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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

The WSCUC team conducted the Reaffirmation of Accreditation Visit of Touro University Worldwide (TUW) in Los Alamitos, California, on April 24-27, 2017. The staff, faculty, and administrators were welcoming and responsive to the team’s needs.

TUW is a private, non-profit institution of higher education with its main campus and administrative offices located in Los Alamitos, California, and its branch campus, Touro College Los Angeles (TCLA), in West Hollywood. TUW is one of the campuses of Touro College and University System, a non-profit educational institution. Chartered in 1970, Touro College and University System has more than 30 campuses in the United States (New York, Florida, and California) and abroad (Berlin, Moscow, and Jerusalem) and enrolls approximately 18,000 students in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. Touro College and University System is the largest Jewish university system in the United States and maintains a strong financial position among private non-profit institutions. Touro College and University System owns Touro University, a California company, which has two division: Touro University California and Touro University Worldwide (TUW). This reaffirmation of accreditation report reviewed TUW, which offers mostly distance education degree programs and on-ground bachelor’s degree programs at TCLA. To avoid confusion, TUW and TCLA are abbreviated, but Touro College and University System and Touro University are not.

In Spring 2017 TUW’s student population was 1,047, which represents growth above the administration’s projections for four consecutive years. TUW offers an online AA in General Education. The institution’s four bachelor’s degree programs include Business Administration
(BS), Psychology (BA), Health Sciences (BS), and Social Work (BSW). TUW offers seven online Master’s degrees: MA in Psychology, MBA (Business Administration), MIOP in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, MS in Human Resource Management, MS in Health Sciences, MFT in Marriage and Family Therapy, and MA in Dispute Resolution. TUW offers a doctoral program in Psychology (PsyD). The graduate programs in Human Resource Management and Dispute Resolution launched after the 2015 Special Visit. TCLA offers three on-ground undergraduate programs: Psychology (BA), Business Management and Administration (BS), and Judaic Studies (BA).

In February 2005, the Commission approved the creation of a new campus, Touro College of Los Angeles (TCLA), within the WASC region as “a separately accreditable unit of Touro College of New York.” The Commission “stipulated within a period of three years, the locus of accountability shift to a local provost.” TCLA was approved to offer only the baccalaureate degree.

In February 2009, the Commission requested:

1. “a meeting with senior leadership of Touro College Los Angeles and New York within the next 90 days to discuss the issues raised by the Commission regarding administrative authority and structure.

2. “that by May 1, 2009, TCLA submit a progress report to be reviewed by the February Commission, providing written evidence of: (a) autonomous governing authority, including planning and budget management, (b) sufficient resources to support current programs, (c) appropriately localized decision making at the Provost level, (d) formal protocol of operations showing authority of roles for provost, and
In June 2009, the Commission’s action following the Capacity and Preparatory Review granted continued accreditation to TCLA. The primary issues raised regard “(a) long-term sustainability; (b) assessment of student learning; (c) defined faculty roles and governance with regard to curriculum; and (d) systems, policies, and procedures specific to the needs to TCLA.”

In June 2010, the Commission action reaffirmed accreditation and scheduled the next report for spring 2015, the Capacity and Preparatory Review visit for spring 2017, and the Educational Effectiveness Review visit for fall 2018. The Commission scheduled a special visit in fall 2012 to focus on new online programs, organizational structure, sustainability and local autonomy, policies and procedures, assessment and program review, and strategic planning.

In June 2013, the Commission requested a Special Visit for spring 2015 (completed in fall 2015) to review enrollments, financial performance, budget process, curriculum development, role of adjunct faculty, student learning outcomes, program reviews, strategic and master planning. In February 2016, the Commission received the Special Visit team report and continued with the scheduled reaffirmation review. The offsite review was conducted at WSCUC offices in October 2016, and the onsite visit was conducted April 24-27, 2017, at TUW, the results of which are reported herein.

**B. Description of Team’s Review Process**

Team members reviewed the January 2016 action letter, TUW’s Reaffirmation Report and accompanying documents and attachments, additional documentation requested of the institution following the team’s Offsite Review in October 2016, and TCLA’s response to the WASC
Interim Report in March 2009.

The Reaffirmation Team first met by telephone conference on September 29, 2016, for an orientation to the process and to TUW’s documents. The Offsite Review was held October 27-28, 2016 at WSCUC’s offices in Alameda, California, and concluded with a video-conference between the Review Team and TUW’s representatives on October 28, 2016. Following the Offsite Review, additional information was requested of TUW. In preparation for the onsite visit, the Review Team met by telephone conference on March 10, 2017, to assess additional documents provided by TUW’s Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), who is also the provost, and approve an itinerary for the April 2017 onsite visit.

The Accreditation Visit of Touro University Worldwide took place on April 24-27, 2017 in Los Alamitos, California. Team members met with the CEO, provost/ALO, COO, campus CFO, associate provost, members of the academic council (full-time faculty and staff), part-time faculty (via WebEx), educational effectiveness committee, director of institutional research, executive director of registration and enrollment, director of student records, enrollment counselors, academic advisors, the student success advisor, doctoral program director, dean of TCLA, students (via WebEx), and alumni (via telephone conference). In addition, the team also met via telephone conferences with the CFO and financial aid directors of Touro College and University System and separately with two members of Touro College and University System’s Board of Trustees. TUW does not have a separate board of trustees from Touro College and University System.

The campus community was knowledgeable about the university’s progress (CFR 4.3, 4.5, 4.6). TUW’s community members conveyed their pride and commitment to the institution. The level of engagement by community members was as impressive as it was consistent. The team
valued the courtesy and responsiveness of the ALO and her staff prior to and during the visit.

C. The Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality of the Report and Supporting Evidence

TUW’s Institutional Report was well-organized, reflective, and substantively supported. TUW was responsive to the team’s request for additional information (CFR 1.8). The institution demonstrated evidence of progress since the 2015 Special Visit.
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

The Commission action letter dated March 2, 2016, identified three issues for further development. To its credit, TUW’s Institutional Report addressed the management of its enrollment growth and development of its academic program development. It provided evidence of high involvement by members of the Academic Council in the implementation of the institution’s strategic plan. The Commission letter in March 2016 also advised TUW to strengthen its financial and budgeting processing and to improve integration of those processes into its strategic decision-making. TUW’s progress in this area is mixed. In addition to considering the Commission’s 2016 action letter, the review team widened the scope of its assessment in accordance with the WSCUC guidelines for reaffirmation reviews with a more thoroughgoing evaluation of all four standards.

