

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
FOR REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
TO REACH UNIVERSITY

April 23-26, 2024

TEAM ROSTER

Chair: Diane Carnahan
Board Chair, EDvance College

Assistant Chair: Angela Schmiede
Vice President for Student Success & Strategic Planning, Menlo College

Melea Fields
AVP Accreditation/ALO, Licensure & State Authorizations
The Chicago School

Alma Boutin-Martinez
Associate Provost for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, Fielding Graduate University

Joline Pruitt
Former Director of Business Operations, Saybrook University

Ja Ne't Rommero
Interim Assistant Dean / Administrative Faculty, Pacific Oaks College

WSCUC Liaison: Mark Goor
Vice President, WASC Senior College and University Commission

The team evaluated the institution under the 2013 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	2
A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History	2
B. Description of Team’s Review Process	3
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS	6
A. Component 1: Introduction and Response to Previous Commission Actions	6
B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and Federal Requirements	9
C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees	19
D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation	21
E. Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation	23
F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data, and Evidence	25
G. Component 7: Sustainability, Financial Viability, Preparing for a Changing Higher Education Environment	28
H. Component 9: Conclusion	29
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW	30
APPENDICES	32
Federal Compliance Forms	32
1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review	32
2. Marketing and Recruitment Review	34
3. Student Complaints Review	36
4. Transfer Credit Review	39
DISTANCE EDUCATION	40

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

Reach University has undergone profound change since its inception in 2006. Starting as the Reach Institute for School Leadership (RISL) the institution was founded with a simple mission in mind – to reinvent teacher education. Reach, a nonprofit institution, is focused on helping communities grow their own highly effective teachers and leaders while pursuing equity in underserved urban and rural areas (CFR 1.1, 1.4). The university is dedicated to advancing the job-embedded degree, serving working adults seeking to reach their full potential (CFR 1.1). In 2007, and in collaboration with Alternatives in Action, Inc. (formally Bay Area School of Enterprise), a K-12 school system, Reach was accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to offer its first teacher credential program with 25 students. In 2009 they introduced the Instructional Leadership Academy for experienced teachers wishing to move into school administration and added additional teacher and administrator credential programs, also accredited by CTC. With an interest to expand their offerings, Reach received WASC Senior and College University Commission (WSCUC) accreditation for a Master in Education in Teaching, as well as a Master in Education in Instructional Leadership in 2017 (IR, 2023).

In February 2020, Reach received WSCUC approval for a structural change to incubate Oxford Teachers College (OTC) and offer a degree at the bachelor’s level - the Bachelor of Arts in Global Education. Reach and OTC’s mission and vision were complementary as both attended to exceptional education rooted in best practices (Reach/OTC Substantive Change Proposal). By June 2020 however, Reach’s financial sustainability had become an urgent, existential challenge. It was apparent to the Reach administration and board that the sustainability of Reach’s existing

and incubated programs required the combination of their financial resources (Special Visit Report, 2021). As a result of this work, Reach University has now become the umbrella institution for the undergraduate programs of the Oxford Teaching College, offering two bachelor's degrees (added Bachelor's in Liberal Studies) and a newly accredited associate of arts in liberal studies degree (2023). The graduate program has been additionally accredited with a new Master of Arts in Teaching degree (2022), and Reach continues to offer the current credential and masters programs previously approved. Although early programs at Reach were offered with in-person instruction in Oakland, California, Reach University now provides all coursework via distance education. In addition, Reach has extended their access to include bachelor's degrees in five states – California, Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, and Louisiana. These efforts have created a more sustainable and financially solvent institution.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

This report communicates WSCUC's visiting team's examination of Reach University from the Offsite Review conducted in fall 2023 and the onsite Accreditation Visit (AV) conducted April 23-26, 2024 in their office in Oakland, California. The team paid particular attention to the recommendations shared in the Commission Action Letter dated March 8, 2022, as well as the Lines of Inquiry developed during the Offsite Review process. There were seven themes for the Lines of Inquiry established in the Offsite Review: 1) strategic planning; 2) finances; 3) board of trustees; 4) distance education; 5) assessment, evidence and use of data; 6) meaning, quality and integrity of the degree; and, 7) human resources. The recommendations from the Commission Action Letter dated March 8, 2022 aligned with the areas identified for the Lines of Inquiry shared in the Offsite Review:

