and services. Locally, through letters of understanding, students have access to library resources at Lehigh University, Moravian College, Rutgers University, Temple University, and the schools of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (Letters of Understanding, Documents Room). WorldCat provides access to library catalogs worldwide and gives students the ability to search by zip code to locate libraries closest to them for the specific material they require. The Pennsylvania State University Interlibrary Loan System supplies journal articles for those periodicals that our library collections do not include. Membership in LYRASIS, a library consortium and educational organization, provides group rates for the purchase of information resources and opportunities for library staff continuing education.

The Librarian attends faculty meetings to stay attuned to any changes in curriculum that might require additional or different library resources and to assist faculty in identifying specific resources. Faculty review publication catalogs each term to suggest library purchases, and a link on the library webpage offers students the opportunity to suggest acquisitions for the Librarian’s consideration.
Current assessment tools of the library’s effectiveness in providing appropriate support to students include Second Year Student Survey and Student Exit Survey questions about library use and library resources (Second Year Student Surveys, Student Exit Surveys, Documents Room). For AY 2009/10, respondents reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with the ease of obtaining information both on-site (92.9%) and online (85%); with access to electronic resources (80%); with the assistance received in person, by phone, or email (100%); and with library holdings (94.7%). The Librarian also led the faculty through an evaluation of the library’s webpage in Spring 2010 in which they expressed satisfaction with the resources provided on the webpage and offered suggestions for additions (Annual Unit Assessment Report- Library, Objective #2, Documents Room).

The library’s development is addressed in the Library Plan (Documents Room) that focuses on the long-term objective of creating a mostly electronic library so that it may serve its patrons in a variety of formats without being place-specific. The Library Plan, which contains identified goals and deadlines, is reviewed annually during the budget process. The Librarian also reviews usage statistics each term to evaluate how often and how well students are using online resources (e.g., SocINDEX, IIRP Catalog) and collects daily statistics on library usage via email, phone, and in-person to help identify and plan for future needs (Library Usage Statistics by Term, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). A new statistics collection system called READ was implemented in Spring 2010 that itemizes types of assistance (e.g., basic instruction, APA citation assistance, ILL Complex search help, material retrieval) to further aid in future planning.

While enrolled in courses at the Graduate School, students must become technologically proficient, if not already, in the use of email, the internet, word processing, database searching, and the school’s electronic course management system, Moodle. Any entering student with limited computing or technological proficiencies is offered support through the library to ensure that any inadequacy is addressed promptly and does not present an impediment to their progress. No formal analysis of skill level for entering students is in place because enrollment is currently small enough that inadequacies can be identified on an individual basis. In the Entering Student Surveys for AY 2009/10, 95.8 percent of students report they were somewhat or very confident in their computer skills (Entering Student Surveys, Aggregate Results, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**

1. Our data indicate that our adult learners are achieving the program goals in their course of study.
2. The Learning Matrices are an effective tool for assessing student learning as well as achievement of the institutional mission and goals because they directly link student performance to learning outcomes, which have been linked to program goals and institutional goals.
3. Our electronic library provides a viable educational resource for a unique student body studying a new academic field.
Challenges
1. Library services must be regularly evaluated to assure that they are meeting changing student needs.
2. The course offerings in our two existing programs are prescribed. They offer no electives or the opportunity to interchange program parts.
3. We must reengage with our Academic Advisory Committee to create an assessment of the academic rigor of our academic programs.

Recommendations
1. Persist in our assessment of students’ library needs and take adaptive measures.
2. We need to create additional course offerings and perhaps a third program in order to increase the academic offerings for our graduate students.
3. The Librarian and faculty should identify a means to review the information literacy standards to ensure they are reflected in the student learning matrices and in any changes to the curriculum.
4. Start the process of reengagement with our Academic Advisory Committee in AY 2010/11.
“The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.”

While the focus of general education is largely a concern of undergraduate education, our graduate school acknowledges its importance in our admissions requirements. We admit baccalaureate holders from regionally accredited institutions, so they have met general education criteria in achieving their degrees (Admissions Policy, Documents Room).
STANDARD 13: RELATED EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

“The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.”