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The March 2016 action letter noted, “The university should ensure that its budget and financial management processes and strategies are continuously strengthened to maintain long-term financial sustainability and continuing focus on educational quality and effectiveness (CFR 3.4).” The March 2016 action letter urged the university to ensure that growth of new programs is matched to infrastructure needs. It said, “As the university is planning implementation of new programs and continuing enrollment growth, it is essential that an appropriate academic, technological, and student support infrastructure continues to develop and is aligned with the realized growth.” In August 2016, TUW hired a COO responsible for marketing, information technology, facilities, and enrollment processing. The Reaffirmation Team considered this new position a significant step to strengthening infrastructure management. In contrast, the full-time
CFO at TUW has limited influence and responsibility in the management of the institution’s financial structures (CFR 3.8).

**Component 2: Compliance with the Standards and Federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

TUW’s *Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators* accurately reflects an institution-wide commitment to quality assurance and improvement of educational results over time (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4). The institution has well-defined and clearly stated learning outcomes that are actively engaged in systematic learning assessment at institutional, program, and course levels (CFR 2.3). TUW faculty are the primary developers and assessors of learning outcomes and standards of performance, respectively, which demarcate and demonstrate student achievement (CFR 2.4).

The provost and associate provost for quality assurance work collaboratively to ensure that educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved (CFR 1.2). Undergraduate and graduate degree programs undergo systematic program review to attend to students’ understanding, development, and achievement of core competencies; strong retention and graduation rates; and attainment of career goals and objectives (CFR 2.2, 2.7). TUW continuously enhances its Integrated Campus System used by institutional leaders and faculty to record, monitor, and evidence that its graduates consistently achieve stated institutional, program, and course learning outcomes and established standards of performance (CFR 2.6).

The Reaffirmation Team recognized, as other review teams have, that TUW is part of a larger university system. But the team found evidence that TUW’s autonomy is questionable,
raising concerns across the standards (CFR 1.5, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9; see also the Independent Governing Board Policy, Accreditation Reviews for Institutions within a System Policy, and Related Entities Policy).

The issue is three-fold.

First, TUW has grown significantly in large part because of a highly effective CEO and equally effective provost, and, while they both acknowledge how unexpected leadership changes at the institution impacted programs in the past, the institution has no clear succession plan at present. Two board members acknowledged the same concern with similar endorsements of the CEO’s successes.

Second, the CFO’s position at TUW does not have the expertise or scope of responsibilities one would reasonably assume of an officer in this position. Indeed, the CFO of Touro College and University System acknowledged his fiduciary responsibility extends into TUW in a way WSCUC assumes an independent officer of the accredited institution would hold.

Third, TUW has no independent governing board. Its CEO reports to the system-wide president. TUW has no advisory committee as a previous WSCUC review recommended. Instead Touro College and University System’s Board of Trustees is the directing board of TUW.

Regardless of this concern, TUW is doing a lot of things well. The reviewers noted the commitment to the institution’s mission, growth of academic programs, related growth of student body, involvement of faculty in the university’s governance, emphasis on quality across the curriculum, and a climate committed to institutional learning and improvement (CFR 1.1, 1.4, 2.1 to 2.7, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7).
Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees

TUW introduced two new programs since the special visit in October 2015. The senior administration, with input from faculty and other staff, continuously weigh the strength of existing programs and the potential for new ones. TUW taught-out the MA in Media Communication Psychology due to low enrollment and then responded with the two new master’s degree programs (Human Resources Management and Dispute Resolution).

The associate provost for quality assurance demonstrated how TUW’s proprietary learning management system (LMS) operationalizes the Robust Learning Model, which emphasizes regular and substantive interaction between faculty and students, ongoing engagement between students and advisors, and access to additional instructional supports (e.g., online library). The associate provost’s role involves the ongoing tracking of course and program effectiveness. The LMS includes metrics related to the performance of various low- and high- stakes assessments, and the instructor (who is also the course Subject Matter Expert or SME) and associate provost amend or correct course resources. At the program level, the provost, associate provost, program chair, and COO use the integrated campus system to assess the quality of courses and success of students across courses within a program.

A proposal for a new degree involves the director of institutional research, the associate provost for quality assurance, the provost, and faculty with expertise in the proposed degree area to evaluate breadth of curriculum, potential need in the market, key knowledge and competencies, and academic resource requirements. The CEO conducts a focus group to evaluate the marketability of the program. Then, the CEO, COO, CFO, and provost review the financial requirements to launch and sustain a new program. The CEO discusses the new program idea with the president of Touro College and University System, which involves its CFO, before
pursuing a sub-change with WSCUC. Touro College and University System reserves its fiduciary right to reject an academic program from TUW, but it has not exercised this right (as was explained to the reaffirmation team) because TUW’s CEO has consistently launched successful new online degree programs.

The level of attention to student needs was expressed enthusiastically by the handful of current students and alumni in two separate telephone conferences. Part-time and full-time faculty underscored the importance of responding to students quickly and providing students with knowledge and skills immediately applicable to a career interest. The strongest relationship was found in the programs in social work; in addition to practitioner teachers as the core of the faculty, students also complete a rigorous and comprehensive practicum.

The administration tracks the usual end-of-course satisfaction. Its report did not cite any national benchmark student satisfaction data. To ensure responsiveness, all student advisors and all faculty report to the provost, though the associate provost provides back up. The provost’s concern for students and expectation for ensuring their progress toward graduation is evident in her personal attention to student complaints and appeals. With more than a thousand students at TUW, this level of personal attention seems unmanageable, but high student satisfaction and low withdrawal rates suggest it is effective.

