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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

High Tech High School Graduate School of Education (HTHGSE) is embedded within High Tech High, an integrated network of 16 charter schools serving some 6,000 K-12 students across four campuses. HTHGSE was established in 2007 with a mission “to develop reflective practitioner leaders who work effectively with colleagues and communities to create and sustain innovative, authentic, and rigorous learning environments for all students.” HTHGSE seeks to leverage its unique position as a graduate school embedded within a network of K-12 schools to bring together theory and practice, scholarship and action. The institution pursues its mission by offering two master’s programs, by promoting inquiry and dialogue about how to improve teaching and learning at all levels of education, and by providing professional education and adult learning programs. More than 170 students have completed graduate degrees to date, and some 5,000 educators and leaders each year participate in professional education programs.

HTHGSE submitted a letter of intent to seek accreditation in 2008. Following a special visit in 2012, the Commission granted the institution candidacy status. The institution received a Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit in September 2013 and an Educational Effectiveness Review for Initial Accreditation (EER-IA) visit in March 2015. During its June 2015 meeting, the Commission granted HTHGSE Initial Accreditation for five years, endorsed recommendations made in the team’s EER-IA report, and scheduled an Accreditation Visit in spring 2020. The 2015 team recommended that HTHGSE’s strategic planning process should address key infrastructure and student service issues, clarify faculty governance structures and processes, and define faculty workload and time expectations.
B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The team followed standard procedures and schedules for reaccreditation visits as specified in the WSCUC August 2019 Evaluator Guide. HTHGSE posted its Institutional Review Report for Reaffirmation on September 6, 2019, and on September 9 the team chair sent team members a letter with assignments for analysis of the re-accreditation materials, including lead analysts (a writer and reader) for each component of the institutional report, each of the four standards, and each of the required federal compliance forms.

In preparation for its pre-Offsite Review (OSR) conference call, each team member reviewed the institutional report and related evidence exhibits and then completed an OSR Team Worksheet. The team assistant chair compiled the team members’ responses and distributed a combined worksheet. The conference call enabled the team to move efficiently during its October 29, 2019 Offsite Review. At the OSR, the team confirmed its initial assignments, crafted five preliminary commendations based on the institutional report, and specified five lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV). The team also decided to request the institution to provide a number of additional exhibits of evidence and identified key individuals and groups to meet during the AV. By mid-February 2020, the institution had provided the requested material and developed a visit schedule that met the team’s needs.

The team held its pre-Accreditation Visit (AV) conference call in late January 2020, reviewing the team member’s assignments, the additional material provided by the institution, and the process for conducting the Accreditation Visit and its aftermath. On the eve of the AV, which was held March 4-6, 2020, the team met to finalize the schedule, draft questions to pose during each session of the AV, and discuss how the team could best cover its most pressing
questions and concerns, especially regarding the lines of inquiry. In addition, the assistant chair reviewed early communications through the confidential email account (there were none). During the visit, the team requested and HTHGSE provided additional evidence exhibits to clarify and confirm statements made by HTHGSE community members during the visit. After deliberation and per standard practice, the team developed its final commendations and recommendations on the evening of the second full visit day, which the team chair delivered verbatim during the exit interview.

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

Prior to beginning its self-study HTHGSE hosted a WSCUC vice-president, who trained HTHGSE’s leadership on the accreditation process. The training served as a foundation for HTHGSE’s leadership who then formed an Institutional Review Team (IRT). The IRT included nine members of senior leadership and faculty. The IRT met regularly and pursued a rigorous self-study process. The team took a clearly intentional approach, reflecting both on areas of strength and areas of potential improvement in its master’s programs. Their ultimate goal was to use the self-review as the groundwork to develop an action plan for institutional improvement. In addition to the internal self-study program review, HTHGSE enlisted the help of an external evaluator who conducted interviews, observed students showcasing capstone projects, and facilitated focus groups with program faculty, current students and alumni. The external reviewer was engaged to conduct an outside formative assessment and to act as a “critical friend” to shine a fresh and different perspective on the strengths and opportunities of the programs offered at the institution.

The institution’s review of compliance with WSCUC Standards was conducted in a reflective process that revealed areas of strength and areas needing attention. For example, they
concluded that HTHGSE “regularly and systematically analyzes data and reflects on the effectiveness of programs” and that “reflective dialogue and a culture of institutional learning are evident in quality programs,” but also that “inclusion of multiple stakeholders in the program review process would be valuable” (Standard 4 Synthesis/Reflections). The compiled results of all self-study review documents were used to determine strengths as well as prioritize opportunities for improvement and will be incorporated into the upcoming process of the next five-year strategic planning cycle.

Leadership and staff of HTHGSE were insightful, thorough, and reflective throughout the self-study process as they prepared and wrote the institutional report. The report was systematically organized and clearly written, precisely articulating the status and condition of the institution. The extent of HTHGSE’s self-study review was apparent in the breadth of evidence provided to the team to accompany the institutional report. When the team requested additional documents, the updated data and evidence provided by the institution supported the team’s ability to accurately assess the institution’s efficacy and adherence to the WSCUC Standards.

The team concluded that the self-review did lead the institution to a greater understanding of its effectiveness, systems of quality improvement, and ability to assess student learning.
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

HTHGSE clearly summarizes its response to previous Commission actions, in particular the recommendations included in the Commission’s July 2015 action letter and makes a strong case in its institutional report that the institution has responded appropriately to the Commission’s actions. The institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate development in four areas of concern: (i) the status of its diversity task force (CFR 1.4); (ii) timely disclosure of Student Handbook policies (CFR 2.12); (iii) the development of a formal student governance system (CFRs 2.11, 2.13); and (iv) the careful development of faculty governance policies. (CFR 3.10)

The institution noted significant progress made on each of these matters. In each case, HTHGSE has met the Commission’s recommendations, and in the case of the diversity task force, now a standing body, they have substantially exceeded what was recommended. Because most of the recommendations in the 2015 Commission Action Letter were offered in the context of a young institution just beginning to grow its student body, faculty, and programs, the institution’s responses to the recommendations provides a useful window through which to view its overall development over the last five years.