1. Develop a strategic enrollment plan, in collaboration with the board, that leads to

long-term sustainability. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

2. Analyze enrollment and market conditions to optimize program offerings. (CFR 3.4, 4.7)

3. Continue to analyze student success data to further develop a continuous improvement plan for retention. (CFR 1.2, 2.10, 4.1, 4.3)

4. Engage in board development that focuses training to utilize best practices of board operations and to recruit new board members who understand the impact of educators in a socio-cultural context. (CFR 3.9)

5. Revise the bylaws to reflect the current status of the organization. (CFR 3.7)

6. Continue to assess the impact of the merger of Reach and OTC on faculty, staff, and students.

At the accreditation visit (AV) the visiting team found everyone in the institution to be accommodating, supportive of the accreditation process, eager to share their thoughts and successes, as well as learn about next steps for the university. Interviews were carried out with a variety of personnel including: the chancellor and president, provost / accreditation liaison officer (ALO), chief financial officer, president's cabinet, report writing team, board of trustees (5 of 9), candidate support services team, senior vice president of operations, director of institutional research, director of people operations (human resources), vice provost of data and technology and staff, marketing and recruitment staff, director of development (related to fundraising), curriculum developers, dean of admissions and staff, representatives of faculty governance, and, students and faculty from various programs.

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

Initial impressions of Reach's institutional report (IR) by the WSCUC Visiting Team were that it did not follow WSCUC's protocols for the IR. The report did not include links to documents within the IR, and did not cite appropriate CFRs throughout the narrative. Instead, each CFR was addressed separately and documents of supporting evidence were separated from the report. This made it challenging for the team to adequately review the report; and therefore, Reach was asked to revise the report, adding links to evidence and CFRs. Reach responded and provided additional documentation as requested and addressed the issue with linking and embedding the appropriate CFRs within the report. The WSCUC team assistant chair worked closely with Reach's ALO to ensure compliance. With the additional information provided prior to the AV, the team was able to develop questions for the interviews, which allowed a deeper dive into the inner workings of the university. Ultimately the conversations throughout the AV supported the team with being able to determine appropriate commendations, and identify key recommendations for furthering Reach's continuous improvement efforts.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Component 1: Response to Previous Commission Actions

As noted in section I, Reach University was asked to respond to recommendations from the Commission Action Letter dated March 8, 2022. The WSCUC Visiting Team found that several of these recommendations were not fully addressed by the university. Details follow for each recommendation from March 2022 and what the team found during the AV in April 2024.

1. Develop a strategic enrollment plan, in collaboration with the board, that leads to long-term sustainability. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

Reach has not taken the necessary steps to complete a strategic enrollment plan. Enrollment projections are made based on staff recommendations, using vision, mission, and aspirations to guide expansion, or defining the future state of each program (IR, p. 11). While Reach has several ideas for executing more strategic enrollment practices, they consider this effort a work in progress. Recruitment is conducted more organically with no strategic process written down for determining projections for each program. The most current enrollment numbers (as of April 29, 2024) and projections (2025-2027) were shared with the visiting team, which indicated that increasing the bachelor's programs will be the long-term strategy for sustainability.

Although Reach initially targeted an enrollment of 10,000 students by 2027, this number has been modified as they determined that they need the internal capacity to expand to this extent. The current targets are to go from 1,476 students in the two BA programs to 5,000 in FY 2027. The bachelor's programs receive the majority of time and energy from staff and are clearly financially sustaining the graduate programs (credentials and masters), which currently have low

enrollment numbers (10 students over three masters degrees). This recommendation continues to be a priority and is noted at the end of this report in Section IV, Recommendations, #1 and #7.

2. Analyze enrollment and market conditions to optimize program offerings. (CFR 3.4, 4.7)

This recommendation aligns with #1 as Reach works to develop a more strategic and systematic process to analyze enrollment trends and review market conditions in their target regions. Reach will want to consider what specific strategies should be employed for their different programs, as well as consider the viability of programs with low enrollment.