Introduction
The Graduate School offers a Certificate Program and non-credit offerings that are consistent with and further its mission by educating a growing number of professionals in the field of restorative practices. The Certificate Program is part of the curricular offerings of the school and provides education in the foundations of restorative practices to those individuals who are not able to or interested in pursuing a master’s degree. Non-credit offerings in the form of trainings conducted by Training and Consulting provide professionals in the fields of education, criminal justice, and social services with an introduction to and training in restorative practices.

Certificate Program
Up until February 2010 the IIRP offered a 12-credit non-degree Graduate Certificate in Restorative Practices. As of the end of AY 2009/10, the Graduate School had awarded 25 graduate certificates. However, in February 2010, we became aware that the United States Department of Education required post-baccalaureate certificates to consist of 18 credits. We immediately suspended new admissions to the Certificate Program but allowed those already enrolled to complete it. In the Fall term of 2010, the faculty worked to create a certificate meeting Federal requirements. We were conscious of the assessment work we had already done and hope to do in the future, so we hoped to make our changes as minimal as possible. The result of our work is this. We will keep the first twelve credits, the first four of our courses, and which were the whole certificate previously, in place. With the consent of their graduate advisor, our adult learners seeking a certificate may take any two additional courses, which they can justify from our existing curricula.

Those seeking the Graduate Certificate must complete the 12 course credits in the Core Curriculum of the master’s degree program. Therefore, all students take the same courses and are evaluated in the same way, regardless of whether they have matriculated, intend to get a certificate, or are simply taking courses for personal and professional development. These processes continue in our Certificate Program.

The three program goals for the Certificate Program were developed concurrently with the program goals for the two master’s degree programs and are identical to the first three program goals of the degree programs. Therefore, Certificate Program goals are evaluated in the same way as the degree program goals, as described in Standard 11. The Certificate Program’s three program goals are directly related to the mission’s dedication to, “the advanced education of professionals at the graduate level” and its first institutional goal to, “educate a growing number of professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthening civil society.”
Non-credit Offerings
The Graduate School has grown out of the IIRP’s role as the leading international training organization in the new field of restorative practices. With affiliates and licensees in 20 nations around the world, the IIRP has provided restorative practices training to tens of thousands of professionals in education, criminal justice, and social and human services.

Training and Consulting advances this role by educating social workers, educators, counselors, and other youth workers in the use of restorative practices via trainings and non-credit offerings. This includes extensive consulting work with organizations locally, nationally, and internationally. In the past three years, more than 2,000 people have attended trainings held at the Main Campus, and Training and Consulting has conducted approximately 500 on-site trainings worldwide over that same time period.

In fulfilling its role, Training and Consulting supports the mission and goals of the IIRP, specifically, the first institutional goal of “educating a growing number of professionals who are capable of applying restorative practices to strengthen civil society.” Because Training and Consulting’s trainings and events attract attendees who might also be interested in the Graduate School offerings, Training and Consulting has become a source for graduate student referrals. The “How You Heard About Us” Report showing responses for AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10 indicates 29 of 143 (20.3%) responses and 23 of 126 (18.3%) responses were that students heard about the Graduate School because of a training. To ensure that Training and Consulting is closely aligned with the Graduate School’s mission and goals, the Director of Training and Consulting reports directly to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; he also is a member of the COW.

Training and Consulting also supports the mission of positively influencing human behavior and strengthening civil society throughout the world by organizing annual World Conferences on restorative practices. To date, 12 conferences have been held. The IIRP had about 1,600 attendees in the last three years at its world conferences in Bethlehem, PA; Toronto, Canada; Budapest, Hungary; and Hull, England, UK. An upcoming conference is scheduled for June 2011 in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Table 1 provides a complete list of World Conference locations, dates and registrants (Conference Information, Documents Room). Faculty members are encouraged to present at these World Conferences, and resources are made available for them to do so.