While the areas of student governance and faculty governance are better articulated and understood than they were in 2015, these will continue to be works in progress as HTHGSE progressively grows its enrollment, defines its programs, and articulates the role of the faculty and staff. (CFR 2.8, 3.2, 3.3, 3.10)
Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with Standard 1, with the exception of CFR 1.2, about which the team has made a recommendation noted below.

Institutional Purpose (CFRs 1.1-1.2) The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes the institution’s focus. The mission serves as a foundational statement to guide the implementation of the institution’s core values, particularly related to diversity, equity and integration (DEI). The faculty, students and staff clearly and enthusiastically demonstrated through the various interviews during the AV that they share these values and are committed to the institution’s efforts to realize the mission. HTHGSE’s leadership, faculty and staff will re-evaluate the mission during the upcoming strategic planning process. The team is confident that HTHGSE’s reflective nature and thoughtful attention to creating and sustaining an innovative, authentic and rigorous learning environment, in addition to DEI, will be apparent in this next stage of their development. (CFR 1.1)

Relative to CFR 1.2, the team notes that HTHGSE does not use its public website to make data available about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, as well as evidence of student learning. Although the institution does maintain an Institutional Data, Research and Evaluation website with information about student learning and other critical information and analysis, this site is not easy to locate on the institution’s public website. As a result of this, the team made a clear recommendation regarding CFR 1.2: “Post disaggregated student success data on the institution’s public website” with the expectation that mandated data will be made public on their website. (CFR 1.2)
Integrity and Transparency (CFRs 1.3-1.8) The institution has a published statement for academic freedom which is shared in the Faculty Handbook (page 7) and makes clear that principles of academic freedom extend to all HTHGSE faculty members as teachers and scholars. (CFR 1.3) The team found HTHGSE’s leadership to be mindful of strengthening diversity in their hiring practices for full-time faculty and staff, as well as practitioner faculty. The Faculty Handbook outlines these policies (page 17-18). Faculty and staff interviewed during the AV expressed satisfaction with the attention to diversity. In addition, HTHGSE’s Strategic Communication and Marketing Plan states a goal to “increase enrollment in programs with diverse representation of students” (page 13). Data from 2018-2019 shows the institution’s concentrated effort to recruit a diverse student population was evident in the MEd in Educational Leadership as this program increased the Black/African American enrollment to 38% from 18% in 2017-2018. Latinx stayed the same for these two years at 6%, but the White/Caucasian enrollment data shows a decrease from 58% in 2017-2018 to 44% in 2018-2019. (CFR 1.4)

The Student Handbook includes an Equal Opportunity statement that “all admission actions will be administered in a non-discriminatory manner” (page 42) and there are defined formal and informal policies and procedures regarding filing a grievance against a faculty member, staff member or administrator (Student Handbook, pages 45-51). (CFRs 1.4, 1.6, 1.7). HTHGSE adheres to CFR 1.6 as the institution clearly shares information on academic programs, costs, completion timeframes, human subjects in research, and student support services in the Student Handbook, recruitment and marketing materials, and the institution’s website.

In an interview with the Chief Financial Officer, the team members confirmed that the institution’s finances are audited annually with the most current audit being conducted by
Christy White Associates for the year ending June 30, 2018. The 2017-2018 audit was also made available to the team as evidence with the institutional report. (CFR 1.7)

HTHGSE is not affiliated with government, corporate, or religious organizations, and the institution has education as its primary purpose. HTHGSE operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. (CFR 1.5)

Lastly, the team found that, at every stage of the reaffirmation process, HTHGSE’s leadership, faculty, staff and students communicated openly and transparently with the team. The team thanked members of the institution for hosting the team in a welcoming manner and addressing its needs throughout the visit, including responding to requests for more information, arranging many interviews, and happily sharing their valuable time. High Tech High Graduate School of Education clearly conducted a thorough and thoughtful internal review with input from key constituencies. The team affirmed the hard work that HTHGSE put into the institutional report and in responding to requests for documents. As a result of the reaffirmation visit, the WSCUC team came to understand the progress made since the accreditation visit in 2015 and future directions for the institution. (CFR 1.8)

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

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

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1-2.7) HTHGSE ensures through a variety of processes, including an annual review, that its educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, and rigor. (CFR 2.1) Faculty develop student learning outcomes and standards of performance for each course, disseminating this information through course syllabi. Standards of performance reflect graduate-level competencies and skills. Full-time program directors for both degree programs collaborate with faculty to evaluate curricula and develop academic policies,
with the teaching and advisement of students being a priority. The team is impressed by the institution’s intentionality in developing degree programs that integrate theory and practice and take advantage of being embedded in a K-12 environment. Assessment and program review practices discussed in more detail below actively involve students and provide evidence of student achievement. (CFRs 2.5-2.7)

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8-2.9)

HTHGSE clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for both students and faculty. “Normative Loads” are stipulated for faculty and staff. (CFR 2.9) The institution is distinctive in that its scholarship and creative activity are action-based, supporting innovations that enhance the community and other stakeholders at-large. An increasing share of faculty and staff have earned terminal degrees, and the institution has supported current faculty who are in the process of earning their doctorates. Faculty, students, and alumni regularly collaborate in the presentation of scholarship at educational conferences and for publication in academic presses. (CFR 2.8) Annually, HTHGSE sponsors and hosts nationally--and internationally--recognized conferences for educators.