3. Continue to analyze student success data to further develop a continuous improvement plan for retention. (CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.3)

Several groups interviewed, including the chancellor and president, indicated that it was important to address first-year retention and determine what changes were needed to improve rates. While their goal is to have 70% of candidates “within a cohort successfully complete their undergraduate program...it is also a leading indicator monitoring persistence in the first year” (Reach Retention Overview, January 2024). The retention rate for students matriculating from the first semester to the second is at 61% (Reach Retention Overview, January 2024). Reach utilizes an internal metric, separate from IPEDS, to calculate retention and persistence rates as they believe the data will be useful for longitudinal analysis. This recommendation continues to be a priority and is noted at the end of this report in Section IV, Recommendations, #6.

4. Engage in board development that focuses training to utilize best practices of board operations and to recruit new board members who understand the impact of educators in a socio-cultural context. (CFR 3.9)

The Reach board of trustees have made much progress since the last WSCUC Special Visit in March 2022. They have increased the number of trustees from four to nine, two of which

have some higher education background and expertise. It was noted that they recruit members based on needs of the university, and therefore have secured trustees with backgrounds in philanthropy, nonprofits, technology, equity, law, and education. The board chair takes his role seriously and has been committed to establishing structures for board activities, including convening a board retreat, holding a book study with “Small Giants,” and forming ad hoc committees. Thus far, the board has not yet participated in outside board development opportunities designed for institutions of higher education. The visiting team feels the board would benefit from outside board development to continue to refine structures (e.g. board committees and board self-assessment practices); and therefore, included this as an area for further growth, found in Section IV, Recommendation #3.

5. Revise the bylaws to reflect the current status of the organization. (CFR 3.7)

The Reach board of trustees has spent time crafting new bylaws that do reflect the current status of the organization. Missing from the bylaws is a key responsibility of a board, which is to evaluate the president, and for Reach, also the chancellor. The board expressed that they have great confidence in the leadership of Reach, but should establish procedures for annual and comprehensive evaluations. (CFR 3.9)

6. Continue to assess the impact of the merger of Reach and OTC on faculty, staff, and students.

Noted during interviews was Reach leadership acknowledging that integration of graduate programs and OTC undergraduate programs needed to happen sooner, rather than run parallel to one another, now creating somewhat of a silo for each set of programs. They understand the need at this time to continue to evolve as Reach University, forming a more strategic and cohesive Reach University School of Education. Recommendation #1, Section IV, addresses this by asking Reach to “develop and implement a comprehensive, institution-focused

strategic plan spanning 3 to 5 years to serve as a roadmap for the institution” (CFR 3.10, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7).

B. Component 2: Compliance with the Standards, Federal Requirements, and Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Mission and Acting with Integrity

Institutional Purposes (CFR 1.1-1.2)

Reach University operates with a mission focused on cultivating highly effective teachers and leaders while promoting equity in underserved urban and rural communities. Founded in 2006 as the Reach Institute for School Leadership, the institution has evolved to offer teacher credential pathways, master's degrees in teaching and leadership, and innovative programs like the Oxford Teachers Academy (OTA) (now Oxford Teachers College) (CFR 1.1).

In 2020, Reach faced financial challenges, prompting the integration of OTA's undergraduate programming with Reach's graduate programs in a formal merger. Despite initial miscommunication with WSCUC, Reach University officially adopted its new name and expanded its offerings to include undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate degree programs.

A Special Visit in fall 2021 assessed the progress of the integration, revealing a collaborative culture between Reach and OTC, supported by passionate leadership committed to serving their communities. The visiting team noted the need for further board development and suggested professional learning opportunities for trustees to ensure the long-term success of the university.

Reach’s mission is clear and focused: “Our mission is to help schools grow their own highly effective teachers and leaders, pursuing equity in underserved urban and rural

communities. We also seek to advance the efficacy and adoption in higher education of inquiry-based instructional methods and job-embedded degree pathways.”

