INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR RESTORATIVE PRACTICES

**INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR RESTORATIVE PRACTICES
SELF-STUDY DESIGN**

Prepared for
The Middle States Commission on Higher Education
May 13, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

As the International Institute for Restorative Practices (IIRP) Graduate School commences its Self-Study for reaccreditation, we are excited about this opportunity to learn more about our institution and to further enhance our culture of planning, assessment, and institutional renewal. Since initial accreditation, we have matured as an institution of higher education, while also facing the challenge of a national decline in graduate school enrollment, particularly among educators, one of our chief markets. In the meantime, the field of restorative practices has been gaining credibility and public acceptance, and the IIRP is positioned as a pioneer and leader in that field, with affiliates, licensed trainers, and other allies across the United States and around the world. In 2012, to better serve our mission in the contemporary higher education environment, we developed a flexible Master of Science in Restorative Practices degree program, accessible to students around the world through hybrid and online learning, with the potential to benefit students from a broader range of professions.

Origins and Background

The International Institute for Restorative Practices is a private, stand-alone, nonprofit graduate school operating in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, which arose from two Pennsylvania social service agencies. In 2000, these two sister agencies, Buxmont Academy and the Community Service Foundation, undertook a new venture, which was to become the world's first graduate school devoted entirely to the teaching, research, and implementation of restorative practices. In June 2006, we were granted a Certificate of Authority to operate as a degree-granting institution by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Education.

Our mission states that we are:

... 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.

As the first graduate school dedicated solely to the transdisciplinary study and application of restorative practices, the IIRP provides an intellectual home for this emerging field, a public face to demonstrate restorative ideas and practices, and a center for scholars and practitioners to share new ideas and expand the boundaries of the field. The establishment of the IIRP Graduate School was the culmination of decades of work in restorative practices by a number of pioneers around the world, among them the IIRP's founders.

The social science of restorative practices has roots in restorative justice, which views crime from the perspective of those directly and indirectly affected by an incident. However, through the integration of perspectives from many fields, this new social science has grown in scope to encompass more than how communities respond to crime. 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. Our faculty and graduate students engage in reflection, scientific inquiry, and academic discussion drawing on theory, as well as their own professional practice and personal experience. Our entire institution is guided by the premise that "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." (For an in-depth explanation of restorative practices, see "Defining Restorative" in Appendix.)

The IIRP's students and supporters include educators, social workers, nurses, human service providers, lawyers, criminal justice professionals, leaders of organizations and faith communities, and others. The field of restorative practices has begun to make an impact on a national level. For example, in 2013 the RAND Corporation invited the IIRP faculty to participate in the first randomized control study for restorative practices as an approach to whole-school change, funded by the National Institutes of Health, with the IIRP faculty and instructors providing consulting and professional development. In 2014, the Department of Justice and Department of Education jointly called for guidelines recommending restorative practices to improve school climates and address the inequities of zero tolerance. Recently, the IIRP announced that it would partner with the Center for Social Organization of Schools at the Johns Hopkins University School of Education on a three-year randomized field-trial evaluation of the IIRP's SaferSanerSchools Whole-School Change Program. The study will include 15 middle and high schools in Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, New York, San Antonio, Baton Rouge, and Washington, D.C. On an international level, the IIRP has trained more than 50,000 professionals from 70 countries, with more than 400 trainers, licensees, and affiliates in 22 countries: Australia, Bermuda, Brazil, Canada, Cayman Islands, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Curaçao, El Salvador, Hungary, Mexico, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Singapore, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom, and the United States. With promotional help from the IIRP, the peer-reviewed *Restorative Justice: An International Journal* (Leuven Institute of Criminology, University of Leuven) debuted in 2013, with President Ted Wachtel serving on its international advisory board. In short, while we are a new, small graduate school, for nearly two decades the organization has been an integral part of a large international movement of restorative practices and restorative justice scholars, policy-makers, and practitioners.

The origins of the IIRP go back to the 1970s. Faced with 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 two youth-serving agencies, the Community Service Foundation and, subsequently, Buxmont Academy (CSF Buxmont), which provide research-proven strategies for reintegrating delinquent and at-risk young people into meaningful community life. More than three decades later, these agencies continue to serve youth in eastern Pennsylvania through day treatment, education, counseling, and residential services, and they have become model programs for the IIRP Graduate School. (These entities do not provide educational services for the IIRP Graduate School.)

President Ted Wachtel is the co-author of *Toughlove* (York, York, & Wachtel, 1982), an influential and popular book that shares the ethos of restorative practices. In the 1990s, the CSF Buxmont staff, as well as like-minded scholars and practitioners elsewhere, embraced a criminal justice innovation called "restorative justice." Restorative justice practices seek to repair the interpersonal harm caused by crime. During the years that followed, parallel developments in social work, education, and organizational management brought new insights to the relational paradigm of restorative justice. IIRP leaders, and others, began to integrate other relational and community-building practices into a new "restorative practices" paradigm. This led to a wealth of innovation and research into more engaging and participatory practices with clients, students, and employees in varied settings. In his 2013 book, *Dreaming of a New Reality*, President Wachtel gives evidence of restorative practices implementation in schools, the justice system, families, higher education, leadership, and community building (Wachtel, 2013).

The IIRP's theory of restorative practices has attracted the interest of professionals from diverse fields and many nations. The IIRP has sponsored 16 international conferences in North

America, Europe, and Australia with the term "restorative practices" describing the common thread across many professional fields. Although our network is global, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, remains the IIRP's international and intellectual hub. Committed professionals come here to study, and then return to their communities and countries, equipped with the knowledge to create programs that are culturally appropriate and sustainable within the framework of their own needs and resources. This accords with our mission to strengthen civil society throughout the world. The IIRP created the "Restorative Works" learning network (restorativeworks.net) to focus on what works in restorative practices, what doesn't, how, and why, and disseminates the "eForum" e-newsletter to 40,000 subscribers around the world.