Full- and part-time faculty are involved in the development of courses and programs, and, as the SMEs for their courses, they are continuously improving assignments, assessments, and resources based on qualitative feedback from students and quantitative tracking on the LMS (CFR 2.2a, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7). The breadth of expertise is well-represented in the various degree programs. In sum, TUW employs 13 full-time and 96 part-time faculty, and 73% hold a doctorate. The level of professional and academic development was also noteworthy (CFR 2.8,
TUW curriculum emphasizes writing and communication skills as evidenced by both the extensiveness of reflective writing assignments and the consistent emphasis with faculty, advisors, and administration on writing competencies. To this end, faculty develop and continuously refine rubrics for case assignments, signature assignments, and capstone projects. The LMS allows the instructor and administrators to track student performance among these assignments. To be sure, core competencies for programs expand the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected within a discipline and professional practice. TUW’s course design and review rubrics ensure a balance of learning outcomes, and distinguish appropriate rigor for undergraduate and graduate courses (CFR 2.1 to 2.4).

The quality of program reviews varies, but all demonstrate exceptional effort to improve the student experience and program outcomes. For example, the reviews for the BSBA, BSW, and BA-PSY involved numerous stakeholders, assessed learning outcomes, reported some career data, and offered recommendations for improvement (CFR 2.6, 2.7). In alignment with Standard 2, Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions, the strength of TUW’s academic programs through ongoing course-level and program-level evaluations and the engagement of sufficient faculty with both academic and non-academic professional expertise is commendable.

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

The methodology to develop student learning outcomes and assign the appropriate instructional level appears pedagogically sound. As with course development, teaching faculty are engaged in shaping and refining SLOs for their courses (CFR 2.1, 2.3 – 2.11). The associate
provost for quality assurance tracks course performance metrics and manages efforts for continuous improvement.

The associate provost for quality assurance emphasized to the team, “Everything we do is geared toward achieving outcomes…. Beyond being student centered, we are student learning outcomes centered.” To that end, TUW academic administration and faculty evidenced clearly defined competencies at program- and course-levels, Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) respectively. PLOs are well-aligned with Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs). Specifically, the majority of PLOs for TUW undergraduate programs emerged from the ILOs, which are reflective of the five (5) core competencies prescribed byWSCUC. The ILOs are extended by disciplinary competencies associated with TUW’s various fields of undergraduate study. PLOs for TUW graduate programs are comprised of core and disciplinary competencies. Additionally, specialized professional competencies required for particular degree programs (e.g., MA in Industrial & Organizational Psychology, MA in Marriage & Family Therapy, and PsyD in Human and Organizational Psychology) have been developed. (CFRs 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3)

ILOs, PLOs, and SLOs are assessed against rubrics that are scored by faculty and viewable by students in the Integrated Campus System. Each TUW online course has eight (8) modules, two (2) discussion threads per week, one (1) signature assignment, and a self-reflective essay. TCLA also includes direct and authentic assessment of demonstrations of student learning outcome achievement. In addition to assessing students’ learning outcome achievement for each delivered course, faculty must also complete an assessment rubric for students’ submitted signature assignments. Capstone course PLOs are used to measure student learning outcomes in each program. Noteworthy, upon completion of the Associate degree, each student completes a
portfolio which is assessed by a rubric designed to determine whether the PLOs for the degree have been achieved. TUW ILOs Standards of Performance prescribes that at least 80% of the students in each program achieve the stated PLOs in the program (CFR 2.3, 2.4).

The director of institutional research collects and analyzes learning outcome achievement data—which includes faculty-provided assessments of students’ achievement and student-provided assessments of course quality and faculty instructional efficacy, in the form of course evaluations—for presentation to the provost, associate provost for quality assurance, Educational Effectiveness Review Committee, and the Academic Council. The Academic Council includes both full- and part-time faculty representatives. Academic and program administrators collaborate with faculty in the use of assessment data to devise student-focused intervention strategies and develop course- and program- improvement plans. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2)

In addition to facilitating the collection and distribution of learning outcome achievement data, the Integrated Campus System has an impressive “Student Voice” function, which enables TUW students to provide course-level support requests and satisfaction feedback throughout the duration of a course. Students’ submission of episodic support needs and (dis)satisfaction data aids TUW faculty and staff’s ability to immediately respond to issues, while also strengthening the institutions’ collection of course-level quality assurance data that are triangulated with overall student satisfaction, graduate exit, and alumni survey data to improve teaching and learning methods that can effectively “close the loop.” (CFR 2.10, 2.12, 2.13)

With the same attention to quality, TUW offers three on-ground bachelor’s degrees at the TCLA campus: Psychology (BA), Business Management and Administration (BS), and Judaic Studies (BA). While TCLA enrolls less than eight percent of TUW’s total enrollment, it provides
an important mission-centered contribution to Jewish education. The team did not visit the TCLA campus, but two team members met with its dean and reviewed educational outcomes. The enrollment plan and structure of the classes reflect the institution’s commitment to Jewish traditions and academic pursuits. Because of its highly personal and religiously focused curriculum, TCLA’s educational outcomes, student success, and faculty dedication meet those of the larger online programs.

**Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation**

TUW measures student success in multiple ways. Student satisfaction is consistently high. TUW’s student success survey in Spring 2015, for example, reported its highest levels of satisfaction (all above 4.4/5.0 scale) on the following scales:

- Satisfaction with their individual performance
- Satisfaction with their overall academic performance
- Amount of effort invested in their studies
- Satisfaction with their signature assignment
- Satisfaction with their case assignment
- Expectation for completing their degree
- Care about what happens to TUW

High student satisfaction alone is insufficient for measuring student outcomes. In TUW’s case, its persistence rate of 92.71% is a good indicator of graduation. TUW acknowledged that it has not conducted a longitudinal study of student success after graduation, a common constraint of managing new program offerings.

TUW uses reflective summative writing assignments as another indicator of student learning
and progress toward degree. When combined with larger models of program learning outcomes and performance across a program, this indicator may provide a better predictor. TUW reported a high retention rate of 82% for undergraduates and 92% for graduates. The graduation rates were also impressive: undergraduate at 78%, and graduate at 88%. These values reflect how the high degree of personal attention for students across the institution pays off in student success (CFR 2.10, 2.12). The team noted that these values were widely shared across the institution (CFR 1.2).