Student Learning and Success (CRFs 2.10-2.14) The institution demonstrates that it is attuned to students’ needs to make timely progress towards the completion of their degrees and for them to be successful after graduation. According to reported data from program reviews, HTHGSE is aware of specific opportunities for improvement. Increasing and refining the collection of data from students and alumni will help the institution envision and foster better student learning and success. The team believes that the recently deployed How You Doing? dashboard will help with the achievement of this standard. HTHGSE’s approach to student success is discussed more completely below.
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

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

Sufficient faculty and staff (CFRs 3.1 to 3.3) The team met with faculty and staff in a series of interviews that helped the team more completely understand the rich and diverse roles faculty and staff fill across the organization. Over the past five years the number of faculty and staff have briskly grown, expanding from what faculty and staff frequently described as a cohort of four faculty members to a contingent of almost forty. Faculty and staff members who were interviewed repeatedly and enthusiastically welcomed this growth, averring that they benefitted greatly from expanded opportunities for broader cross-collaboration and enhanced perspectives from diverse voices. The data reviewed by the team substantiated a robust faculty-to-student ratio. The team observed that the institution may wish to consider adding a small number of additional support positions to ensure ongoing adequate staffing levels. Nevertheless, given its expected continued growth, the organization as a whole would benefit from a strategic analysis of its staffing needs and the development of a staffing plan. (CFR 3.1)

HTHGSE faculty and staff evaluation practices align with the overall organizational culture of continued assessment and improvement occurring on the individual, team, and institutional levels. HTHGSE has clearly articulated employment practices in its Faculty and Staff Handbook, including processes for evaluations that support the program’s goals of providing feedback to improve teaching and learning in the programs. Faculty are evaluated by three forms of evaluation: peer review consisting of a two-person faculty committee, self-evaluation, and student evaluation. Additionally, faculty are evaluated for contributions made directly in the classroom such as guest lectures, development of course materials and the like.
Lastly, faculty are evaluated on their impact in the field based on publications and presentations. HTHGSE has developed and defined scholarship and methods of evaluation in HTHGSE’s Statement on Scholarship and Innovation. Upon completion of the faculty review process, faculty meet with the Dean or Program Director to further discuss faculty evaluations and goals, completing the assessment cycle. (CFR 3.2)

Faculty and staff enumerated many professional development opportunities available to them within the organization. Faculty highlighted professional development trainings, cross pollination of expertise, networking, and external conferences. They also proudly pointed to each individual faculty and staff member’s dedication to constant improvement and learning as sources of continual professional growth. Although the team did not see a cohesive plan for faculty and staff development, evidence of the ease of access to professional growth opportunities was clearly present and appropriate to the scale and character of HTHGSE. (CFR 3.3)

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFRs 3.4, 3.5) Audit reports for both 2017-18 and 2018-19 present an organization with a sound financial basis and multiple revenue streams, largely from philanthropic grants and substantial fees earned from presenting well-attended professional trainings and events. HTHGSE’s annual budget processes are appropriately developed and account for contingency plans. At the date of the site visit, the level of philanthropic activity and other assets suggest sufficient financial resources to carry out HTHGSE’s mission for the immediate future. (CFR 3.4)

In its self-study, HTHGSE says it is interested in exploring the potential for sustaining itself through philanthropic support, examining models that place lesser emphasis on tuition and more on research grants as one example. AV interviews with campus leadership also revealed an
active concern about how to increase tuition revenue. Based on the data reviewed, continued analysis of the viability and appeal of the degree programs will be beneficial and should be necessarily accompanied by careful modeling of the revenue contributions of its training and research programs to determine the right balance for long-term viability. (CFR 3.4) This work will likely take place during the institution’s strategic planning, therefore the team added a recommendation for HTHGSE to, “clarify, as part of its upcoming strategic planning process, the desired mix and scale of degree and professional learning programs, and develop a strategic enrollment plan based on the analysis of its degree programs.” (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.6)

The team reviewed survey data from HTHGSE’s “How You Doing” dashboard, which included satisfaction with IT resources and facilities, among other factors. Surveys indicated an overall high satisfaction with access to appropriate IT resources. At the site visit, HTHGSE piloted its “Zoom Room” allowing faculty, staff and board members to remotely attend meetings. While some students interviewed during the AV expressed a desire of additional on-campus library resources, the team did not observe a clear need for additional scholarly resources. Faculty and staff groups interviewed during the AV expressed general satisfaction with the academic resources available to them from their course materials and from the CREI resources.

HTHGSE moved into in its current facility in 2015, conveniently connected to a High Tech High elementary school and within a block of High Tech High. Easy access to the HTH schools was stated as highly desirable for the graduate students as it allows an immediate blending of theory and practice. HTHGSE’s facility houses offices for staff and faculty, with dedicated classrooms and a large open space utilized for multiple purposes across many programs and external users. Given HTHGSE’s growth in the past five years, competition for
space has increased considerably. (During the AV, the team took over all normal classroom
space for its team room and interview room forcing some courses to temporarily relocate). In
multiple meetings, faculty and staff expressed concerns about space, although faculty did
indicate they had ideas and plans for how to better use its existing space. HTHGSE will need to
assess its facility as part of its next phase of strategic planning. (CFR 3.5)

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.6 to 3.10) HTHGSE has
appropriate processes and applies resources and organizational structure to ensure the quality and
sustainability of its programs. Faculty expectations and workloads are documented in the faculty
handbook. Although taking on a number of roles, faculty and staff understand their roles within
the larger organization. Faculty have significant engagement in the development of their own
programs and collaborate across the organization. Based on meetings with faculty and staff, the
institutional environment encourages communication and includes faculty and staff voices to
ensure educational effectiveness based on a continual process of evaluation and subsequent
improvement in all its programs. At all levels of the organization, strong communication and
decision-making processes are clearly valued and everyone is dedicated to respectful decision-
making processes, having even identified a system of decision categories and who should be
included in the decision. (CFRs 3.7, 3.10)