Because our mission extends to how we work with and treat one another, we utilize the "fair process" decision-making model of engagement, explanation, and expectation clarity (Kim & Mauborgne, 1997). Our "Statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities" articulates our explicit expectations and mutual support for one another as members of a restorative learning community. We do not have representative governance; we have direct governance. The five full-time faculty meet regularly as a faculty with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and are also members of the Committee of the Whole (COW), our highest internal deliberative body. Besides faculty, the COW includes the President, three vice presidents, librarian, and registrar. It is the heart of our approach to governance, in which all stakeholders work *with* one another to make decisions affecting the institution. This body brings all full-time faculty and senior administrators together in one forum, reviewing assessment results, approving policy changes, and advising the President on all critical decisions. The President, when appropriate, shares the COW's decisions with the Board of Trustees. The members of the COW are responsible for executing the COW's decisions throughout the whole institution.

Since the IIRP's inception, we have focused on building a culture of assessment among administration, faculty, and staff and routinely share assessment results across units. The process of the first Self-Study helped us formalize assessment and link it more explicitly to planning, budgeting, and institutional renewal. Assessment is now the norm; it is embedded in our everyday work life. We are collectively using assessment results more consistently, identifying areas of assessment that need improvement, and making thoughtful changes to best serve our mission.

Challenges and Opportunities

At the time of initial accreditation in 2010, the IIRP offered two master's degree programs—the Master of Restorative Practices and Education and the Master of Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling—via in-person classroom instruction, largely at our campus in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. (In 2012, these two programs were renamed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education to Master of Science in Restorative Practices and Education and Master of Science in Restorative Practices and Youth Counseling.) Despite the specialized nature of these degrees, we consistently had professionals enrolling from fields outside of youth counseling and education who found the existing programs beneficial in their work. We recognized that a degree program of a more global nature would better serve our mission.

At the same time, we began charging tuition instead of offering full scholarships. We had been offering full scholarships before we were accredited to attract students. While we feared charging tuition would lead to a drop in enrollment, we thought that drop would be offset by the enrollment of professionals (particularly educators, our primary market) who could take advantage of tuition reimbursement for accredited graduate education from their employers.

This did not turn out to be the case. School districts in Pennsylvania, such as the School District of Philadelphia, were affected by the economic downturn and began laying off staff and

cutting budgets for tuition reimbursement. In Academic Year (AY) 2010-2011, our enrollment began to decline, as too few teachers and counselors were registering for courses to make the Graduate School financially sustainable.

The President, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Vice President for Administration engaged with faculty and staff in discussions regarding the precarious financial position of the institution and the probable need for staffing cuts. The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) requires that we maintain five full-time faculty, although we have insufficient enrollment to justify that number. The five full-time faculty renegotiated their contracts with the institution, with some of them continuing in scaled-back roles while mentoring other faculty who were serving as lecturers. These other faculty were appointed to full-time status, based on their academic qualifications and expertise in restorative practices. Each also has the ability to perform additional functions, such as working with Continuing Education or the IIRP's model programs (CSF Buxmont). Thus we were able to successfully reorganize while meeting PDE's faculty requirement.

Throughout the process, we acted in a restorative manner, just as we seek to do in our everyday work life and as we teach others. We have found that when people are engaged in decisions that affect them, even when they do not like or agree with those decisions, they are more likely to accept and cooperate with the outcome. That proved to be the case in this instance. Because of the five full-time faculty's willingness to renegotiate their contracts, the cooperation of staff, and the administration's agile reorganization—which sadly included laying off several employees—the IIRP Graduate School is still able to serve its mission.

Simultaneously, around the nation, school districts were recognizing the effectiveness of restorative practices in creating better school climates, supported by an expanding body of empirical evidence. Schools were regularly requesting services from our Continuing Education division, and revenues for professional development significantly increased in the same year that graduate school enrollment declined (AY 2010-2011). This growth suggested to us that there was still a strong demand for restorative practices education.

Additionally, we had been receiving inquiries from potential students about opportunities to take online courses at the IIRP. On a national level, online learning was becoming an increasingly prevalent mode of course delivery in higher education. In 2011, 32% of all students in higher education took at least one online course (Allen & Seaman, 2013).

These factors—decreasing enrollment, increasing participation in professional development, and the growth of online learning in higher education—spurred us to take a fresh look at how to sustain an institution dedicated to the emerging social science of restorative practices. Our solution was to achieve a broader geographic reach through a hybrid in-person/online degree program, rather than a local traditional program. In spring 2011, we applied and were approved for distance learning through the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) substantive-change process. In June 2012, we applied for and were approved by PDE to offer a new degree.

In AY 2012-2013, we introduced the Master of Science in Restorative Practices, a flexible program that is relevant to professionals from a broader spectrum of fields, beyond just education and counseling. We developed new courses to expand the breadth and depth of our curriculum for our student body. Hybrid and online electives enable students to work with faculty advisors to personalize a coherent program to match their interests. This new hybrid model allows us to integrate our high-quality professional development experiences with rigorous online coursework. Professional development provides foundational experiences, which can be applied toward graduate credit after the addition of required reading and online

assignments under the direction of our faculty. Interested individuals can first experience restorative practices through events at locations around North America and internationally. Then the student has the option of having those classroom hours of professional development count as seat-time hours toward a related graduate course.

While we did not reach our enrollment goals in AY 2012-2013, two indicators offered some encouragement and reason to hope for a reversal in enrollment trends. First, the total number of credit hours increased 13.5% in AY 2012-2013. Second, 16 new students matriculated in a master's degree program, more than double the combined total from the prior two years (new admissions: 5 in AY 2011-2012; 9 in AY 2010-2011). We believe that the changes we have made to our program will halt the downward trend and allow us to increase enrollment.

The IIRP Graduate School has been evolving in numerous other ways:

- We continue to maintain and enhance a process of continual improvement by embedding planning and assessment throughout the institution.
- We have supported faculty and staff in writing articles for noteworthy publications and journals.
- Faculty have been offering keynote presentations at a growing number of professional and academic conferences.
- We have increased our collaboration and relationships with individuals, organizations, and other higher education institutions nationally and internationally.
- We continue to maintain a competitive graduate tuition rate and offer scholarships, and we now offer a low-interest loan program.