Table 1: Dates, Locations, and Registrants for the IIRP World Conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference Dates</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Registrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 1998</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1999</td>
<td>Burlington, VT</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2000</td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2002</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2003</td>
<td>Veldhoven, Netherland</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2004</td>
<td>Richmond, BC, Canada</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2005</td>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2005</td>
<td>Manchester, England</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>Bethlehem, PA</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>Budapest, Hungary</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>Bethlehem, PA</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2010</td>
<td>Hull, England, U.K.</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training and Consulting also has 76 licensees worldwide (46 in the U.S.; 30 elsewhere) that provide training events to their constituents. The licensees are enumerated in the List of Licensees (Documents Room). This includes licensees who have translated the trainings and other materials into Dutch, Chinese, Thai, Hebrew, Spanish, Hungarian, and Swedish. Trainings are also conducted by affiliate organizations in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and Hungary.

Historically, Training and Consulting evaluations for trainings measured participant satisfaction without being tied to learning outcomes. Through the Commission self-study process, the need for a more comprehensive evaluation tied to specific learning outcomes was recognized. As a result, Training and Consulting Plan (Documents Room) now includes an objective to show evidence of self-reported change in thinking and practice of professionals following attendance at a training or event. To facilitate this objective, learning outcomes for trainings were identified, and an assessment survey was designed by faculty and approved by the IIRP Research Committee (Draft for Evaluation of Training Outcomes, September 2010, Documents Room). The use of this survey is being developed in AY 2010/11, and a process is being developed to evaluate this data and provide a feedback loop for institutional improvement.

Training and Consulting has its own operating budget, and quarterly reports are generated on the financial performance of the department. The impact of Training and Consulting is reviewed by faculty and administration in the biannual institution-wide budget meeting and tracked by the Director of Finance (Budget Meeting Minutes, February 2010, Documents Room).

Support staff, equipment, and classroom space are shared with the Graduate School. Training and Consulting events occur on weekdays when classrooms are largely unused. The IIRP rents space for trainings from Buxmont Academy.

**Additional Graduate School Locations**
The principal center for classes is the Main Campus located in Bethlehem, PA. In addition, classes are offered at two other locations – Woodlyn, PA and Lansdale, PA. Additional locations were identified as being more accessible to prospective students. When students were asked in the Entering Student Survey about their preferences with regard to location, the majority of respondents indicated a preference for Lansdale, PA and the Philadelphia, PA, area (Entering Student Surveys, Documents Room). Thus, the two additional locations were chosen to help increase the number of enrolled students.
All faculty, including lecturers, share teaching responsibilities at the Main Campus and the additional locations. Classes at all locations utilize syllabi with the same learning objectives and learning outcomes. Both factors help to ensure that the same standards of quality, rigor, and effectiveness are maintained at all locations.

All courses in all locations are evaluated in the same manner. Course Improvement Forms give immediate feedback on student evaluation of each class. This form provides data on the student’s evaluation of course content, organization, quality of discussion, course materials, class activities, assignments, and testing. The form also addresses the rigor, pace, and quality of learning of each course. Faculty utilize this information to consider changes in resources and/or methodology. Course Improvement Forms indicate similar results among the additional locations (Course Improvement Forms Aggregate YC/ED 501, YC/ED 530, AY 2009-10, Documents Room).

The additional locations were intended to increase enrollment in graduate courses thereby helping fulfill the mission of offering graduate courses in restorative practices. Table 2 indicates the numbers of students enrolled in the additional locations for AY 2009/10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summer 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdale</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlyn</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Bethlehem location also includes students registered for 600-level courses, which are not offered at the other locations because numbers of students matriculated are still too small to offer those classes in additional locations. Only 500-level courses are offered at the additional locations.

Faculty have regular opportunities to ensure that the additional locations provide a comparable environment and similar supports in which to provide instruction. At faculty meetings, faculty review and discuss their needs regarding supplemental or supporting equipment to assist them in teaching assignments (Faculty Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). Additionally, at regular COW meetings and at the annual budgetary meetings, faculty make requests regarding their needs for maximizing classroom effectiveness (COW Meeting Minutes; Budget Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). Results of these requests have included faculty orientations of facilities at other additional locations, enhanced internet connection at additional locations, and the creation of a faculty office in Bethlehem. (Facility Assessment Report, December 2009, Documents Room).
The instructional budget includes allowances for faculty to obtain necessary supports for their operational needs. For example, when faculty experienced inconsistent audio-visual equipment at additional locations, personal AV kits were created that include a projector, speakers, DVD player, necessary cords and connections, and miscellaneous other equipment. Each faculty member has a kit for their personal use, making it possible for them to instruct effectively at any location where they may be assigned to teach. Similarly, all faculty are provided home office equipment including laptops and printer/scanner/copiers, internet connection, cell phones, and technical support of this equipment.