HTHGSE has a full-time CEO and a full-time CFO and other qualified administrators.
(CFR 3.8) The former provost was recently elevated to president and the institution appears to be
managing that leadership transition smoothly. Throughout the visit, the team heard praise for the
efforts of leadership to create an environment of transparency, inclusivity, and responsiveness.
Meetings with leadership indicate they are deeply responsive to needs expressed in the
community, and their actions demonstrate their investment in the goals and values of the organization and commitment to its successful future. (CFR 3.6)

Three board members recently joined the now seven-member board. The board members are all notable experts in their respective fields of education, business, marketing and investments. Board members have the necessary fiduciary knowledge, and the board systematically reviews appropriate financial information and key indicators. An interview with board members demonstrated that they are seriously engaged in key institutional issues, such as leadership development and strategic planning. Given the institution’s growth and functional development, board members will benefit from specialized training that addresses their roles as members of an academic board and bolsters their knowledge of the academic, finance and audit responsibilities of boards including the need for the evaluation process of the CEO. (CFR 3.9) This team recommends that the institution should “enhance the role of the Board of Directors through training, building on the existing committee structure as outlined in the Board’s by-laws, and establishing a regular process to review the president’s performance.” (CFR 3.9)

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

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

Quality Assurance Processes (CFRs 4.1-4.2) Maintaining and improving a systematic and comprehensive set of quality-assurance programs is an essential feature of HTHGSE’s identity.

The heart of HTHGSE’s quality-assurance efforts is the cyclical Institutional Review process, which integrates institutional assessment (program review), institutional evaluation (multi-level goal setting) and annual faculty and staff review. HTHGSE archives key assessment
and program review documents at its Data, Research, and Evaluation website. Assessment and program review documents show that the institution and its programs implement clearly designed assessment and review processes that result in regular actions to improve the institution’s programs. Other critical data are available at a recently unveiled dashboard called How You Doing? (CFR 4.1)

HTHGSE does not have a sole staff member with designated responsibility for overseeing the institutional research function, employing instead an institutional research team led by the president. This arrangement is consistent with institution’s size and developmental stage. During its upcoming strategic planning process, HTHGSE will want to consider its institutional research function, asking, for example, whether its effectiveness is adequately assessed by current program review processes and what opportunities are available to leverage institutional data to achieve institutional purposes in enrollment management and other areas. (CFR 4.2)

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.3-4.7) As noted above, HTHGSE has developed and consistently employs well-established policies and practices for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information, and the institution has carefully nurtured a culture of evidence and improvement. The most recent Institutional Review Report shows that HTHGSE uses its assessment and review processes not just to evaluate and improve student learning, but also to address matters including enrollment management, the role of faculty, access to scholarship, information technology and data systems, facilities, and finances. The institution is poised to use its conclusions from its 2019 institutional review to inform the next stage of its strategic planning. A notable aspect of recent assessment and institutional review is a
consideration of how the institution should engage a wider range of constituencies in these processes. (CFRs 4.3-4.6)

The 2019 Institutional Review Report shows HTHGSE to be an institution that keeps in mind changes that are currently taking place and can be anticipated in the higher education environment. The institution is addressing questions specific to changes in graduate education studies and also to matters like the challenge of generating a sufficient tuition revenue stream while making programs accessible for a diverse student body, the impact of increasing journal subscription prices, and the quality and impact of scholarly publication. The institution should widen its environmental scan as it approaches its upcoming strategic planning process. A self-described niche graduate program that aims to improve K-12 education on a universal basis will need constantly to be scanning its environment, including the local array of graduate education programs, to anticipate how those changes will affect its niche.

**Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI).** HTHGSE completed its IEEI in a thoughtful fashion reflecting an institutional commitment to educational effectiveness and improvement. As a graduate school of education, the institution both teaches and practices principles of “continuous improvement” (page 23). In its institutional report, HTHGSE discusses its continuous improvement approach no fewer than 22 times. During its Offsite Review, the team commended the institution for developing “a distinctive reflective community of practice based on solid theoretical foundations” and for articulating “an intentional, well-supported, and rigorous process, founded on best practices of institutional assessment and evaluation linked to a regular review cycle.”

The IEEI reflects this at the institutional and program level. Learning outcomes are established and published at the institutional level and articulated at the program level. Clearly
identified artifacts of student work are examined to determine how students achieve program, and by projection, institutional learning outcomes. Faculty members review and analyze outcomes data annually. Faculty and students review assessment data and analyses to inform program improvement. Ultimately the assessment process informs institutional strategic planning through the institutional review cycle.

In its institutional report, HTHGSE demonstrates that it is aware that it can improve its educational effectiveness, addressing areas such as including more stakeholders and developing additional measures of educational effectiveness such as peer benchmarks and alumni employment data.

**Federal Requirements.** A careful review of the HTHGSE catalog, policy documents, course schedules, syllabi, and program review documents shows that the institution provided sufficient evidence to confirm that HTHGSE complies with federal standards for assigning academic credit, fair marketing and recruitment practices, responding to student complaints, and transfer credit.

*1. Credit hour and program length review.* The institution aligns the “Carnegie Unit” hour across all programs and degrees. There was an issue with the credit hour in the 2015 EER Report, and this was resolved through the development of a clear policy outlining credit hour assignments. Clarity regarding online work, supervised fieldwork, and internship hours have also been examined and resolved. In addition, HTHGSE master’s degree graduates can now have their degrees accepted, with some additional advanced credit awarded, by the University of California, San Diego. Hence, since the last Accreditation Visit, the credit hour and program length policies have been aligned with federal standards. Now, the course schedule, academic catalog, and individual course syllabi collectively indicate the quality of work expected. In
addition, the level of time and engagement expected from students for each course is reasonable and consistent across programs.