In 2013, we began developing a new Strategic Plan to succeed our 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. Interest was budding in our graduate programs, and restorative practices was gaining national recognition for changing school climates in large, urban school districts. We convened our stakeholders to decide how to best pursue our mission in this new economy.

With the experience of collecting institutional data for seven academic cycles, we are now consistently using assessment results to inform our planning. This has allowed us not only to construct goals that support our mission, but also to create objectives with outcomes that are specific and measurable in tackling such a lofty goal as strengthening civil society. While many of the objectives from our previous strategic plans have long been accomplished, our goal of achieving financial sustainability remains unmet. We decided to reassess our strategy, as well as our resources, to make certain we are able to continue to develop our graduate school at a level that a small institution could sustain with results that a larger community would value.

Planning for the Future

Beginning in the summer of 2013, faculty, administration, and staff were convened for structured conversations that acknowledged strengths, gaps, and weaknesses by focusing on our assets, aspirations, and measurable results. We decided to use the SOAR (strengths, opportunities, aspirations, and results) strategy for strategic planning (Stavros & Hinrichs, 2009). This strengths-based approach aligned with our restorative philosophy better than the SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) approach, which we had used previously. SOAR emphasizes harnessing strengths and articulating aspirations, while assessing weaknesses and threats through the lens of opportunities that we can proactively address.

In addition to the meetings, online surveys invited feedback from trustees, students, and alumni. Constituents reliably pointed to many of the same strengths: being mission-focused in all

of our activities; being agile and adaptable to change; practicing our own restorative principles; treating one another with respect; employing fair process; transparency in our thinking and actions; providing honest feedback for personal and professional growth; and effectively addressing conflict at all levels of the institution. Constituents recognized the opportunities in developing key relationships with other higher education institutions, key opinion leaders, international partners, and community and social-service agencies eager to develop social capital in their communities. Shared aspirations were echoed in advancing our graduate programs, participating in national research to propel this social science forward, and reaching deeper into communities to create more participatory and empowering relationships throughout the world. Results included the need for increased enrollment, financial sustainability, and evidence of the effectiveness of restorative practices, especially in improving school climate and decreasing discipline problems. We took the concordance of these comments from our trustees, faculty, staff, students, and alumni as evidence that (a) we do have a shared vision based on a solid belief in our mission and (b) aspirations and ideas have been cross-fertilizing for continual improvement and dialogue.

In order to enhance the environmental scan in our strategic planning process (a recommendation from our initial Self-Study), throughout the summer of 2013 and into the spring of 2014, we interviewed colleagues regarding trends and opportunities in graduate education. Through these conversations, we discovered that we were maturing as an institution of higher education and that our challenges were quite common: developing rigorous online learning experiences; building enrollment in an increasingly competitive environment; and making the most efficient use of resources. We also recognized that some elements of our restorative culture truly set us apart: our faculty's willingness to collaborate in developing a hybrid and online curriculum; our faculty and staff's readiness to participate in assessment and eagerly share data across units; and our trustees' and leadership's commitment to openly discuss and plan transitions in leadership and staffing.

Our draft of the IIRP Strategic Plan 2014-2019 (which the Committee of the Whole has approved and will forward to the IIRP trustees for approval at their next meeting in spring of 2014) is thus a result of engagement, education, and reflection. This plan directly addresses our greatest challenges of maintaining our commitment to teaching and learning, as well as to our restorative culture, while creating a financially sustainable small graduate school and transitioning leadership as our President and some key leaders retire within the next five years. It also edifies our mission-based resolve to mature as a rigorous and relevant graduate school.

The Strategic Plan's five goals are that the IIRP will:

1. Provide a robust hybrid and online curriculum that expands learning opportunities and interest in restorative practices at a graduate-school level;
2. Advance professional development opportunities that will strengthen civil society;
3. Develop new leaders and staff at every level to effectively meet the challenges of both succession and growth;
4. Be financially strong;
5. Sustain its restorative culture as it grows.

The Self-Study process will allow us to integrate the issues that are most relevant to the Strategic Plan into our self-assessment. Once the Board of Trustees approve the Strategic Plan, all units will revise their unit plans—identifying measurable objectives and sources of evidence—to ensure that their activities are aligned with the Graduate School's strategic

objectives. Each unit is responsible for providing quarterly reports, evaluating their objectives, updating their plan as necessary at the biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day, and submitting annual reports to senior leadership, as noted in our assessment timeline.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY DESIGN

As a newly accredited institution, the IIRP is required to use the comprehensive model for self-study, and our Self-Study Report will be organized in the context of the 14 standards in the *Characteristics of Excellence* (MSCHE, 2006). We view Self-Study as a learning opportunity that will help us improve our process of institutional renewal, providing feedback for planning, resource allocation, and assessment in helping us meet our institutional and strategic goals. Our Board of Trustees, faculty, administration, staff, and students will be learning and working in unison to understand how the *Characteristics of Excellence* and the IIRP's new Strategic Plan will guide us in continuing to build a robust and sustainable graduate school.

INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The Self-Study presents an opportunity to collectively engage the IIRP community in meaningful inquiry, open discussion, and collaborative work to help us better fulfill our mission. Additionally, the following intended outcomes have emerged from the Steering Committee's discussions:

- To reaffirm our commitment to demonstrate restorative practices throughout our teaching, learning, relationships, and procedures.
- To create a common vision of the future direction of the institution related to our Strategic Plan.
- To develop new leadership immersed in the culture of assessment, planning, and institutional renewal.
- To root our field of study and encourage our faculty, staff, and trustees to deepen their understanding and build relationships within the higher education community.
- To assess and refine the data-collection processes that influence our decision making.
- To demonstrate that we have addressed all recommendations from the initial Self-Study.

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In the fall of 2013, the President appointed the Self-Study co-chairs, Craig Adamson and Linda Kligman, who attended the MSCHE Self-Study Institute, along with Judy Happ, the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO). Based on what they learned at the MSCHE Self-Study Institute, the co-chairs and ALO made recommendations for the Steering Committee membership. In December 2013, the President appointed the committee members, which include faculty, a trustee, and staff with experience in board governance, assessment, technology, and communications. This gives a breadth of perspective while mirroring how we work collectively as an institution.