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

TUW has implemented systematic quality assurance processes that are effectively managed by the provost, associate provost for quality assurance, and COO. The collective leadership and management of TUW quality assurance—supported by the director of institutional research—enables ongoing methodical assessment of quality assurance efficacy. Institutional learning and improvements are authentically expressed, extensively supported, and consistently achieved by way of reflective examination that yields mission-centric actions aimed at enhancing teaching, learning, and student services. TUW faculty, staff, and students are actively engaged participants in the continuous improvement of educational effectiveness, and to a lesser extent overall institutional effectiveness. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7)

TUW emphasizes in its Institutional Report that “the appropriate integrated technology…was built to assist the model implementation of the pedagogy, the assessment component and measurement of student success.” Noteworthy, both administrative and academic quality assurance are strongly supported by TUW’s custom-developed Integrated Campus
System. System functionality yields a robust central repository for program, course, student, and learning outcome data. These data are collected and presented to academic leaders who enact regularized monitoring and analyses of program quality, course effectiveness, student progress, faculty-student engagement, program- and course-level learning outcome attainment, and curricular-related feedback loops. (CFR 4.1)

The director of institutional research works collaboratively with the associate provost for quality assurance, Academic Council, and Educational Effectiveness Committee on matters relating to program reviews and learning assessment. TUW continues to strengthen its institutional research capacity in respect to tracking and curating; comparing, contrasting, and relating; analyzing and interpreting; and disseminating data for more pronounced operational planning and well-informed decision-making processes. There is, however, some need for improvement in terms of discernable applications of institutional data to the institution’s strategic plan, specifically in the form of performance indicators. (CFR 4.2)

The Educational Effectiveness Committee—chaired by the associate provost for quality assurance and comprised of a subset of program directors—employs a “Closing the Loop” model to guide the collection and triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data to support the systematic assessment of TUW teaching and learning. The Integrated Campus System is used to elicit student feedback about their learning experiences and outcomes. These data are subsequently used to inform course development, reviews, and design revisions. Data collection instruments administered to students include: self-reflective essays for each course, end of term surveys, student satisfaction surveys, and graduate exit surveys. (CFR 4.3, 4.4)

TUW notes in its Institutional Report that “university leadership [worked] with the entire faculty, staff and students through the Academic Council, meetings, committees, and
subcommittees to define a clear strategic plan to achieve the university’s mission, goals and Institutional Learning Outcomes.” The team ascertained that the Academic Council serves as the institution’s strategic planning team, and in that capacity meets semi-annually to focus on reviewing and revising the institution’s 2010-2020 Strategic Plan. Varying combinations of staff and faculty comprise institutional teams that attend to Strategic goal #2: Improve operational quality, transparency, and accountability, and the complementary mega goal to “Develop Culture of Achievement and Continuing Improvement Process.” (CFR 4.5, 4.6)

Both TUW and TCLA reflect the Judaic foundation and associated values that defined each institution’s founding, but are distinctly represented in their respective targeted student population. TCLA was established to meet the needs of “students desiring a quality accredited Orthodox Jewish college education [who] were [otherwise] forced to go to the East Coast or to Israel.” Comparatively, TUW intentionally focuses on attracting and serving a growing population of adult students who may not be well-positioned to pursue undergraduate or graduate education in a traditional campus environment. Faculty, staff, students, and alumni view TUW as being markedly different from other online institutions and even more so when compared to campus-based colleges and universities. Some institutional differentiating factors shared with the team are: affordable, student-focused, success-centered, robust, caring, flexible, interconnected, and forward-moving. (CFR 4.7)

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

As noted by the October 2015 Special Visit Team Report, significant enrollment growth of TUW’s online programs continues to have a positive impact on the financial performance of the
TUW provided internally prepared and unaudited operating results with tuition and fee revenues of $8.2 million in fiscal 2016, an increase of $2.8 million, or 51%, from $5.4 million in fiscal 2015. At $6.8 million in fiscal 2016, operating expenses increased $1.3 million, or 24%, from $5.5 million in fiscal 2015. (CFR 3.4, 3.8)

It is noted that the TUW operating results do not include charges for services provided by related entities. The *Master Inter-Company Services Agreement*, dated June 30, 2015 provides for certain services to be delivered from Touro College and University System to Touro University, of which Touro University Worldwide (TUW) is accounted for as a division. The agreement defines the services to include but not be limited to:

1. Executive Office
2. Academic Administration
3. Finance and Accounting
4. Technology
5. Central Administrative Operations
6. Student Administrative Services
7. General Administrative and Other Expenses

The agreement prescribes that Touro University is charged a pro-rata share based on a percentage of Touro College and University System’s total central administrative costs. However, Touro College and University System’s CFO wrote that this charge is intended as “essentially a way to distribute income to [Touro College and University System].” The visiting team did not receive agreements or other documentation defining how charges are further allocated from Touro University. Although not included within the TUW operating results, $1.2
million and $1.1 million in fiscal 2016 and 2015, respectively, was paid to Touro College and University System for services rendered.

In the absence of TUW audited financial statements, inclusive of related party transactions, the visiting team was unable to ascertain the operating results or net assets attributable to TUW as an entity.

The March 2016 action letter noted, “The university should ensure that its budget and financial management processes and strategies are continuously strengthened to maintain long-term financial sustainability and continuing focus on educational quality and effectiveness”. As part of the team’s assessment, meetings were held with executive, administrative and faculty leadership, Touro College and University System’s CFO, select Board of Trustee members, Strategic Planning Team, and Academic Council. (CFR 3.4)

The annual budget process fundamentally represents a top-down approach from senior leadership, rather than a process developed in a collaborative manner at the program level. The Provost initially requests program goals and needs from faculty and staff. Proposals are prioritized and assessed by the TUW President and Provost, and evaluated through benchmarks, marketing outcomes, and other strategic analysis, in developing the proposed budget. The proposed budget is submitted to Touro College and University System for their approval from a system perspective. After their approval, TUW is provided responsibility for the budget bottom line, without consideration to individual categories or programs.