2. Marketing and recruitment review. The HTHGSE website and Student Handbook follow federal regulations on recruiting students, typical length of time to complete the degree and overall cost of the degree. As HTHGSE is solely a graduate school of education, the institution also shares information on the kinds of education-related jobs its graduates are qualified for and provides information about the employment of its graduates as applicable.

3. Student complaints review. The HTHGSE Student Handbook delineates the institution’s procedures for collecting, tracking, and resolving student complaints and grievances. The team interviewed student affairs staff responsible for the student complaints process who explained that while no student has yet filed a formal complaint, the institution has established a data base to record and track any complaints that are made.

4. Transfer credit policy review. HTHGSE has a formal transfer credit policy that is publicly available in the Student Handbook and a “crosswalk” handout that details specific course articulations. The policy includes criteria for evaluation of credits earned at other institutions of higher education.

Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degrees

HTHGSE defines what it means for a graduate to hold a degree from the institution, explains the process it uses to ensure the meaning, integrity, and quality of the degree (MQID), and delineates the standards it uses to define these areas. The commitment of HTHGSE’s leadership to articulate the meaning and ensuring the quality and integrity of its two degrees is evident on multiple fronts. The team found HTHGSE’s leadership was purposeful in designing
structures and supports that reflect continuous improvement efforts that directly impact the quality of degrees offered.

The institution has articulated their Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), as well as Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and has clearly described how these outcomes are embedded in the mission, coursework, program assignments and capstone projects. In the institutional report, HTHGSE declared that, “to ensure the integrity, meaning, and quality of the degree, all of the coursework over the two-year MEd programs, as well as all of the clinical work, is deliberately aligned with the professional standards of the domain, with greatest emphasis on those standards which align to HTHGSE’s mission and the relevant Institutional Learning Outcomes.”

An exemplary structure that the institution employs to make certain that students meet the standards is the annual Looking at Student Work Retreat where a group of stakeholders and the program director examine students’ digital portfolios. The group norms the assessment, uses specific criteria to review the work, and develops emergent recommendations that are included in the program review. Changes to programs are made as needed in the following academic year. Additional structures related to ensuring MQID were shared in the institutional report and mentioned in interviews by faculty, staff and students at the AV. The Annual Faculty Retreat and Annual Student and Faculty Design Retreat serve to inform program review and strategic planning as stakeholders and directors use these events to analyze data, look at student work, and share best practices. Modifications to program design and/or coursework are made as a result.

In addition, the institution demonstrates how it meets its targets for MQID through the Curriculum Maps developed for both degree programs – the MEd in Teaching and Learning and
the MEd in Educational Leadership. The maps illustrate how the PLOs are staged and embedded in the coursework sequence and where each PLO is “introduced,” “reinforced,” or where students receive “advanced treatment” of the PLOs. These documents show HTHGSE’s commitment to carefully incorporating the PLOs into programs that emphasize theory in practice and building a community of adult learners. Students in these programs have various opportunities to apply concepts/theory in their own context and receive feedback from members of their cohort and the instructor. This continual practice and feedback loop helps ensure mastery of each PLO.

Both the institutional report and comments from HTHGSE’s’ leadership during the AV noted that an area for improvement identified in the above activities was that the program could use more direct evidence and performance-based assessments of PLOs in order to capture additional student learning successes and challenges. The institution also collects a mound of data via surveys. All evidence is used by the program directors to substantiate that programs continue to reflect the core values and mission of the college. The highly reflective nature of HTHGSE’s leadership was evident throughout the institutional report and confirmed in the AV by the team. The team recognizes that HTHGSE’s leadership initiates extensive measures to ensure that their degree programs are rigorous, well-defined and well-earned by their students.

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

The Institutional Review describes the solid educational quality and programming at HTHGSE in regards to student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation. HTHGSE is dedicated to creating and sustaining innovative, authentic, rigorous, and intentional learning experiences for all students across both degree programs. Outcomes align with the
HTHGSE mission, with programs sharing ILOs, in addition to a commitment to integrating theory with practice. In the two MEd programs, ILOs are shared.

HTHGSE’s pedagogy has solid scholarly and academic foundations in Project Based Learning (PBL), with the structure and content of courses serving the belief that students learn by doing. Students are encouraged to ask “what” and “why” to uncover the logic and impetus of their learning of core competencies. In addition, HTHGSE’s pedagogy is adult-centered, acknowledging that adult-learners have special needs and unique competencies which need to be fostered and addressed for students to succeed and have the greatest impact in their schools and society at-large.

Assessment of HTHGSE courses is structured as a dialogue, a two-way street where faculty, students, and alumni reflect, comment on, and shape the curriculum. HTHGSE uses the process of having students submit a self-assessment which is then commented on and reviewed by the instructor and as well as other students. Assessment of core competencies is a daily and weekly process where students respond to online discussions, always reflecting on their teaching and scholarship. Through their reflective and intentional pedagogy, they continuously “close the loop,” contributing to a culture of continuous improvement. In addition, the regular and frequent use of exit cards provides multiple iterative moments for meaningful assessment and reflection. The assessment processes described are thoughtful and frequent, allowing for meaningful moments of reflection, revision, and deep learning.

Grading across all programs is pass/fail. Instead of validating learning through letter grades, the pass/fail model focuses on the cultivation of excellence through iterative assignments and reflective moments. Students are guided to reflect on their learning through supportive conversation and critique. Student work is frequently shared with a larger audience who engage
in the review and critique processes. Students are encouraged to see their work as a performance which contributes to the vitality of a larger community of learners, teachers, and scholars. Passing work reflects professionalism and is able to “meet” or “exceed” course core competencies and institutional Student Learning Outcomes.