The committee membership is as follows:

- Craig Adamson, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- John Bailie, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- Muriel Berkeley, Ph.D. – Trustee
- Sue Bogard, B.A. – Assistant to the Administration, Secretary to the Board

- Jamie Dinbokowitz, A.A. – Registrar
- Judy Happ, M.S., M.R.P.E. – Vice President for Administration
- Mary Jo Hebling, M.S. – Lecturer
- Linda Kligman, B.S. – Vice President for Advancement
- Patrick McDonough, Ph.D. – Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Margaret Murray, M.S. – Librarian
- Stephen Orrison, M.R.P.E. – Assistant Director of Technology
- Elizabeth Smull, M.R.P.Y.C., C.A.D.C. – Lecturer
- Benjamin Wachtel, B.A. – Director of Communications and Technology

Co-chair and faculty member Dr. Adamson teaches courses in restorative justice and is the designated successor to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Co-chair Linda Kligman, Vice President for Advancement, leads our marketing and development programs and is the designated successor to the Vice President for Administration. Stephen Orrison and Benjamin Wachtel have been assigned to assist the co-chairs in writing and editing this Self-Study Design and the Self-Study Report.

To develop the Self-Study Design, the committee began meeting twice a month in January 2014. The committee's responsibilities include:

- Establishing the general structure and timeline for the Self-Study;
- Establishing the appropriate Working Groups and identifying Steering Committee membership on each;
- Developing research questions for the Self-Study Design;
- Completing the Self-Study Design;
- Providing a clear mandate for each Working Group and supporting their efforts;
- Receiving and reviewing interim and final reports from each of the Working Groups;
- Planning and arranging for all constituents to review and respond to a Self-Study Report draft;
- Completing and approving the final Self-Study Report;
- Overseeing the evaluation team visit; and
- Assessing our work as a Steering Committee from a restorative perspective.

The co-chairs of the Steering Committee have been communicating with faculty, staff, trustees, students, and alumni about the Self-Study process, letting them know that we will need their voluntary support on Working Groups once this design is approved.

WORKING GROUP ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP

To determine how Working Groups should be organized, we first evaluated how the Working Groups performed in our previous Self-Study. At the co-chairs' recommendation, the Steering Committee agreed to an almost identical Working Group structure, with four working groups organized around specific standards: Mission and Leadership, Planning and Assessment, Student Services, and Instruction. We made one change in the assignment of standards: Mission and Leadership will address Standard 5 (Administration) instead of Planning and Assessment. We felt it best that a single group address those standards most closely related to the President, senior administration, and the Board of Trustees (Standards 1, 4, 5, and 6). We view the quality of the working relationships among these constituencies as critical to our future success, especially as we prepare for a transition in leadership as senior leaders retire within the next five years.

Each Working Group is chaired by a member of the Steering Committee to ensure that their work is coherent with the Self-Study Design and the original intent of the research questions. Each chair has an assistant who was involved in the IIRP's first Self-Study to help guide and mentor the chairs, building leadership capacity and sharing institutional knowledge.

Each group will include members from the faculty, administration, staff, trustees, and students who possess a variety of skills, including strategic thinking, attention to detail, analytical thinking, and excellence in writing. Most faculty, trustees, and staff have already volunteered for Working Groups. The membership of the Working Groups is currently as follows:

Mission and Leadership – Standards 1, 4, 5, and 6
- Chair: Mary Jo Hebling, M.S. – Lecturer
- John Bailie, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- Muriel Berkeley, Ph.D. – Trustee
- Sue Bogard, B.A. – Assistant to the Administration, Secretary to the Board
- Heshimu Green, D.B.A. – Student
- Judy Happ, M.S., M.R.P.E. – Vice President for Administration
- Linda Kligman, B.S. – Vice President for Advancement
- Julie Malloy, M.R.P.Y.C. – Alumna
- Patrick McDonough, Ph.D. – Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Gregor Rae, B.S. – Trustee
- Kaitlin Tito, B.A. – Marketing Associate

Planning and Assessment – Standards 2, 3, and 7
- Chair: Steve Orrison, M.R.P.E. – Assistant Director of Technology
- Craig Adamson, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- Tom Albright, M.Ed. – Student
- William Ballantine, B.A. – Trustee
- Sue Bogard, B.A. – Assistant to the Administration, Secretary to the Board
- Sandy George – Office Coordinator
- Judy Happ, M.S., M.R.P.E. – Vice President for Administration
- Eileen Stone, B.A.S. – Student
- Benjamin Wachtel, B.A. – Director of Communications and Technology
- Jody Weaver – Payroll Clerk

Student Services – Standards 8 and 9
- Chair: Jamie Dinbokowitz, A.A. – Registrar
- Jess Bogensberger, B.S. – Support Staff
- Angela di Felice, M.S. – Director of Operations
- Sandy George – Office Coordinator
- Steve Grieger, A.S. – Audio-Video Coordinator
- Erin Hoffert-Keller, B.A.– Student
- Linda Kligman, B.S. – Vice President for Advancement
- Binny Silverman, B.A. – Trustee
- Tom Simek, Ph.D. – Associate Professor
- Benjamin Wachtel, B.A. – Director of Communications and Technology

Instruction – Standards 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14
- Chair: Elizabeth Smull, M.R.P.Y.C., C.A.D.C. – Lecturer
- Craig Adamson, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- John Bailie, Ph.D. – Assistant Professor
- Dinorah Foster – Support Staff
- Shelby Haverson, J.D. – Student
- Lynne Mann, B.S. – Assistant Director for Administration
- Henry L. McClendon, Jr., M.P.A. – Trustee
- Patrick McDonough, Ph.D. – Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Laura Mirsky, M.F.A. – Assistant Director for Communications
- Margaret Murray, M.S. – Librarian
- Tom Simek, Ed.D. – Associate Professor
- Jessica Zimmerman, M.A. – Student

CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS

The Working Groups are charged with addressing specific research questions as defined by the Steering Committee and are responsible for addressing the designated standards from the *Characteristics of Excellence*:

- Mission and Leadership: Standards 1, 4, 5, and 6
- Planning and Assessment: Standards: 2, 3, and 7
- Student Services: Standards: 8 and 9
- Instruction: Standards: 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14

Working Groups will be charged with gathering and analyzing evidence to address the research questions designed by the Steering Committee. Each of the four Working Groups will produce preliminary and final narrative reports that provide:

- The specific research questions it addressed;
- An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry, including strengths and challenges;
- Documentation of evidence;
- A discussion of the connection of the Working Group's topic with those of other Working Groups, if applicable, and of any collaboration between groups that took place;
- An explanation of how the strengths, challenges, recommendations, and conclusions identified by the Working Group relate to the Commission's standards; and
- An assessment of how the Working Group performed from a restorative perspective.