TUW additionally prepares three-year projections, characterized by an operational focus. Although it is important that any multi-year financial plans are inclusive of capital spending plans and cash flow projections, the present visiting team is unable to further evaluate the annual and multi-year financial plans in the absence of TUW audited financial statements.
Component 8: Reflections and Plans for Improvement

The strategic plan needs to be updated. With so many initiatives in play, from growing new programs to evaluating marketing channels, the institution would do well to refresh and expand its strategic plan. The plan needs clearer identification of resources and a critical assessment of those resources against the competing priorities and goals. An updated plan should express how TUW will take steps to better delineate its autonomy from Touro College and University System’s directives.

The institutional SWOT analysis lacked sufficient depth and critical assessment of external forces and financial limitations. The depth may be appropriate at the level of a program review, but the institution fits into a larger competitive environment, and its autonomy and sustainability are more complex. While the team commends TUW for involving all full-time faculty and staff (i.e., the Academic Council) in discussion of the strategic plan, it would benefit from external advisors (like an advisory council recommended in 2009), stronger quantitative analysis (CFR 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3), and possibly an independent board of trustees dedicated solely to the growth and improvement of TUW.

Administrators for Touro College and University System (including its CFO and representatives from institutions in Northern California and Nevada) review TUW’s academic plans and give direction to TUW’s CEO. Touro College and University System is the key stakeholder in assessing the financial viability of TUW’s strategic initiatives. TUW’s successes over the last three years appear to secure its good favor with Touro College and University System administrators.

Faculty, staff, and administrators discuss strategic ideas (e.g., new academic programs) and
institutional values (e.g., student-centeredness); students are not directly involved in the strategic planning process (CFR 4.5, 4.6). The culture is supportive, almost family-like. New employees “join” the university and are passionate about ensuring a student’s success from their very first course to their capstone and onto a viable career. In this way TUW’s strategic plan is more of an ongoing internal conversation about how to make academic programs and the student experience better. What a larger institution may view as more tactical matters, TUW holds as competitive advantages, like building video capacity into the LMS or creating a new reporting feature in the student information system (SIS) to enable faster response to students. With TUW’s enrollments exceeding 1,000 students, greater discipline would improve TUW’s strategic planning process. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 4.6, 4.7)
SECTION THREE -- OTHER TOPICS

A. Marketing and Growth

TUW has realized an average of 15% growth in enrollment for the last three academic years. Growth in online program enrollment is attributed to new academic programs, promotion of existing programs, and strengthening of the university’s academic affairs infrastructure (CFR 3.5, 4.7). Enrollment in Touro College Los Angeles (TCLA) meets the institution’s expectations and relies on revenues from TUW’s online programs to maintain the faith-based on-campus programs. TCLA’s enrollment goal is to be revenue neutral.

It is also important to note that TUW is a tuition-driven institution heavily dependent on its student enrollment. It launches new academic programs based on academic interest, estimates of viable employment for graduates, a focus group led often by the CEO, and estimates of budget impact. It dropped one academic program after it did not meet enrollment projections.

TUW is spending significantly on marketing. The COO estimated the annual expenditure to be $1.3 million or about $110,000 monthly. The marketing channels includes a mix of online channels (e.g., Google search terms) and targeted promotions related to specific degree programs. The significant and consistent enrollment growth suggests the marketing is effective. The COO, who is in charge of marketing, did not share the average cost of acquiring a new student. To its credit, TUW is also effective in retaining its students with its withdrawal rate at less than 20% (CFR 3.4, 4.6, 4.7). One major step to ensure ongoing assessment and improvement of the infrastructure was TUW’s hiring of a new COO in August 2016.

TUW expects further enrollment growth based on the high demand for and marketability of its online academic programs. (CFR 4.6). The provost, associate provost and COO emphasized
that the decision to launch new programs is based on projected enrollment growth, focus groups held by the CEO, and estimates of human resource and technology needs (CFR 4.6, 4.7). While a new program idea may emerge from the faculty and conceptually developed by them, senior administrators develop the budget and financial plan before the CEO submits it to Touro College and University System’s senior leadership team for review and approval.
A. Touro University Worldwide’s Institutional Autonomy

In both the Offsite Review (OSR) and during the Accreditation Visit (AV), the team became increasingly aware of a long-standing matter regarding compliance on issues of autonomy from Touro College and University System. The team asked TUW’s WSCUC liaison to elucidate, and, after his extensive research, the team concluded that this is a grey area which requires clarification between the institution and WSCUC. The team identifies what we view as requiring clarification through a WSCUC and TUW collaborative effort in this section of our report. Four CFRs are of most concern:

- 1.5: … [T]he institution … operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.
- 1.7: [T]he institution’s finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors.
- 3.4: The institution … has unqualified independent financial audits…
- 3.9: The institution has an independent governing board that … exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.

The team wishes to make clear that we are not making a judgment on whether TUW complies with these CFRs. The issue for the team is that, given what we found in our analysis, we could not make that judgment. Our research indicated a convoluted accreditation history, and our recommendation to WSCUC and TUW is that they must sort this out as soon as possible.

The key question, as indicated at other points in this report, is: To what extent is TUW independent of the policies and controls of its larger entities, Touro College and University
System and Touro University? This seems to the team an unresolved issue which must be more firmly determined as part of an accreditation reaffirmation.

In our conversations during the visit with Touro College and University System’s CFO and two of its board members, we deduced that, despite any nuances among them or their view of the strength and the inter- or in-dependence of TUW’s current leadership, their characterization of TUW was that it was a branch campus of the System. The team members who spoke to these individuals independently determined this estimation.