Students at all locations are regularly surveyed for their input regarding the adequacy of facilities, and the results of these surveys are considered on a regular basis. Questions on the Second Year Student Survey, the Student Exit Survey, the Student Alumni Survey, and the Course Improvement Forms (Aggregate Student Surveys, Documents Room) are written to solicit student input about the adequacy of facilities to the students’ needs. The Bethlehem classrooms were recently repainted using a softer color in response to students’ input that the previous wall color was harsh in combination with the overhead fluorescent lights.

**Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal**

**Strengths**

1. A certificate program helps fulfill the institution’s mission by offering an option to students that does not require their commitment to a full degree program.
2. Students attending courses at additional locations get the same faculty, courses, assignments, and learning objectives as those in any other location.
3. Training and Consulting furthers the mission of the IIRP by presenting trainings, events, and hosting an annual international conference which raises the Graduate School’s profile in the larger academic community and also serves as a recruiting vehicle for the Graduate School.

**Challenges**

1. Attract and retain adult learners for the 18-credit Certificate Program.
2. Continue to teach learners at the additional locations with the same concern and rigor as at the Main Campus.
3. Continue to ask Training and Consulting to market the Graduate School and develop more consultant arrangements and more knowledgeable professionals throughout the world.

**Recommendations**

1. In AY 2010/11, faculty and administration will develop an attractive 18-credit Certificate Program and begin to market it in AY 2011/12.
2. Continue to ensure that the rigor of the academic program in additional locations does not vary from place to place.
3. In AY 2010/11, Training and Consulting will create and measure learning objectives for their trainings and events and make necessary adaptations to close the loop.
STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

“Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.”

Introduction
The nature of restorative practices leads people to be reflective practitioners, self aware of professional actions. The people of the new graduate school, therefore, were predisposed towards “managing by facts.” We went further, as the founding faculty spent a year together before our opening, creating curricula, which had embedded within it assessment measures in every course and linked the learning outcomes to one another and to the program. We worked out a thoughtful matrix of these inter-relationships, evaluated every course, every time, made factual judgments and the resulting adaptations. We closed the loop, and we still do that continuously. But that, as we knew after achieving candidacy, was not yet sufficient.

The Graduate School also recognizes that improvement is an ongoing process, both in achieving the highest possible outcome and in maintaining each progressive step along the way. Employees have always been encouraged to consider how to improve the culture and operation of the organization, to identify areas of strength and weakness, and to question how the organization can improve as a whole and support employees in their development. This approach was transferred into creating the Graduate School, but administrators recognized that formal assessment on many levels would be required to meet expectations for a new institution.

That initial commitment to continuing evaluation has been formalized with the creation of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Appendix B), which aims to ensure institutional effectiveness as a whole. The diagram below provides an overview and illustrates how the assessment of student learning outcomes is an integral part of the plan.
The text of the Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Appendix B) identifies timetables, defines assessment instruments and how they are used, and outlines the responsible party or parties for carrying out the various parts of the plan. Student learning outcomes assessment is a key component of this process, with learning outcomes tied to program goals, which in turn are linked to institutional goals and, thus, the mission. Faculty, staff, and administrators have access to the Comprehensive Assessment Plan (Appendix B) via the private website, and everyone participates in assessment at various stages throughout the process.

The Foundation of Student Learning Assessment: The Student Learning Matrix
The founding faculty designed the first curricula, which is still largely intact, with some minor changes and refinements. At the same time, the framework for the Student Learning Matrix was created (Learning Matrices, Documents Room). The Student Learning Matrix, as described in depth in Standard 11, is the primary method for assessing student learning with faculty evaluating students for every course based on course learning objectives and learning outcomes that are tied to program and institutional goals.