Working Group reports will be submitted according to the editorial and style guidelines and edited by the Steering Committee co-chairs for inclusion in the final Self-Study Report.

Research Questions

Research questions to be analyzed by the Working Groups are listed below.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates whom 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 utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

- How does the IIRP determine that educational programs align with its mission? To what extent do we communicate our mission and goals to all stakeholders?

- What demonstrates that our mission and goals are reflected in and influence teaching and learning?

- To what extent are the mission and vision driving the decision-making and planning process at all levels of the institution?

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.

- What prompted recent significant initiatives and changes in the institution's programs, services, and activities? What evidence exists that the institution's Strategic Plan is used to guide and respond to change and identify new programs, services, and activities? How effectively did the institution's Strategic Plan guide these initiatives and changes?

- What issues has the IIRP identified as priorities in its planning process? How were these priorities determined? How does the IIRP's integrated system of planning and resource allocation address those issues?

- What demonstrates that the IIRP's planning processes are effective in establishing links between institutional and unit-level goals? How are these interrelationships demonstrated and shared?

- What demonstrates that assessment results are shared across the institutional community? Since initial accreditation, how has the IIRP enhanced the utilization of assessment results in order to support student learning and improve institutional effectiveness?

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

The human, financial, technical, 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.

- How does the IIRP secure, align, and assess its institutional resources to support the mission of the IIRP? What specific changes have been implemented as a result of assessment?

- How effectively is information distributed to faculty, staff, and trustees? How are assessment results utilized to make informed judgments about institutional resources, allocations, and expenditures?

- What processes were used to address the financial downturn of the IIRP and realign the human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources to stabilize and improve the financial condition of the IIRP? How were we able to measure success of these processes? How is the institution positioned to effectively address financial decline or growth?

- What are the most significant challenges facing the IIRP relative to its human, financial, technological, and physical resources over the next five years? What processes exist to anticipate, monitor, and respond to challenges?

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.

- How are trustees recruited, oriented, and evaluated to ensure that individual trustees and the Board as a whole are effective in supporting our mission? What process has the board developed to recruit, orient, and evaluate itself—individually and collectively—in order to improve its effectiveness as a governing body?

- How do we assess our Board of Trustees to assure that it provides sufficient resources to sustain the institution and makes appropriate governance and policy recommendations? How does the Board provide leadership? How does the Board receive timely and quality information to make appropriate governance and policy recommendations? In what ways do trustees consider input from IIRP stakeholders?

- What evidence exists of continuous dialogue between the Board and the President? How do we ensure that the Board and the President are working together to make informed decisions and provide leadership to the IIRP? How does the Board exercise its final authority?

- What amendments have been made to the IIRP by-laws since the initial Self-Study, and what prompted the need for those changes? How were the amendments decided? What has been the impact of these amendments?

- How do we assess the effectiveness of the reciprocal roles and responsibilities of faculty, staff, trustees, and students in shared governance? How have we shared the statement on Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities with each administrative unit, faculty, students, and trustees?

- How has the board addressed succession of the institution's leadership?

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.

- How does the organization ensure that the President has the requisite experience, is committed to the organizational mission, and is able and effective in leading the Graduate School toward achievement of its institutional goals? How is the administration preparing for leadership succession and ensuring that successors to senior leaders have the requisite experience and qualifications for their positions?

- How do we assess that the administrative structure is hiring, supporting, and retaining staff and faculty of sufficient number, with the appropriate skills to meet our mission and goals? How are the findings from this assessment used in making decisions concerning the administrative structure and staffing needs of the organization?

- How does the administration work with faculty to encourage and facilitate participation in research and scholarship?

- How does the administration ensure quality improvement in administrative structures and services?

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.

- What evidence exists that our institution acts with integrity in our interactions with the public and our constituencies? How do the policies and practices of the IIRP support fidelity to the mission?

- What practices are in place to assure integrity and fidelity to our mission when developing and implementing marketing and public-relations campaigns?

- What steps has the institution taken to ensure that our policies, procedures, and communications are clear and accessible? What steps have we taken to maintain students' privacy and security?

- How does the IIRP address grievances from students, staff, and faculty in a restorative manner? How are these practices evaluated?

- How does the institution demonstrate integrity in hiring, evaluation, promotion, and dismissal of staff and faculty? How are these practices reviewed?

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.

- What are the key mechanisms for evaluating the overall performance of the IIRP to ensure that it (a) satisfies its mission, (b) can continue to provide an educational environment that promotes excellence, and (c) remains fiscally sound? How can these mechanisms be improved, and are there particular areas where improvement efforts should be focused?

- Do our data collection efforts and analyses of data address the full range of questions the IIRP needs in order to gauge its institutional effectiveness? Do assessment results show convincing evidence that the IIRP is achieving its mission and key goals?

- How have we enhanced the utilization of assessment results since initial accreditation? How do assessment activities inform the identification of areas for improvement and the implementation of new initiatives?

- What evidence exists that the institution's assessment procedures and evaluation instruments are effective in creating change or improvement across all campus units? To what extent are assessment results used in making decisions about and prioritizing institutional planning and resource allocation in an effort to improve its effectiveness?

- How do assessment results inform decisions about planning, resource allocation, and budgeting in order to improve student learning and advance the institution in achieving its goals? How does assessment of student learning inform decisions about teaching in order to improve student learning and advance the institution in achieving its goals?