Integrity and Transparency (CFR 1.3-1.8)

The mission of cultivating highly effective educators and leaders within schools has been effectively integrated into Reach University's Institutional Learning Outcomes, curriculum, and the ethos of its faculty and staff. This integration underscores the institution's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. As articulated in an interview during the AV, a core value is ensuring meaningful learning experiences for underserved communities. This dedication is exemplified by the impact cited by a student who noted that without Reach University, accessing education would have been unattainable; the nearest community college is two hours away. This commitment aligns with CFRs 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4, highlighting Reach University's dedication to expanding educational access and fostering inclusive learning environments. Additionally, Reach University has reported conducting regular assessments of retention and graduation data. However, it is noted that the internal metrics utilized differ from those defined by IPEDS. Furthermore, the institution acknowledges shortcomings in collecting and reporting alumni data, highlighting the need for improvement in data collection efforts in this area.

Throughout the visit, faculty and staff consistently emphasized the review of courses to ensure alignment with learning outcomes. Upon closer examination, it was revealed that faculty rely more on grades as a metric for assessing learning outcomes. Notably, Reach University continues the work on employing rubrics throughout the institution, programs, and courses to evaluate whether students are meeting learning outcomes, a practice highlighted under CFR 1.2. At the time of the AV, the issue of academic freedom was not prominent. Because several faculty also have dual roles as staff or administrators, the notion of shared governance in the Curriculum

Instruction Continuous Improvement (CI2) Council doesn't seem to entail full ownership of academic decision making by the faculty. As a result, the team made a recommendation in this area, found in Section IV, #4.

Reach's administrative leadership, faculty, and governing board are committed to issues related to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI). The DEI policy is posted on their website: "Reach University affords equal opportunity to all employees and prospective employees, volunteers, candidates, and other participants without regard to race, color, religion, citizenship, political activity or affiliation, marital status, age, national origin, ancestry, physical or mental disability, medical condition (as defined under California law), veteran status, family care status, sexual orientation, sex (which includes gender and gender identity, pregnancy, childbirth, or related medical conditions), taking or requesting statutorily protected leave, or any other basis protected by law" (CFR 1.4).

In various interviews, Reach University expressed a keen interest in expanding its programs to reach more underserved rural communities, aiming to promote equity in education. This commitment has been facilitated by the institution's dedication to offering low-cost tuition and fostering partnerships with local school districts in Arkansas, Louisiana, Alabama, California, and Colorado. While there is a recognized need for a strategic enrollment and hiring plan, Reach's steadfast dedication to serving the underserved remains evident. Evidence indicates that Reach maintains clear and transparent communication with its constituent groups regarding academic programs, goals, services, costs, and operational procedures, aligning with regulatory standards (CFR 1.6, 1.7, 1.8). The academic programs are specifically tailored to meet the needs of working adults with a median age of 36 for its certification and degree programs, as evidenced by meetings with Reach students. Additionally, Reach provides appropriate academic support

services, such as mentorship programs, to assist students facing hardships or seeking support. While Reach may lack a traditional library, they do have a librarian and students have reported that online resources effectively meet their research needs. Despite the challenges posed by increasing student enrollment, staff members encountered during the AV demonstrated a positive attitude, enthusiasm, and a strong commitment to the institution's mission and the success of its students.

The institution's documentation is thorough in many respects but lacks certain crucial elements, such as detailed information regarding specific program features like the Oxford tutorial method, which is prominently featured but requires further explanation for a comprehensive understanding of its efficacy. The website fails to address accommodations for students with disabilities. Although there is a section for program statements, it leads to a Google document that offers additional details on graduation requirements.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning, Mission and Quality and Integrity of its Degrees (CFRs 2.1- 2.5)

Reach assesses the core functions of teaching and learning as described in Standard 2. There is a clear connection between Reach's mission and their five pillars: (1) Efficiency, (2) Flexibility, (3) Relevance & Applicability, (4) Affordability, and (5) Professional Capital. To promote a sense of community, Reach provides synchronous course meetings, cohort groupings, and a faculty coaching model. The Oxford Tutorial Method is the foundation for their synchronous pedagogical approach. Review of the course syllabi indicated high standards of performance and rigor. Faculty are responsible for assessment (CFR 2.2b) and student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi (CFR 2.3).

Student Learning Outcomes and Performance (CFR 2.6)

The institution's student learning outcomes and performance standards are stated clearly at the course and program levels. The institutional report indicated that students consistently surpass the national average for bachelor's degree completion rates.