The TUW CEO, on the other hand, disagrees strongly that there are any issues regarding autonomy. In a conversation with the team chair before the exit meeting, where this was raised, he asserted:

- That any and all questions about TUW autonomy had been resolved with WSCUC over the last decade;
- That the System recognizes the TUW CEO’s competence to such a degree that he has complete independence as long as he exercises his fiduciary responsibilities to the System;
- That the TUW Finance Office has sufficient autonomy from the System Finance Office (e.g., in financial aid and budget construction/management) and that they are de facto, if not de jure, autonomous;
- That every academic decision is independently made and implemented with what amounts to pro forma System academic leadership approval;
- That, while there is no independent governing Board, TUW complies with applicable WSCUC policies;
• That, because the System knows so well and trusts so completely the TUW CEO, it is inconceivable that there would be any issues about autonomy. As an example, when asked about setting up an advisory council for TUW (promised in an earlier institutional report), the TUW CEO eschewed the idea because of his complete and total access to the Board.

B. Commendations and Recommendations

Based upon the team’s extensive review and analysis of all documents and materials provided by TUW, as well as interviews conducted during the Reaffirmation Visit and further deliberations, the following commendations and recommendations are presented.

Commendations

1. The team appreciates the warmth of the welcome and the receptivity to us and our needs by the entire TUW community. The provost and ALO deserves a special thank you for her responsiveness and promptness in meeting the team’s needs and making the visit smooth.

2. TUW is commended for its robust academic culture with a strong commitment to continuous improvement and mission alignment.
   a. The connection of the Robust Learning Model to the elements of educational effectiveness is impressive.
   b. TUW exhibits a significant commitment to living its educational values and implementing programs reflecting those values.
c. By all accounts, TUW shows a remarkable ability to make both full-time and contingent faculty feel like part of the one academic community.

d. Mission-commitment in sustaining TCLA.

3. TUW is clearly a student-centered institution with a very strong commitment to students’ positive educational experience. We were impressed by the TUW LMS that affords professors of undergraduate and graduate students a level of touch and flexibility at least equal to, if not better than, what we typically assume is the advantage of traditional classroom teachers.

4. The financial success and turnaround from 2012 is to be commended and is quite remarkable.

Recommendations

1. Institutional autonomy. TUW needs to revise its organizational governance structure in a manner that conforms with WSCUC guidelines for an independent and autonomous institution (CFR 1.5, 1.7, 3.9). The team recommends that institutional leadership collaborate with WSCUC staff to establish the appropriate path to correct the extant deviations from recommended practices.

2. Strategic planning. While there are aspects of budgeting and planning processes in place, the team concludes that TUW must refine and develop those processes so all the elements work toward overall institutional goals (CFRs 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6).

3. Sustainability. While the team recognizes the immeasurable contributions of TUW’s CEO and provost, an institution is larger than any individual. Senior stakeholders from TUW and the board of trustees should institute mechanisms, processes and principles to
assure the institution will continue to be strong when new leadership follows their respective tenures (CFR 3.7, 3.8, 3.9).
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A. Self-Review Under WSCUC Standards-Compliance Audit Checklist: WSCUC Re-Affirmation
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## 9A  Self Review Under WSCUC Standards-Compliance Audit Checklist

**WSCUC Re-Affirmation**

**Instruction to team:**
Please attach this form to the team report. Missing documents should be noted in the recommendations section of the team report.