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.

- How are the Enrollment Plan and marketing activities aligned with our mission, strategic goals, budgeting, and planning? How do we use assessment results to inform our recruitment and retention efforts?

- In what ways do admissions policies and procedures align with and support our mission?

- How do we ensure that program learning goals, course objectives, and learning outcomes are clear, accurate, and accessible to students and prospective students? How do we ensure that policies and procedures are clear, accurate, and accessible to students and prospective students?

- How do we ensure that students have the academic preparation and support to successfully complete their programs of study?

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.

- What student services exist, and how are students informed about them? How does the IIRP evaluate whether its student services support the needs of its adult learners? Are these services adequate for our current enrollment projections, and how will these services change or expand to accommodate enrollment projections?

- How are students informed about complaints and grievances procedures? What evidence exists that complaints and grievances procedures are being followed and carried out in a restorative manner?

- How do we ensure the security and privacy of student information?

Standard 10: Faculty

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

- How are IIRP faculty selected, oriented, and evaluated to ensure that the institution's instructional, research, and service activities are successful? In what ways do the faculty participate in institutional planning and governance to help the institution achieve its mission and goals?

- What institutional support exists for ongoing faculty professional development in teaching, research, scholarship, and service? How are faculty supported in developing their restorative skills?

- How does the IIRP select, orient, support, and evaluate adjunct faculty?

- What processes demonstrate faculty involvement in the development and assessment of the educational curriculum?

- How does the IIRP faculty observe and implement the principles of academic freedom within the context of the IIRP mission?

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

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

- How does the IIRP ensure that all educational offerings support course objectives and program goals and are consistent with the institution's mission?

- What evidence exists that educational offerings have academic content and rigor appropriate for a graduate curriculum? What evidence exists that faculty are appropriately qualified to support graduate curricula?

- What opportunities do students have to assess their learning throughout each course and throughout the program?

- How do library staff, technical staff, faculty, and administrators support information literacy and technological competency, and how do we know their efforts are effective?

- What evidence exists that assessment results are used in making changes to existing courses or for the creation of new courses?

- How are students informed of educational policies?

- How has the IIRP improved its schedule of course offerings so students can build a coherent program of study?

Standard 12: General Education

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, we acknowledge its importance in our admissions requirements. We admit baccalaureate holders from regionally accredited institutions, so that we know they have met general education criteria in achieving their degrees. In addition to providing official transcripts, letters of reference, and qualifying test (GRE, MAT or PPST) scores, students complete an essay describing their reasons for seeking our specialized graduate education. The essay provides the admissions committee with a sample of the student's ability to communicate in writing, as well as a sample of analysis and reasoning. Students demonstrate basic technological competency by creating and using an online student portal account, which is required to complete the admissions process and is the primary medium of communication with the Graduate School.

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.

- How do the goals of the certificate program align with our institutional mission and goals? How does the certificate program relate to the degree program? How is the certificate program evaluated?

- What support services are available to students in the certificate program?

- How do we ensure that Continuing Education offerings are consistent and coherent with the mission and goals of the IIRP?

- What academic oversight exists to ensure that professional development offerings that are paired with a hybrid graduate course have learning objectives that are foundational to the related graduate course?

- What assessment processes are employed to evaluate professional development and events delivered by Continuing Education? How do the results inform the faculty and staff's decision-making process?

- What assessment exists to evaluate the impact of non-credit programs on the IIRP's resources (e.g., human, fiscal, physical) and our ability to fulfill our mission and goals?

- What evidence exists that the IIRP Graduate School online offerings meet the institution's expectations for quality of instruction, student learning outcomes, educational effectiveness, and consideration of legal and regulatory requirements? How has the change to online and hybrid learning continued to meet the IIRP's program goals, institutional goals, and mission?

- What support services are in place to help students and faculty become proficient in the use of online learning as the means of course delivery?

- How do we ensure that each registered student is the same person participating in the course, completing the assignments, and receiving credit?

- What evidence exists that our staff are able to support the IIRP's commitment to online learning (e.g., sufficient staff, technical and financial resources)? How does the technical infrastructure provide resources to students and faculty to help achieve the learning outcomes we intend?

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.

- How is student learning assessed? What evidence exists that the results are utilized by faculty and the institution to make changes to courses or programs?

- What methodologies are being utilized in order to ensure reliability of student feedback? How is that information used?

- How are the institutional learning goals linked to student learning outcomes? How is the relationship between the learning experience and learning objectives made clear to students?

- How does our practice of consistent course evaluation, student surveys, and alumni surveys provide us with useful data for continuous improvement? How are the results shared and utilized with all faculty and staff?

SELF-STUDY TIMELINE

November 2013	Co-chairs receive training from MSCHE.
November 2013	President appoints Steering Committee.
December 2013	Steering Committee convenes.
January-April 2014	Steering Committee writes Self-Study Design.
April 2014	MSCHE liaison receives Self-Study Design.
May 2014	MSCHE liaison visits the IIRP.
June 2014	Upon approval of the Self-Study Design by the MSCHE liaison, the Steering Committee orients and charges Working Groups with their tasks.
June 2014-March 2015	Working Groups analyze research questions and write reports. Steering Committee meets regularly.
April 2015	Working Groups submit final reports to Steering Committee.
Spring 2015	MSCHE selects Team Chair. Within two weeks of notification of the Team Chair, the IIRP chooses the dates for a Spring 2016 Team Visit.
May-June 2015	Steering Committee meets regularly, receives sections of Self-Study from Working Groups, and begins writing Self-Study Report.
Summer 2015	MSCHE selects Evaluation Team members.
July-September 2015	Steering Committee writes Self-Study Report and revises as necessary. Campus community, including trustees, reviews draft report.
September 2015	Team Chair receives Self-Study Report.
Fall 2015	Team Chair visits the IIRP.
Fall 2015	Steering Committee prepares final draft of the Self-Study Report.
December 2015	Evaluation Team receives Self-Study Report.
January 2016	The IIRP submits Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations.
Spring 2016	Evaluation Team visits the IIRP. The IIRP submits response to Team Report and posts Team Report on public website.
June 2016	The Commission votes to approve reaccreditation of the IIRP.