Each program at Reach University has its set of rubrics; however, development of institutional learning outcome (ILO) specific rubrics is in progress along with implementing university-wide ILO assessments. Reach's commitment to assessment is evident in its current approach to measuring evidence of learning. While the Graduate Institute has developed evidence of learning across multiple programs, including both direct and indirect methods, with a measurable expectation assigned to each Program Learning Outcome (PLO) (CFR 2.6), it is unclear how frequently faculty review student assessment reports and how they use this data in aggregate form or at the student level to plan interventions and improve programs.

Student success measures include:

- Undergraduate and graduate-level rubrics to assess mastery
- The On-the-Job (OJL) Tracker to track job-embedded learning
- Student surveys
- Licensure exams to ensure mastery of key knowledge and skills required within each state

However, it was not evident during the AV how Reach uses licensure passage rates to measure success. The Team encourages Reach to develop benchmarks to evaluate their licensure rates and review this data annually.

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8-2.9)

Core faculty have appropriate credentials and are responsible for assessing appropriate standards of student performance. The faculty at Reach are organized into six distinct categories: professor of practice, professor, associate professor, assistant professor, lecturer, and adjunct. Reach must continue to commit to recruiting and retaining enough faculty to teach. Many of the faculty the team met during the site visit also had administrative roles. Although the team met with the faculty shared governance committee, this group was defined as the Curriculum and Instruction Continuous Improvement Council (CI2) whose focus is on approving significant curricular changes. The CI2 Council is composed of roughly 30% faculty members from both the undergraduate and graduate programs. There is no Faculty Senate at Reach. In the undergraduate and graduate program the majority of faculty are part-time due to the professor of practice model, meaning faculty are employed in an educational role during the day and teach in the evening at Reach. Reach does not have a faculty promotion model and does not use tenure. As a result, processes for periodic performance evaluation and contract renewal must establish clearly how faculty research and scholarship are valued and supported for the various faculty roles at Reach (CFR 2.8).

Student Support Services and Program Review (CRFs 2.10- 2.13)

Reach has made steady progress identifying the challenges associated with retention and addressing barriers to students' persistence. Students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees (CFR 2.10). Reach has implemented retention strategies to improve clarity and consistent communication (e.g., website, info sessions, orientation), a more structured onboarding process, and time management components in the introductory courses, and

recognizes the need to focus on first-year retention. The team encourages Reach to continue collecting data and analyzing students who persist, to identify factors that promote students' retention.

Reach provides student support services, including academic, health and disability, placement, financial aid counseling, registrar, and social support services (CRF 2.11, 2.13). Students are advised by advisors and faculty and, if needed, develop degree completion plans. During the site visit, students and staff spoke highly about the excellent quality of advising, including the important role of helping students navigate state-specific teaching requirements, placement concerns, communication via text and one-on-one phone calls, orientation sessions, and degree preparation. An undergraduate college preparatory course covers teacher qualification exams, writing basics and APA citations, growth mindset, the study cycle, and how to leverage professors and advisors for academic success. It does not appear that Reach has a writing support center or writing tutors. Developing more writing support systems could be helpful, particularly for master's students who need to complete theses. The review team commends Reach's recent work to streamline the alumni survey to address both undergraduate and graduate alumni and encourages Reach to use the findings from the alumni survey (projected date of deployment of spring 2024) to support the continuous improvement of student support services and programs.

There has been steady progress in facilitating the use of data analysis. Reach has a "holistic" program review and a mini program review supporting documentation outlining three steps of the program review, including a self-study, external review, and action plan. Program review data included enrollment, student demographics, performance data, and alumni and student surveys. Reach's progress report noted the development of longitudinal trend assessment data (ILOs, PLOs, and CLOs). The Team encourages Reach to design program reviews to

include analysis and interpretation of assessment data for ILOs, PLOs, and CLOs, along with disaggregated reports of retention and time to completion by program and key demographic variables. Reach should also consider analyzing licensing examinations, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers. Program reviews for co-curricular and non-academic programs are nascent, with a program review for Candidate Support Services currently underway.