The MEd in Teaching & Learning focuses on cultivating teachers and learners who are attuned to equity, those who have a solid commitment to anti-oppressive education. The curriculum is dedicated to cultivating moments where patterns of inequity and marginalization can be disrupted, a form of learning and scholarship which is also the center of the Master’s Capstone project. This kind of pedagogy unites academic scholarship with action and activism.

HTHGSE uses a suite of assessments that are culturally responsive--assessments that engage in authentic assignments resulting in meaningful work. These assessments include the following:

- Teaching Performance Assessment (Gateway 1)
- Philosophy of Teaching Essay
- California Teaching Performance Assessment
- Portfolio Defense (Gateway 2)

HTHGSE knows its mission well and its work is authentically mission-driven. Its idealistic commitment to equity permeates its suite of culturally-attuned assessments, and it is clear that faculty are committed to guiding students through these activities, supporting them as they gain competence and mastery. Standards of performance at graduation are high, pursued throughout a guided-curriculum devoted to helping students attain their highest level of learning and competence thorough a pass/fail model focused on mastery.
HTHGSE has a deeply personal and individualized faculty-student advising model. This, and their modest enrollment, allows faculty and staff to keep detailed, personal tabs on their students’ progress. However, because the MEd in Teaching and Learning was launched as recently as fall 2018, HTHGSE does not yet have data for that to reach conclusions about student learning, core competencies, and standards at graduation.

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

HTHGSE’s institutional report states that the institution thinks about student success in three ways. Its first student success measure is the rate at which their students complete courses and satisfy gateway requirements. Second, HTHGSE tracks job placement rates, especially significant for the MEd in Teaching and Learning program. Third, HTHGSE aims to achieve a record of student success based on conventional measures of persistence and timely graduation that disrupt “predictably inequitable patterns.” The Fall 2019 Student Success Report adds that HTHGSE aims for 90% year one to year two persistence and an eventual 90% graduation rate.

Given the short history of the Teaching and Learning program, not much data is yet available for that program. Nevertheless, early indicators are promising. Students in the 2018-19 academic year had a 100% completion rate for Year 1 courses and gateway requirements, and 80% of them were offered jobs as teachers of record by June 2019. Sixty percent of the first cohort persisted to Year 2 and 30% deferred the start of their second year. Noting the limitations of data analysis based on a population of 10 students, there are no early warning signs that students from different backgrounds are on pace to succeed at different rates.

The Educational Leadership has a longer track record. Persistence rates for full-time students have consistently exceeded the 90% goal. Part-time students have not persisted at the same high rate. Since the 2014-15 academic year, 85% of part-time students have persisted to
the second year of the program, ranging from 75% in 2014-15 to 90% in 2016-17. Full-time graduation rates have exceeded 90% in each year with an average of 96%. Part-time graduation rates have fallen short of the institution’s goal and have averaged 64% since the program’s inception. However, if one drops the 2104-15 graduation rate (20%), the average rises to 81%. HTHGSE does not intend that Educational Leadership program graduates will necessarily take on formal leadership positions in schools, believing that “teacher leaders” are needed for strong schools, and current program students confirm that intention. It is still noteworthy that 46% of the program’s graduates do in fact hold formal school leadership roles.

Student success in the Educational Leadership program does not appear to vary according to the background of the students. The only group that has demonstrated a significantly lower success rate than the mean is Latinx students who have a 69% graduation rate compared to the 82% rate for all students. A “small-N” problem will affect all efforts to analyze disaggregated HTHGSE student data, and that is the case here. Of the 84 graduates of the Educational Leadership program through 2017-8, 13 have been Latinx. Of those 13, 4 have not graduated on schedule. Because there are many reasons a given student might not graduate on schedule, there is no prima facie reason to suspect that the relatively low rate for Latinx students implies a systematic problem. (CFRs 2.10, 2.12) As noted above and in the team’s recommendations, HTHGSE must make student success information easily available on its public website. (CFR 1.2, 2.12)

HTHGSE appears to do a good job of using exit interviews to understand why students do not persist or graduate on schedule. They are able to report with a very fine level of granularity why individual students do not persist or graduate on schedule. The exit-interview findings found in the institutional report and the Fall 2019 Student Success report suggest that
factors related to work or personal life explain most cases where students do not persist or graduate on schedule.

Given the scale of the institution, HTHGSE provides an impressive array of supports for students in both MEd programs, including a writing center, course-based writing support, individualized support programs for students with exceptionalities, mental health support, equitable assessment practices, and scaffolded advisor and instructor check-ins. How to improve student success is a regular agenda item during annual and cyclical reviews. Graduates of the program who were interviewed during the AV report that they felt well supported to succeed, citing close faculty and staff support as well as the benefits of being in a small, tightly-knit cohort of students. (CFR 2.13)


HTHGSE demonstrates a culture committed to continuous assessment and improvement. The institution pursues and assures quality by cultivating improvement. At the core of their culture of quality assurance and assessment are three questions: 1) What are they trying to accomplish? 2) What changes might they introduce, and why? 3) How will they know if a change is an improvement? Although they acknowledge that it can be challenging to achieve clear, measurable goals, they remain dedicated to the process of assessment and continuous improvement, despite theoretical complications.

HTHGSE’s excellence in this area is manifested by the Carnegie Foundation selecting them in 2017 as an inaugural organization in the foundation’s “Spotlight on Quality in Continuous Improvement” initiative. HTHGSE is to be commended for its innovative work aimed at improving K-12 education, both in and beyond HTH classrooms. The institution has
promoted advances in math, science, and literacy instruction, in addition to decreasing absenteeism. In addition, HTHGSE is working to integrate the science of continuous improvement into program and institutional reviews.