**Name of Institution:**
**Touro University Worldwide**

Date of Off Site Review:  October 28, 2016  
Date of Site Visit:  April 25-27, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1  Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.2  Educational objectives at the institutional and program levels (Also CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.42) | [http://www.tuw.edu/about_us/institutional_goals.html](http://www.tuw.edu/about_us/institutional_goals.html)  
[http://www.tuw.edu/about_us/institutional_learning_outcomes.html](http://www.tuw.edu/about_us/institutional_learning_outcomes.html) |
| 1.2  Public statement on student achievement (retention, graduation, student learning (Also CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2) | **Statement on Student Achievement**  
Consumer Information |
| 1.3  Academic freedom policy (also 3.2, 3.10) | **Academic Policy Book – Page 60**  
**Student Handbook - Page 28** |
| 1.4  Diversity policies and procedures; Procedures for Special Accommodations (also CFR 2.2a, 3.1) | Diversity: Page 149  
Special Accommodation: Page 153  
**Catalog** |
| 1.5  Independent Board Policy (also CFR 3.6-3.10) | The institution does not experiences interference from the board of trustees . |
| 1.6  Student complaint and grievance policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for 6 years  
Institutional Policy regarding grading, credits offered, also information about grade appeal. (also CFR 2.12) | **Catalog**  
**Student Handbook – Page 31**  
**Academic Policy Handbook – Page 57**  
**Catalog – Page 156**  
**Student Voice System**  
**Student Handbook: Student Grievance – Page 31**  
**Academic Policy Handbook: Grievance Policy – Page 71**  
**Catalog: Grievance Policy – Page 139** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.7  | Integrity, appropriate policies, Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc. Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files | **Catalog – Page 111**  
**Academic Policy – Page 70** |
|      |                                                                                    | Faculty Handbook – Page 51  
**Academic Policy – Page 71** |
|      |                                                                                    |TUW Official Transcripts |
|      | Faculty grievance policies                                                        | **Employee Handbook – Page 51** |
|      | Record of faculty grievances                                                      | **Employee Handbook – Page 51** |
|      | Staff grievance policies                                                          | **Employee Handbook – Page 44** |
|      | Record of staff grievances and complaints                                          | TUW keeps record of grievances |
|      | Employee handbook                                                                 | **Employee Handbook** |
|      | Up-to-date student transcripts with key that explains credit hours, grades, levels, etc. | **TUW Official Transcripts** |
|      | Admissions records that match stated requirements; complete files                 | All admissions records are located in the Registrar’s Office  
Admissions Requirements- **Catalog Page 111** |
|      | Policies and procedures to protect the integrity of grades                        | **Academic Policy Handbook – Page 9**  
**Grading Policy** |
|      | Tuition and fee schedule                                                          | **Catalog: Tuition and Fees Page 118** |
|      | Policies on tuition refunds                                                       | **Catalog: Refund Policy – Page 120** |
|      | Policy on credit hour/award of credit                                             | **TUW Student Success Guidelines**  
Credit Hour for Online Learning  
**Catalog: Transfer Credit Policy – Page 115** |
| 1.8  | Regular independent audits of finances                                            | **Independent Financial Audits** |
|      | WASC-related policies to ensure sub change policies                               | WASC Approvals, Action letters, Documentation of the start of the approved program. Visit report Documents all available  
WASC Related Policies |
|      | **Standard 2  Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**          | **List of Degree Programs**  
**Catalog: Page 6** |
| 2.1  | List of degree programs, showing curriculum and credits for each (also CFR 3.1)  | **List of Degree Programs**  
**Catalog: Page 6** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>Catalog Pages</th>
<th>Admission Requirements</th>
<th>Student Graduation Eligibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation (also CFR 3.1,3.2,3.3,4.3,4.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2a</td>
<td>For associate and bachelor’s degrees statement of general education requirements sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning</td>
<td><strong>Catalog: Touro University Worldwide General Education – Pages 6-9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.2b| The institution’s graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes, and at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree (also CFR 3.1, 3.2,3.3) | **Catalog- Page 159**  
Faculty list and numbers of faculty appropriate to teach graduate program |                         |                                |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Learning Outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated in the course, program PLOs for every program. Practicum work is well organized. There is a Director that is working with the agencies and students and the programs (for example MFT developed a great process of follow up and oversight. (also CFR 4.3, 4.4, 3.5))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Students Learning Outcomes developed by the faculty (SLOs) are reflected in course Syllabi. (also CFR 4.3, 4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Challenge students to meet high standards of performance, provide ongoing feedback about their performance (also CFR 4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>The institution has an assessment infrastructure to assess students at the institutional level (also CFR 4.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.7 | Program review process with clear criteria, which include assessment of program retention/graduation and achievement of learning outcomes (also CFR 4.1, 4.6) | Program Reviews  
Program Review Plan for TUW  
Program Review Plan for TCLA |
| 2.8 | Policies re faculty scholarship and creative activity and faculty promotion (also CFR 3.2) |  
Faculty Handbook – Page 31-34  
Academic Policy Handbook – Pages 62-66 |
| 2.9 | Promote linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. (also CFR 3.2) |  
Faculty Handbook-Page 31 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.10 | Data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by demographic categories and programs (also CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)  
Data collected and disaggregated by appropriate categories of IPEDS, and university assessment of student success. |
| 2.11 | Co-curricular activities  
Policies on student evaluation of faculty  
Forms for evaluation of faculty by students  
List of student services and co-curricular activities  
Policies on financial aid  
Co-curricular activities  
N/A for completely on-line institutions  
End of Course Evaluation  
End of Course Evaluation Instrument  
Student Services and Activities  
Catalog: Federal Financial Aid – Page 123 |
| 2.12 | Academic calendar, accurate advising regarding academic requirements (also CFR 1.6)  
Web site: [http://www.tuw.edu/students/calendar.html](http://www.tuw.edu/students/calendar.html)  
Catalog: Academic Calendar – Page 3 |
| 2.13 | Recruitment and advertising material  
Registration procedures  
Registration forms  
Student Support Services (also CFR 3.1)  
2.13 Folder (Team Room) 2.10.2 Folder (Team Room)  
2.13.1 Registration Procedures  
2.14 Registration Form  
Advisement, ADA Policy, Financial Aid Counseling |
| 2.14 | Transfer students served equitably, and promptly. Providing student services. (also CFR 1.6)  
Catalog – Page 115  
Credit Transfer policy |

**Standard 3 Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability**

| 3.1 | Faculty and staff are sufficient in number, and background in the discipline (also CFR 2.1, 2.2a)  
Faculty Statistics (Attached)  
Organizational Chart (Attached) |
| 3.2 | List of faculty with classifications, e.g., core, full-time, part-time, adjunct, by program (also CFR 1.7, 4.3-4.4)  
Faculty Handbook – Page 29  
Faculty Classification |
| 3.3.1 | Faculty hiring policies  
Academic Policy Handbook- Page 61  
Faculty Handbook – Page 8 |
| 3.3.1 | Faculty evaluation policies and procedures  
Academic Policy Handbook – Pages 62-66  
Faculty Handbook – Pages 29-31  
3.3.1 Faculty Evaluation and Procedures |
| 3.3.1 | Faculty Handbook if available  
Faculty Handbook |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The institution engages faculty (FT, PT) in the processes of assessment, program</td>
<td>Evidence of Faculty Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review and faculty development. Statements concerning faculty role in assessment</td>
<td>3.4.3 Faculty Role in Assessment of Student Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of student learning (also CFR 2.1,2.2b, 4.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>The institution is financially stable. Appropriate financial records (also CFR</td>
<td>3.5 Audited Financial Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1,1.2, 2.10,4.6, 4.7)</td>
<td>Financial Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Financials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of Finances in the university Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Inventory of technology resources for students and faculty (also CFR 1.2, 2.2)</td>
<td>3.6 Technology Resources for Students and Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>The Institutional Leadership is characterized by integrity, high performance,</td>
<td>The university Leadership have many years of experience in higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility and accountability.</td>
<td>education administration. Understands the policies and performs all tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with high integrity responsibility and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>The institution established clear roles of responsibility, and authority.</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>The institution has an independent board that exercises appropriate oversight over</td>
<td>TUW is part of the Touro College and University System and the Board of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>institutional integrity. (also CFR 1.5-1.7)</td>
<td>Trustees is independent, possess the qualifications required to govern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>institution of higher learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>The institution has a full time CEO, CFO whose full time responsibilities are to</td>
<td>CEO, CFO, Provost, Associate Provost ----Bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the institution. Other qualified administrators that provide educational leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Documents Required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.10 | The institution clearly defines the governance roles of the FT and PT faculty (also 2.1,2.4,2.5, 4.3,4.4) | Academic Council  
Faculty Handbook – Page 6 |

**Standard 4  Creating and Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional learning and Improvement**

| 4.1 | The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes in both academic and non academic areas. New curriculum, program approval processes, program review, assessment of student learning etc. (also CFR 2.7,2.10) | Substantive change Policy  
Program Review  
Academic Policy Handbook – Page 53  
New Program Approval Process |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic plan</th>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of planning process</td>
<td>Available in the Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process for review of implementation of strategic plan</td>
<td>Reviewed once a year by Academic Council, Provost, CFO and CEO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New program approval process | Academic Policy Handbook – Page 53  
New Program Approval Process |
| Program review process | Program Review Process |