Standard 3: Assuring Resources and Organizational Structures

Employees at Reach University expressed a high-level of satisfaction and are aligned with the mission, vision, and values of the institution. Staff that attended the AV meetings expressed a strong sense of trust in leadership and the board. The Employee Handbook is comprehensive and current. Employee recruitment, hiring, and orientation practices are well organized and aligned with the Reach mission. An outsourced professional employer organization and legal support paired with a new Human Resource Information System (HRIS) ensures onboarding is consistent and state-specific employee compliance is well managed and recorded. Professional development is offered to employees; however, the budget and a formalized process to support development is unclear. Regular performance reviews, evaluations, and compensation structures are still being developed. Annual compliance and policy review along with regular risk assessment is also an area of opportunity to uphold operational integrity (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).

The Development Department is in its infancy at Reach University. Fundraising planning and direction have been primarily led by the president and chancellor since the merger. Two new employees have been added to the development team in 2024. The new team would like to expand into individual giving and grant opportunities for apprenticeships as part of a new

development strategy, and in support of the National Center for the Apprenticeship Degree (NCAD). Foundation contributions are primarily in unrestricted funds and are used to cover general costs for the institution. The budget should be refined to support intentional resourcing of specific development initiatives that align with the interests of individual donors and foundations (CFR 3.7, 3.10).

The governing board works well with leadership and is dedicated to the mission and vision of the institution. Regular committee meetings, reporting, and structure will support transparency of finance, enrollment, and academic strategies at the university and enhance their contribution and governance. Structured assessment of the president and chancellor performance is also an area of improvement that should be included in the bylaws. (CFR 3.7, 4.7)

Strategic initiative resourcing is unclear and there is limited evidence of resources to support planned growth. The recent increase in new employees and requests for new positions from most departments, including a significant number of full-time faculty, to support enrollment growth will need to be considered in a strategic human resources plan and clearly supported by the budget. A process following best practices for budgeting that includes operating expenses such as strategic initiative resourcing, growth support, legal safeguards, and financial transparency are required to generate the forecasted annual budget contributions (CFR 3.6, 3.9, 3.10).

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

Reach University is currently in the early stages of planning, assessing, reviewing programs, and implementing faculty shared governance. Although they have provided a summary of a strategic plan, it lacks the comprehensive detail needed for effective execution. To realize its goals, Reach University must develop and execute a thorough institutionally focused

strategic plan, prioritizing initiatives through rigorous cost analysis to ensure feasibility and significance. Adequate resource allocation, with a clear tie to budgeting, is essential to support these initiatives effectively. This strategic plan must align closely with Enrollment Management and Strategic Hiring Plans to ensure coherence and synergy across various areas of institutional development. Clear performance indicators should be established for ongoing progress monitoring, with periodic reflection and reassessment to maintain trajectory (CFR 4.6).

In addition to the strategic plan, Reach University should craft an Enrollment Management plan and a Strategic Staffing/Hiring plan, both of which should integrate seamlessly with the institution's broader strategic vision. An Enrollment Management plan will enable Reach University to target the appropriate student demographics, enhancing recruitment and retention efforts (CFR 4.3). By implementing a strategic staffing and hiring plan, Reach University can strategically fill needed faculty and staff positions, alleviating administrative burdens and potentially reducing top-heavy administrative structures. These plans will provide robust roadmaps for initiatives, enabling Reach University to enhance existing practices and explore additional areas of focus such as alumni support and graduate data, bolstering decision-making processes (CFR 4.5).

While Reach University possesses Institutional Research (IR) capabilities to support program review, there is a need for clearer definitions and calculations of publicly available data, including retention, attrition, FTEs, and completions, to facilitate informed decision-making (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). While the institution demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and stakeholder involvement in program approval processes, there is room for improvement in benchmarking and leveraging data analysis from peer institutions, as well as in conducting

marketing analyses (CFR 4.4). Finally, while initial engagement in shared governance is evident, clarification is required regarding the full reporting structure and faculty participation (CFR 4.6).