According to the HTHGSE institutional report, the institution has been attuned to responding to previousWSCUC teams that have encouraged the development of a more formalized assessment process. Given that, assessment is currently mapped on a five-year cycle, including course-level feedback, annual assessment reports, a self-study, and an external review. The bulk of assessment data comes from the Annual Program Assessment reports. This kind of annual assessment engages course and program level SLOs, including the use of exit cards. Every five years, there is a formal Program Review where the institution draws on the Annual Program Assessment reports.

The institution reviewed the Ed. Leadership Program in 2018-2019. This review was led by the program director, dean, and provost. It included a self-study and external review. Data points included program quality, enrollment data, learning pathways, persistence and graduation rates, student satisfaction, and faculty demographics. Although the program review process refers to external benchmarking, given the uniqueness of HTHGSE, the feasibility and utility of external benchmarking remains unsettled. During the 2018-2019 academic year, HTHGSE faculty also read two books about collective and individual goal-setting to foster quality assurance and improvement. The purpose of this activity was to help the institution create and pursue a shared agenda and vision.

The use of data and evidence at HTHGSE are intricately intertwined with the How You Doing? dashboard. This visualization tool helps share data within HTHGSE. Instead of having data isolated in silos and spreadsheets, the purpose of How You Doing? dashboard is to bridge
gaps in K-12 and higher education though visualizations and graphics. This tool is designed to help with tracking students, eventually providing actionable data regarding retention and graduation.

Written by a WSCUC Steering Committee, with feedback from faculty, staff, and students, the Institutional Review Report, demonstrates HTHGSE’s commitment to a culture of collaboration and the science of continuous improvement. Given that the institution is in its final year of their current strategic plan, HTHGSE plans to use feedback from the WSCUC Accreditation Visit to shape the next iteration of its institutional planning. Particularly compelling is the fact that the current strategic plan was realized as a double-sided, one-pager, so faculty, staff, and students could easily access it, putting the plan into live action, instead of housing it on a dusty bookshelf.

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

HTHGSE appears to be fulfilling its goal of improving traditional K-12 education utilizing progressive teacher-training methods to better serve future generations. Recognizing the limitations of historical educational models, HTHGSE teaches project-based, cross-disciplinary learning as a means to keep students engaged and thriving, thus, preparing students for a complex future. HTHGSE presents itself as a nimble organization able to respond to today’s evolving demographics and is clearly dedicated to diversity, equity and inclusion in all of its work, leveraging social media platforms to position itself in the global arena. (CFR 4.7) HTHGSE faculty and staff shared many examples of their success in reaching educators in national and international arenas and this appears to be an area of expansion for them.
Students and faculty spoke passionately in team meetings, articulating how HTHGSE’s programs differed from the surrounding traditional higher educational institutions because of its model of hands-on, project-based, culturally responsive and practically embedded education, and how imperative the mission is to everyone involved with HTHGSE.

As stated previously, HTHGSE is in sound financial position with diverse revenue sources. The organization’s success in obtaining significant grants suggests that well-regarded donors have a strong belief in HTHGSE’s capacity and effectiveness in carrying out its mission.

HTHGSE strives to balance its organizational values with its goal to increase tuition revenue. The distribution of its revenue streams aligns with HTHGSE’s ethos that its graduate and credential programs be accessible for previously underrepresented groups, allowing students to participate with a fellowship or tuition discount and not be barred by an inability to pay tuition. The graduate programs must also compete with peer institutions and their tuition levels. The organization seems to be questioning at this point whether it can rely upon its professional development revenues, supplemented by grants, to sustain the organization as a whole, allowing it to continue with a relatively low contribution from tuition revenue. Leadership within the institution and on the board demonstrated to the team that they are aware of the financial realities necessary to maintain a prospering organization as evidenced by the analysis of its programs in the self-study, its current financial success, and indications of leadership’s close watch over revenue and expenses. In its summary of its degree programs, HTHGSE describes the institution’s efforts to increase enrollment based on an analysis of each program’s appeal and drawbacks. The subsequent development of a strategic communication and marketing plan is an important step in addressing revenue potential of the degree programs. The 2019 plan highlights several key marketing efforts specific to the degree programs. Continued identification and
implementation of such marketing efforts and an ongoing evaluation of its degree programs appear critical at this stage of HTHGSE’s development.

HTHGSE’s well-regarded professional trainings and workshops provide a concrete source of revenue that subsidizes the MEd programs, while serving as another indicator of the relevance of HTHGSE’s program offerings in the field of education. Attendance in the various workshops appeared to have doubled in recent years. Additionally, the efforts of the research arm (CREI) have proven to be a valuable contributor to the organization’s stability and mission.

HTHGSE’s master’s programs are actively evolving and the organization is undergoing continued development and, although currently financially strong, leadership wisely states it is examining its business model to ensure long-term financial sustainability. Development of its financial plans should continue to be a significant part of the next strategic plan incorporating a strategic enrollment plan with an examination of the kind and type of degree programs to offer in accordance with its mission, and how to continue to set itself apart from its competitors.

**Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes**

N.A.

**Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement**

HTHGSE provides reflections on its institutional development and its plans for improvement both in its discussion of the substantive component parts of the institutional report and in the summary conclusion of the report. In both modes, the institution maintains a strong and clear focus on “big-picture” items. This focus demonstrates HTHGSE’s commitment to its mission and its concern about remaining authentic to its mission as it grows in size and complexity. During the AV, members of theWSCUC Steering Committee said that it was a good
time in the institution’s history, after a period of initial growth and just before a renewal of strategic planning, to take stock of where HTHGSE is.

First, they present a clear awareness of what they have accomplished over the short time sinceWSCUC granted HTHGSE initial accreditation. Throughout the report, they return to key themes: contributing to improvement in K-12 education on a broad scale, developing and sustaining a diverse and inclusive community at all levels, including students, faculty, staff, and administration; deploying the insights of improvement science both as a key to ongoing institutional improvement and as a crucial take-away that students and others served by HTHGSE programs can apply to their own teaching and educational leadership; and maintaining sufficient revenue to sustain HTHGSE and its programs.