<p>| 4.2 | The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. (also CFR 1.2, 2.10) | Description of IR Function and Staffing |
| 4.3 | The institution has well established practices and policies for gathering and analyzing and interpreting information to create a culture of evidence and improvement. (also CFR 2.2-2.6) | TUW has a cycle of data collection, analysis interpretation and presentation of the findings and development of a plan to develop improvement measures as needed following the findings. |
| 4.4 | Periodic Analysis of grades and evaluation of procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices. (also CFR 2.2-2.6) | Grades are reviewed every session by Quality Assurance and the Provost. There are effective grading policies, and the grading are compared with the rubrics that represent student achievement. If there is no congruency, the director of Quality Assurance discusses the problem with the Director of the program, and it is brought to the attention of the faculty. Attachment 018a is demonstrating a case as such. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFR</th>
<th>Documents Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.5 | Involvement of Stakeholders  
(also CFR 2.6,2.7) |
| 4.6 | The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, in the planning process such as strategic planning.  
(also CFR 1.1,3.4)  
Strategic Planning  
Academic Retreat- |
| 4.7 | The institution is considering changes such as new program development and recourse allocation.  
(also CFR 1.1, 2, 1,3,4) |

**Additional New Program Development are in the discussion:**

Comments:

### Related to Substantive Change

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Locations of all off-campus sites and programs offered at such sites  
(more than 50% of program) | TUW (TCLA) on-ground  
1. BS in Business and Administration  
2. BA in Psychology  
3. BA in Judaic Study |
|   | Number of students enrolled at such sites | 3 programs with total of 72 students in TCLA |
|   | Date of first offerings | TCLA 2005 |
| 2 | Names of all programs for which 50% of the program is offered through distance education  
All Programs at TUW online are online 100% | TUW-online  
1. Psychology (MA) concentration in media psychology)  
2. Marriage & Family Therapy (MA)  
3. Industrial and Organizational Psychology (MA)  
4. MBA (MS)  
5. PsyD (Doctorate) |
<p>|   | Number of students enrolled in each |   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2b</th>
<th>Date each was first offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>MCP  2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MFT  2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>IOP  2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>MBA  2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PsyD 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>MHRM 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>MDR  2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3  | Names of all hybrid programs | N/A |
| 3a | Number of students enrolled in each | N/A |
| 3b | Date each was first offered     | N/A |

**Accuracy and Availability of Records**

| Policies and procedures for students, faculty and staff are stated consistently in all media | Yes |
| Policies, procedures, and information are readily available to relevant constituents | Yes |
| Records are accurate and up to date | Yes |
### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where is the policy located? University Catalog 2017-2018, pg. 122-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution’s credit hour practices follow federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process, periodic audits)?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was noted that periodic seat time survey is conducted in order to review the continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accuracy of the credit hours. The institution’s credit hour practices follow federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES  ☐ NO All on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution’s credit hour practices follow federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? The institution reviews all courses for appropriate credits and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>periodic surveys are conducted of course work load and time spent on courses. Credit hours are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level)</td>
<td>calculated after the data is analyzed. Each syllabi reviewed within the Integrated Campus system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in each course by the faculty who is teaching the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? All on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)?  ☐ AA/AS  ☐ BA/BS  ☐ MA  ☐ Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? All disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution’s credit hour practices follow federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? All on-line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours</td>
<td>What kinds of courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study,</td>
<td>What degree level(s)?  ☐ AA/AS  ☐ BA/BS  ☐ MA  ☐ Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accelerated)</td>
<td>What discipline(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level)</td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded?  ☐ YES  ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The institution’s credit hour practices follow federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other</td>
<td>How many programs were reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)?  ☐ AA/AS  ☐ BA/BS  ☐ MA  ☐ Doctoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Reviewed</td>
<td>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Federal regulations | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?  
Credit hour cost and net price calculator.  
Enrollment specialists address estimated cost with potential students. |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?  
The institution publishes on its website the average length of time to complete the associate, bachelor, masters, MFT, and doctorate. It also publishes credit hour cost and provides to a net price calculator.  
Enrollment specialists address estimated cost with potential students. |
| Careers and employment | Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?  
The institution provides career information to students for all degrees. It provides more information on employment for specific degrees closely associated with direct job types (e.g., social work, marriage and family therapy, and doctorate in psychology). |

2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.
3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation* WASC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on student complaints | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
● YES ☐ NO  
If so, is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Is so, where?  
The institution’s formal procedure for student complaints is easily accessible via the online Integrated Campus System.  
Comments:  
The institution’s has systemized Student Voice functionality of the Integrated Campus System. A detailed explication of the University Student Voice System (USVS) is available on the university website at: [http://www.tuw.edu/students/student-success-center/university-student-voice-system/](http://www.tuw.edu/students/student-success-center/university-student-voice-system/) |
| Process(es)/ procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
● YES ☐ NO  
If so, please describe briefly:  
Student complaints are managed by the director of student success, and monitored by the Provost. Student complaints are reviewed daily and sent to the appropriate department for immediate follow up and resolution.  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
● YES ☐ NO  
Comments:  
Student complaints receive immediate attention and are typically addressed and resolved within 48 business hours. More complex issues may reflect a “pending” resolution for greater than the standard response time. |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
● YES ☐ NO  
If so, where?  
Student complaints, resolutions, compliments, and suggestions are recorded in the online Integrated Campus System.  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  
● YES ☐ NO  
If so, please describe briefly: Student complaints and resolutions are tracked and monitored via the online Integrated Campus System.  
Comments:  
The institution evidences consistent and persistent efforts to use student feedback wholly for quality assurance and continuous improvement. |

*§602-16(1)(ix)
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.
4 – TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?  
● YES □ NO  
If so, is the policy publically available?  
● YES □ NO  
If so, where? Website (http://www.tuw.edu/admissions/transfer-students/traditional-credits/)  
Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education?  
● YES □ NO  
Comments: |

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

1. Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and

2. Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Mark Schulman  
Date: May 8, 2017