A variety of assessment methods provide data that inform the Student Learning Matrix to assess student learning. A review of the learning matrices shows that instructors use written exams, writing assignments, presentations, role plays, cooperative learning activities, class participation, video/audio recordings, and case notes. This variety also addresses the issue of different learning styles.

The Student Learning Matrix includes the following types of assessment tools:
A. Formative and Summative:

- Formative evaluation: Each professor develops assignments that provide formative evaluation throughout the course. For example, some professors ask students to submit weekly reports and receive feedback from the professor, which make it possible for the students to identify and address weaknesses so that improvement is measurable by the end of the course both by the student and instructor. It also allows the professors to adjust the contents or approach as needed.

- Summative evaluation: Each course has specific goals and learning outcomes. The successful completion of course assignments determines whether course goals and learning outcomes are achieved.

B. Direct and Indirect Methods:

- Direct methods of assessment: A variety of different types of assignments are identified for students in syllabi at the beginning of each course such as examinations, term papers, research projects and more. Such assignments assess students learning of the course objectives and outcomes.

- Indirect methods of assessment: Students’ perceptions and opinions about their learning experience for each course are collected through reflection papers, and a Course Improvement Form (Documents Room) that each student completes at the last class meeting. It includes questions such as: “How much do you feel you learned?” This allows faculty to gauge how students view their learning in the course and to report how challenging it was for them.

Formative assessment provides direct and immediate feedback, while the summative assessment provides an end-of-term or course assessment. Using both kinds of tools in combination with direct and indirect methods and triangulation of the resulting data provide feedback about student learning in each course and offer opportunities for faculty to consider any needed changes.

How the Student Learning Matrix is Used

The Student Learning Matrix was designed originally before we opened our doors. The collective action of the faculty, in creating the matrix, was to have a guide in the hierarchical nature of our goals. That is, the objectives of each course must be met and must relate to the goals of the program, and the goals of the program must be met and relate to our institutional goals. The matrix is a sophisticated guide to decision making by the faculty, individually and collectively, as they closed the loop on student course evaluation data and make judgments about improvement. The Student Learning Matrix, together with the every course/every time evaluation policy, is a foundation for creating a culture of assessment in teaching and learning. The future addition of faculty and staff to our ranks must be accompanied by efforts to create respect for this foundation in them.
Assessing Student Awareness of Learning Objectives
The Graduate School strives to help students understand their learning experience from the earliest possible encounter with the curriculum to ensure that each student achieves the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary to become a restorative practitioner.

Course syllabi, which students receive at the beginning of every course, clearly detail learning outcomes and objectives. Broader program goals are communicated via the website and the Student Handbook (Appendix F). Student awareness of the course and program learning objectives are measured through Course Improvement Forms and Surveys at regular intervals (Course Improvement Aggregate Results; Second Year Student Surveys, Aggregate Results, AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10; Student Exit Surveys, Aggregate Results, AY 2007/08, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

Course Improvement Forms
Feedback from Course Improvement Forms, completed by students at the end of every course, provide data regarding how effective the information students receive is in setting clear learning objectives. Included are questions about how clear objectives were in each course; whether or not syllabi were helpful; and the relation of activities to course objectives. Analysis suggests that the information is effective and students understand the relationship between learning experiences and learning objectives. For Spring 2009 and 2010, none of the 125 respondents in any of the Basic Restorative Processes classes reported that course objectives were unclear; two of 61 (3.28%) respondents in another 500-level course (YC/ED 530 Foundations for Responding to Harm) reported that course objectives were unclear.

Student Surveys
The Student Second Year Survey and the Student Exit Survey provide general indicators for how students perceive their own learning at two points during their education: at the end of their second year of course work and at the completion of the degree or the certificate program (Student Second Year Survey and Student Exit Survey, Aggregate Results, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

Results from both surveys in both AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10 show that 100 percent of students reported their general knowledge, knowledge of restorative practices, critical thinking skills, and analytical skills were either stronger or much stronger compared with when they first entered the Graduate School. Standards 11 and 13 also include information on these topics.