ORGANIZATION OF THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Executive Summary and Eligibility Certification Statement:
- A brief description of the major findings and recommendations of the study.
- The Eligibility Certification Statement attached to the Executive Summary.

Introduction:
- A brief overview of the International Institute for Restorative Practices.
- Description of the Self-Study process.

A chapter for each standard, presented in numerical order, which will include:
- A heading indicating the standard under consideration and the text of the standard itself.
- Section One: Demonstration of compliance with the accreditation standard. Statements will include references to supporting data or documents. Discussion of connections between materials referenced in other parts of the report or collaboration that occurred between Working Groups on other parts of the report.
- Section Two: Analytical discussion of the inquiry that was guided by the research questions and the outcomes of such inquiry, including strengths and challenges. Statements will include references to supporting data or documents. Discussion of connections between materials referenced in other parts of the report or collaboration that occurred between Working Groups on other parts of the report.
- Section Three: A synthesis of the above elements into comprehensive recommendations for improvement and renewal. Recommendations will be supported by evidence referenced in the report.

Conclusion: A summary of the major conclusions and recommendations offered in the report.

References

Appendices

EDITORIAL STYLE AND FORMAT OF REPORTS

All reports submitted by the Working Groups and the final Self-Study Report will include the following specifications:

- Working Groups will use Google Docs to write their reports. Google Docs will also be used for the Steering Committee to collaboratively edit the compiled Self-Study Report.
- All margins 1".
- Single-spaced.
- 12-pt. Times New Roman font.
- One space after periods concluding sentences.
- Page numbers centered in bottom margin.
- Paragraphs left-justified, block style, and first line indented 0.125".
- Level 1 headings: bold, centered, all caps, line return (or 12-pt. space) before and after.
- Level 2 headings: bold, left-aligned, title case, line return (or 12-pt. space) before.
- Level 3 headings: italic, left-aligned, title case, line return (or 12-pt. space) before.
- Use block quotes for quotes that are 40 words or more. Left-justified, block style, all lines indented 0.125" on left and right, 12-pt. line return (or 12-pt. space) before and after.
- Lists (numbered and unordered) have .125" left indent and a .125" hanging indent, 12-pt. line return (or 12-pt. space) before and after.
- For all other style issues, refer first to the IIRP Style Guide (in Google Drive) and second to the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (APA, 2010).

Examples

HEADING 1

This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph.

This is a block quote. This is a block quote. This is a block quote. This is a block quote. This is a block quote. This is a block quote. This is a block quote.

Heading 2

This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph.

- This is a list.
    - Second level bullet.
- This is a list.

Heading 3

This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph. This is a normal block paragraph.

INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS

Many of these items exist in numerous places. We have listed at least one location for each document. Evidence used in the Self-Study will be readily available for the use of site visitors. The following table itemizes the Inventory of Support Documents as they relate to each Standard.

Document Title	Location
Standard 1	
Assessment Plan (includes unit plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Committee of the Whole minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Curriculum and syllabi	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Evaluation of faculty and staff – forms and process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Evidence of research dissemination: eForum, published, references	Office of the Vice President for Advancement
Factbook (number of eForum subscribers)	http://www.iirp.edu
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Institutional learning goals	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
International conference books and documentation	Office of the Director of Continuing Education
Mission exercise	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Mission rubrics	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Mission, vision, educational philosophy, and goals	http://www.iirp.edu/mission-vision.php
MSCHE Evaluation Team Report	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/MSCHE-Evaluation-Team-Report.pdf
Program Goals Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Self-Study Report to MSCHE	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/Self-Study-Report.pdf
Statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities	http://www.iirp.edu/private and http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Entering	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Website (mission is posted for public)	http://www.iirp.edu

Standard 2	
Advancement Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Agreement for support between the IIRP and Buxmont Academy	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Annual Enrollment Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Staffing Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Strategic Plan Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment activity flowchart – in Assessment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Committee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Plan (includes unit plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Audit Report and management letters	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Enrollment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Financial projection documents prepared for leadership meetings	Office of the Vice President for Administration
"How You Heard About Us" Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Lease between Buxmont Academy and IIRP (lease for space)	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Organizational Chart	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Restorative Practices Foundation minutes (portions)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Staffing Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Students and Credits by Term Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 3	
Annual Enrollment Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Staffing Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Strategic Plan Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment activity flowchart – in Assessment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Plan (includes unit plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Audit Report and management letters	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Enrollment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Evaluation of faculty and staff – forms and process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Facility Assessment report	http://www.iirp.edu/private

Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Financial procedures	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Financial statements	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Institutional process and procedures	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Organizational Chart	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Quarterly unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Staffing Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 4	
Bylaws	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment of the Trustees as a Whole (grid)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Conflict of Interest Policy (trustees and directors complete a disclosure annually)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Evaluation of the President – process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Job descriptions	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Organizational Manual	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Shared governance statement – in Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee self-evaluation	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Trustee membership	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 5	
Administrative evaluations – forms and process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Budget	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Document Retention and Destruction Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Employee Compensation Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Employee Protection (Whistleblower) Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Facility Access Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Identity Theft Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Job descriptions	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Nepotism Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Organizational Chart	http://www.iirp.edu/private
President's bibliography	Office of the Vice President for Advancement

Standard 6	
AAUP Statement of Academic Freedom – in Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Academic Freedom Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Academic Integrity Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Academic Performance, Probation, and Dismissal Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Civil Rights Employee Awareness Form	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Code of Conduct – in Student Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Communications with campus community	Office of the Registrar and http://www.iirp.edu/private
Conflict of Interest Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Course Catalog	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Committee of the Whole minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Curriculum and syllabi	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Degree requirements – in Student Handbook and Catalog	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Electronically archived catalogs	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Evaluation of faculty and staff – forms and process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Factbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grievance Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Job postings include EOE statement	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Licensed Trainer Agreement	Office of the Director of Continuing Education
Marketing materials	Office of the Vice President for Advancement
Media produced by the IIRP	Office of the Vice President for Advancement
MSCHE Evaluation Team Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Organizational Manual	http://www.iirp.edu/private
President's Annual Ethics Report to the Trustees (confidential) – activity noted in Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Registrar's Help Desk	http://www.iirp.edu
Research Involving Human Subjects Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Safety and Security – Crime statistics and reporting process	http://www.iirp.edu
Self-Study Report to MSCHE	http://www.iirp.edu
Statement of Non-discrimination	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Student Handbook and Catalog	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf

Written permissions for video/publications/website/audio participants	Office of the Vice President for Advancement
Standard 7	
Annual Enrollment Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Staffing Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Strategic Plan Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment activity flowchart – in Assessment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Committee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Plan (includes unit plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Timeline	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Committee of the Whole minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
"How You Heard About Us" Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Institutional process and procedures	Office of the Vice President for Administration
IPEDS Data Feedback Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Quarterly unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Discontinuing Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Entering Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Unit benchmark baselines	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 8	
Academic Performance, Probation, and Dismissal Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Acceptance letters	Office of the Registrar
Application and Admissions Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Data Book	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Document Retention and Destruction Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Factbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade Reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Graduation completion	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Institutional Learning Goals Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Loan information	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Program Goals Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
No-Gift Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private

No-Money Solicitation Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Resources available for students including the student portal, registrar's help desk and the online course catalog	http://www.iirp.edu
Students and Credits by Term Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Transfer Policy (part of Application and Admissions Policy)	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Standard 9	
Academic Records Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Acceptable Use of Computing Resources Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
AIDS and HIV Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Code of Conduct	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Drug-Free Workplace, Schools, and Communities Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade Appeals Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grievance Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Harassment and Inappropriate Conduct Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Rape and Sexual Assault Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Registration and withdrawal procedures	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Safety and security information and logs	http://www.iirp.edu
Statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Discontinuing Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Entering Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Weapons Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 10	
AAUP Statement of Academic Freedom – Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Academic Freedom Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Academic Integrity Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Budget	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Curriculum and syllabi	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Enrollment Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private

Evaluation of faculty and staff – forms and process	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty activity reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty curricula vitae	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Faculty Governance Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Research Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Responsibility Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade Appeals Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grievance Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Interview process	Office of the Vice President for Administration
IRB submissions	Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
Job descriptions	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Nepotism Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Powers of Faculty	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Professional Development and Other Faculty Resources Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Shared Governance Statement – in Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Staffing Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Discontinuing Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 11	
Academic Definition of Restorative Practices	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Certificate program description	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Course descriptions	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Curriculum and syllabi	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Degree requirements	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grading Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Graduate program description	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Graduation requirements	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Introducing Online and Combination Instructional Policy	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Learning matrices	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Learning objectives and outcomes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Library collection	http://www.iirp.edu/library.php

Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 12	
Since we are a graduate-only institution, this standard does not apply to us. Our graduate students must have a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution.	
Standard 13	
Annual unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Certificate Program Goals	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Continuing Education Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Emergency Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Facility Assessment Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Factbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
International conference books and documentation	Office of the Director of Continuing Education
Learning matrices	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Professional development courseware	Office of the Director of Continuing Education
Professional development evaluations	Office of the Director of Continuing Education
Program Goals Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Quarterly unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Standard 14	
Assessment Committee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Plan (includes unit plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Timeline	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Curriculum and syllabi	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Institutional Learning Goals	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Learning matrices	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Mission rubrics	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Online instructional equivalencies	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Program Goals Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Course Improvement	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate and Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private

General Documents for all Working Groups	
Annual Enrollment Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Staffing Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual Strategic Plan Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Annual unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Assessment Plan (includes all plans)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Biannual Budget, Planning, and Assessment Day minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Committee of the Whole meeting minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Data Book	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Data from Continuing Education database (events/registrations from the reports tab)	Office of the Vice President for Administration
Factbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty Handbook	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Faculty minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Grade reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Institutional Learning Goals	http://www.iirp.edu/private
IPEDS	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Learning matrices reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Middle States institutional profile	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Mission rubrics	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Mission, Vision, Educational Philosophy, and Goals	http://www.iirp.edu/private
MSCHE Evaluation Team Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Organizational Chart	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Organizational Manual	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Program Goals	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Quarterly unit reports	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Search Engine Optimization and Website Usage Report (Restorative Justice)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Self-Study Report to MSCHE	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Statement of Reciprocal Roles and Responsibilities	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Strategic Plan	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Student Handbook and Catalog	http://www.iirp.edu/pdf/IIRPStudentHandbook.pdf
Students and Credits by Term Report	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Summary of Academic and Administrative Outcomes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Alumni	http://www.iirp.edu/private

Survey results – Alumni Association Interest	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Discontinuing Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Entering Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Exit	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Impressions about the IIRP (administered to individuals who expressed interest but did not register)	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Intermediate Student	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Survey results – Restorative Practices Events, and Topics Interest Survey	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Trustee minutes	http://www.iirp.edu/private
Unit benchmark baselines	http://www.iirp.edu/private

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE PROFILE OF VISITING EVALUATION TEAM

As an institution intent on becoming the best it can be, the IIRP would appreciate the opportunity to engage with colleagues from institutions with similar missions and structures. Specifically, colleagues with the following areas of expertise are requested:

- A president or senior leader from a small, private college or specialized graduate school that has been recently reaccredited;
- Academic affairs personnel, especially from a small, private college or specialized graduate school;
- A chief financial officer, especially from a small, private college or specialized graduate school;
- A faculty member in liberal arts, humanities or social sciences, or from a seminary, with experience in distance education, especially one with experience in professional development coupled with online hybrid and distance education;
- An individual with assessment and strategic planning experience.

REFERENCES

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States.* Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC. Retrieved from http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/changingcourse.pdf

APA. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (1997). Fair process. *Harvard Business Review,* January 1.

MSCHE. (2006). *Characteristics of excellence in higher education.* Philadelphia, PA: Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Stavros, J.M., & Hinrichs, G. (2009). *The thin book of SOAR: Building strengths-based strategy.* Bend, OR: Thin Book Publishing.

Wachtel, T. (2013). *Dreaming of a new reality.* Pipersville, PA: The Piper's Press.

York, P., York, D., & Wachtel, T. (1982). *Toughlove.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co.