Second, these themes usefully inform both what HTHGSE sees as its strengths and the areas in which it believes it needs improvement. It sees itself as presenting programs that do contribute to improvement in K-12 education. It points with pride to the increasing diversity of the faculty and the student body. The institution also takes satisfaction in its success in increasing revenue. HTHGSE perhaps underplays its achievements in developing its assessment, program review, and institutional review policies and processes,

In reflecting on areas of improvement, HTHGSE interestingly returns to items it held out as strengths—program quality and impact and diversity. They should be applauded for understanding that strengths can fade if they do not receive ongoing attention. Conversations with the institution’s leadership team during the AV confirmed its concern to maintain its vital organizational culture while becoming a larger and even more robust graduate school. HTHGSE also realizes that an effective communication strategy will be important to its ongoing success and that it needs not just to develop a communications strategy but the institutional capacity to
carry out a strategy. The institution also understands that it must strengthen tuition as a source of
revenue.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

No other topics were addressed during the review.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In its review of HTHGSE, the team found an institution that used its self-review earnestly as an
opportunity to take stock of itself and recognize both its achievements and areas in which it may
improve. The institution has also sought to understand and present a picture of itself in the
context of impressive early growth, the installation of a new leadership team, and the
revitalization of its governing board for a renewal of strategic planning and development. The
team believes that HTHGSE has been clear-eyed and intentional in its use of the review process
to advance the organic development of the institution.

Commendations. The team commends the High Tech High Graduate School of Education
for the following five accomplishments and practices:

1. Fostering a talented and visionary leadership team that acts intentionally to create a
   transparent and responsive organization, operating with integrity, inclusivity, and a
   commitment to continuous improvement across HTHGSE and its programs.

2. Cultivating a deeply engaged, capable, collaborative, and compassionate faculty and staff
   who demonstrate dedication to HTHGSE’s mission, one another, and their students.

3. Building a community of faculty, staff, students, and board members who embody and
   model the diversity, equity, and integration that HTHGSE strives to promote in education
   and the wider society.

4. Establishing an impressive record of sustaining professional learning programs through
   an extraordinarily successful history of attracting philanthropic support from prominent
donors.
5. Offering theoretically-grounded, culturally-relevant, and practice-based programs of teacher education.

Recommendations. The team has identified the following three recommendations to focus the High Tech High Graduate School of Education’s ongoing efforts:

1. Clarify, as part of its upcoming strategic planning process, the desired mix and scale of degree and professional learning programs, and develop a strategic enrollment plan based on the analysis of its degree programs. (CFRs 3.4, 3.7, 4.6)

2. Enhance the role of the Board of Directors through training, building on the existing committee structure as outlined in the Board’s by-laws, and establishing a regular process to review the president’s performance. (CFR 3.9)

3. Post disaggregated student success data on the institution’s public website. (CFR 1.2)
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# 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>
</table>
| Policy on credit hour | Is this policy easily accessible? X YES ☐ NO  
If so, where is the policy located? It is located as a PDF under “Handbooks, Policies and Organizational Chart” on HTHGSE website ([https://sites.google.com/a/hightechhigh.org/gse-assessment/handbooks](https://sites.google.com/a/hightechhigh.org/gse-assessment/handbooks))  
Comments: |
| Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour | Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)?  X YES ☐ NO  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? X YES ☐ NO  
Comments: Periodic review of the credit hour policy takes place in the Annual Assessment Reports and during the 5-year cycle of Program Reviews. |
| Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet | Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?  X YES ☐ NO  
Comments: |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses  
*Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.* | How many syllabi were reviewed? 2  
What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? both  
What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☐ BA/BS ☒ MA ☐ Doctoral  
What discipline(s)? Education  
Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded?  X YES ☐ NO  
Comments: |
| Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated)  
*Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.* | How many syllabi were reviewed? N/A  
What kinds of courses? N/A  
What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☐ BA/BS ☐ MA ☐ Doctoral  
What discipline(s)?  
Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☐ YES ☐ NO  
Comments: |
| Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)  
| How many programs were reviewed? 3  
| What kinds of programs were reviewed? MEd in Educational Leadership, MEd in Teaching and Learning (Teaching Apprenticeship Program), and New School Creation Fellowship  
<p>| What degree level(s)? ☐ AA/AS ☐ BA/BS ☒ X MA ☐ Doctoral |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What discipline(s)? Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

Review Completed By: Elizabeth M. Sturgeon, Associate Professor of English, Mount Saint Mary’s University
Date: 3/8/2020
## 2 - MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal regulations</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree completion and cost</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Careers and employment</strong></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

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

Review Completed By: Diane Carnahan, President, Teachers College of San Joaquin  
Date: 3/10/2020
3 - STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM
Under federal regulation*, WSCUC 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 comments 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? Yes, it is detailed in the Student Handbook and Catalog.  
Comments: |
| Process(es)/ procedure | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
☑️ YES ☐ NO  
If so, please describe briefly:  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
☑️ xYES ☑ NO  
Comments: Per the Director of Student Affairs, the institution has not had a formal complaint filed. |
| Records | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
☑️ YES ☑ NO  
If so, where? The Director of Student Affairs maintains records in a database.  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?  
☐ XYES ☑ NO  
If so, please describe briefly: The database enables tracking and monitoring.  
Comments: Per the Director of Student Affairs, because no formal complaint has been filed, the tracking and monitoring system is untested. |

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)  
See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Brian E. Klunk  
Date: March 4, 2020
**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? Student Handbook and “crosswalk handout”  
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: Tricia O’Reilly  
Date: March 5, 2020