Program Level Assessment Tools
Program level assessment is created with combined Student Learning Matrices, a final comprehensive exam, and a restorative journey paper and presentation. The exam and restorative journey paper and presentation take place in the capstone course, Final Seminar (YC 660 or ED 661), in both master’s programs.

The restorative journey paper and presentation reflects the culmination for each student of their prior learning experiences in the program. It facilitates an overall assessment of student learning and achievement of institutional and program goals as expressed by the students themselves and quantified by the instructor. In addition, a rubric for measuring the extent to which students
believe they are fulfilling the mission in using restorative practices is administered (Final Seminar Rubric Results, Documents Room).

Each year, faculty create a comprehensive exam for that year’s candidates for graduation. This exam is also administered as part of the capstone course. The course’s instructor and the faculty as a whole review the results and recommend changes. Specific content questions have changed from year to year as a result.

Program Level Assessment employs the following kinds of tools:

Direct Evaluation:

The assessment on the program level is a summative one. The IIRP uses direct quantitative evaluation at the end of the program in the form of a comprehensive examination and a qualitative evaluation with a Mapping Your Restorative Journey assignment in the Final Seminar (YC 600 or ED 661) course. In addition, each of the course objectives and learning outcomes relates to program goals. For graduates in each academic year, a report assessing the program goals and is generated based on students’ learning evaluation conducted throughout their program.

Indirect Evaluation:

Students are asked at intervals to complete a survey assessing different aspects of their academic experience including learning, with a Second Year Survey, a Student Exit Survey when they finish their last course, and an Alumni Survey following graduation (Student Surveys, Documents Room). The information provided through those surveys is used to learn more about how students perceive their studies, but also to follow up on their professional and personal implementation of restorative practices following receipt of their degree.

Aggregated results show that graduates are achieving program goals for both the Master of Restorative Practices and Education and the Master of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling, as well as for the Graduate Certificate in Restorative Practices. Achievement of program goals, which is composed of percentage ratings of achievement of course learning outcomes, is consistently above 88 percent (Program Goals Report, 2008-09, 2009-10, Documents Room).

Alumni Survey results show that more than 95 percent of students who have completed a degree program believed courses were relevant to their professional goals and objectives, there have been opportunities to use what they learned in their professional practice, and they have been able to apply theories and concepts learned to practical problems (Alumni Survey AY 2008/09 and AY 2009/10, Documents Room).

Use of Assessment Data to Enhance Teaching and Learning

The success of the collaboration of the faculty and the COW is easily seen in the use of assessment data to enhance teaching and learning (Faculty Meeting Minutes, COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). This collaboration has been most useful for our new institution. Faculty and the COW regularly review the results of Student Learning Matrices and Program
Goals Reports as well as the methods of student assessment, in order to enhance teaching and learning (Faculty Meeting Minutes; COW Meeting Minutes, October 2008, April 2009, June 2009, October 2009, February 2010, Documents Room). Student Learning Matrices are combined in the Learning Matrices Outcomes and Methods Report (Learning Matrices Report, Documents Room) and reviewed by faculty every term and by the COW twice a year (Faculty Meeting Minutes, COW Meeting Minutes, Documents Room). In addition to monitoring overall achievement of learning outcomes, faculty and the COW examine what methods have been used to assess student learning (e.g., written exams, class participation, writing assignments). The Program Goals Report is reviewed at the end of every academic year. Faculty review syllabi once a year (Faculty Meeting Minutes, July 2009, Documents Room) and collaboratively discuss any changes that will be made, some of which may be informed by assessment results. A review of the minutes of the COW and of the faculty for each year supports these findings in detail (COW Meeting Minutes; Faculty Minutes, Documents Room).

Graduation and Graduation Rates
The Graduate School is a stand-alone institution with no undergraduate program. Its students are exclusively adult learners, who attend on the basis of their work and home life schedules. Of the 89 students who were admitted between August 2006 and June 2009, 46 have graduated. We anticipate about half of the remaining 43 are expected to enroll in the Fall 2010 term towards completion of their degrees.

Graduate Success
Our first class of 14 graduates occurred in June 2008. Future assessment efforts will have to accommodate surveying our alumni after we have significant numbers. However, currently data are collected through the Alumni Survey to help evaluate how relevant the new learning acquired through the master’s degrees were to graduates in achieving their professional goals and objectives (Alumni Surveys, AY 2008/09, AY 2009/10, Documents Room). 100 percent of students in the Class of 2008 either agreed or strongly agreed that courses were relevant to their professional goals and objectives. The Alumni Survey for 2009 (Documents Room) included both the Class of 2009 and the Class of 2008. This number was 95.5 percent. Additionally, 95.5 percent who responded to the 2009 Alumni Survey (Documents Room) agreed or strongly agreed that, “there have been opportunities to use what I learned in my professional practice.”

Strengths, Challenges, and Recommendations for Improvement and Renewal

Strengths
1. The collaboration among faculty and between faculty and other administrations on the Committee of the Whole have lead us to a succession of decisions since we opened our doors, which have been marked by consensus and nearly universal support. We are small and so, perhaps, that facilitates this consensus, but we also believe our commitment to our mission helps us to define this consensus.
2. The evaluation of our student learning at both the course and program levels is facilitated by our use of a wide variety of assessment tools.
3. The Student Learning Matrix acts as a kind of “North Star,” providing a compass to drive decisions about our courses and program goals and their attainment.
4. Our policy of evaluating every course, every time and making appropriate judgments, together with the Student Learning Matrix, enables faculty and Committee of the Whole members to clearly see whether or not the relevant goals and objectives are being met.

5. Student awareness of the learning objectives woven into the course syllabi, measured continuously through Course Improvement Forms and later in Second Year and Student Exit Surveys, helps to ensure that students graduate with the knowledge, skills, and competencies necessary to become restorative practitioners.

Challenges
1. As our Graduate School grows, we must build into new faculty and staff a culture of assessment, which will support the use of the Student Learning Matrix, the Course Improvement Forms, etc., to learn from our process of assessment and make relevant changes.

2. We must find a way to examine alumni success over time. Since our five years of operation have yielded just three graduating classes, it is misleading to generalize about any of them.

Recommendations
1. Create a new employee orientation, which introduces new hires to their work in a culture of assessment.

2. Continue to observe the results of Alumni Survey Results and amend that survey to be given at a later point in time (e.g., three years after graduation).
CONCLUSION

In the Introduction, we made the point that this Report is, among other things, also a story with an arc: it shows us growing from one state of affairs to another. Our 11-year struggle to create a small, but viable and respected institution has been fueled by our commitment to our mission. Ours is certainly not a religious institution, but it is populated by professors, students, staff, and Board members who are committed to restoring relationships in a disconnected world. We believe the understandings, values, and skills to accomplish this restoration can be taught and learned. We are the first Graduate School in the world to be devoted solely to the study and practice of restorative practices. And as we prepared this Report, we discovered, in examining Standard after Standard that we can clearly lay claim to be walking our talk. Over and over, it became plain that all our constituencies are both mission-aware and mission-driven.

The years of work we devoted to building our new Institution virtually from out of the air have seen us move from a small group of idealistic academics and practitioners to a much more savvy, united, and reality-testing group of professionals. An enormous amount of team learning has taken place since we were granted candidacy. We learned the virtues and practices of institution-wide planning and assessment; we installed these processes across the board. We then tied the results to both planning and budgeting. The eventual outcomes have been presented in this document for your judgment. We are proud of them. An unanticipated and valuable benefit to us from all this work is that we have learned that we, too, are accomplished adult learners.

Finally, over these years, we have moved by steps to embracing a culture of assessment. We know that our whole process in the last few years has taught us how to construct our new Graduate School upon the right foundations. We are fully operating in a competitive world. While we have made missteps, almost all of what we have put in place, tested, and adapted has shown us how to “do the right things right.” There is no question that the International Institute for Restorative Practices is fully committed to continuous improvement modalities to grow stronger, bigger, and academically more sophisticated.
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