The governing board of Reach University demonstrates admirable enthusiasm and collaboration with the leadership team. Their dedication to the institution's mission and vision is commendable. However, it's evident that the board could benefit from more specialized knowledge in higher education and doesn't have processes in place for self-improvement through evaluation, development, or training initiatives. Additionally, critical functions and expectations are absent from the current board by-laws. To address these shortcomings and fortify the board's effectiveness, it's imperative to enhance and broaden the scope of regular committee meetings, reporting mechanisms, and overall structural integrity. This will ensure transparency in crucial areas such as financial management, enrollment strategies, and academic direction. Strengthening these aspects will not only bolster the board's oversight capabilities but also enhance its ability to contribute meaningfully to the governance of the university (CFR 3.8).

Furthermore, a thorough review and revision of the existing by-laws are warranted, aligning them with industry best practices and the expected standards of board governance. Incorporating provisions for the regular evaluation of the president and chancellor's performance, along with periodic assessments of the board's own effectiveness, are essential steps in this process (CFR 4.7). By implementing these measures, Reach University's governing board can better fulfill its responsibilities and further advance the institution's mission and objectives.

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

Reach University 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,

and delineates the standards it used to define these areas. Reach is continuing to implement outcomes assessment and program reviews to ensure educational quality. For undergraduate programs, the IR states, “In the Oxford Teachers College, educational quality is tied to outcomes that ensure candidates will be fully prepared to step into the role of classroom teacher upon graduation. Our program assessments and standards are connected to PLOs, core competencies, Praxis exam criteria, and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) Aspiring Teacher Rubric.” Likewise, for graduate programs, quality is defined by outcomes that allow graduates to be fully prepared to take on the role of a classroom teacher or school administrator (CFR 2.1).

Reach has identified three traits that define their students, and its leadership team has developed a distinctive program model to support developing those traits:

1. **Curiosity** - This trait is fostered by Reach’s synchronous inquiry-based instruction using the *Oxford tutorial method*;
2. **Commitment** - Because Reach educational programs are job-embedded, students are able to stay committed to the schools and communities *where they are already working*;
3. **Community** - Reach’s *single-subject curriculum design* allows a cohort of students to engage intensively in one subject at a time, as a community of learners.

Developing experience in a classroom is a key component of the job-embedded model that allows students to apply theory to practice in the context of the student population and communities they serve. The On-the-Job Learning (OJL) Tracker is a tool Reach implemented in 2021-2022 to ensure that students are receiving feedback from their supervisors as well as faculty (CFR 2.5).

Reach has recently aligned Program Learning Outcomes with Institutional Learning Outcomes to help ensure the Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of the Degree, although the review team learned that ILO assessment is still a work in progress. In the IR, Reach indicates that they have partnered with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) to train all faculty to use the Aspiring Teacher Rubric (ATR), which is a nationally recognized rubric designed to assess teacher quality using well-defined standards. Licensure exams in the states where students are located help ensure that teachers are meeting the standards set by their state. For graduate programs, in addition to Course Learning Outcomes, Reach relies on licensure exams by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to define the standards set for teaching and administrative credentials.

While Program Review processes are nascent, mini program reviews for newer programs are providing more immediate feedback for continuous improvement. When fully implemented, a comprehensive Program Review process will help Reach ensure quality degrees and standards for preparing effective teachers and administrators (CFR 2.7). In addition to more fully implementing ILO assessment and Program Review, leaders at Reach have acknowledged the need to develop an alumni engagement strategy, which will provide an additional feedback loop for how well Reach has prepared teachers and administrators in their post-graduation roles. Alumni assessment will also provide Reach with feedback on what a Reach degree means in the communities they serve (CFR 4.5).

D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation

Reach University offers undergraduate and graduate programming. In the undergraduate program, educational quality hinges on outcomes ensuring that students are equipped to assume the role of classroom teacher post-graduation, however the extent to which these outcomes are

assessed and used to drive changes to ensure program effectiveness was unclear (CFR 4.1). Conversely, the graduate program places a similar emphasis on educational quality, but with a broader scope aimed at preparing students for roles as classroom teachers or school/site administrators upon completion. The graduate program mirrors the framework of core competencies seen in the Oxford Teachers College (OTC), yet is tailored to the teacher and administrator performance expectations outlined by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Reach University employs metrics such as grades, survey data, and certification exam results to evaluate performance. The self-study underscored the necessity for reliable data that aligns with course-level outcome assessments demonstrating mastery of core competencies. Additionally, the reaffirmation process identified areas for enhancement in direct evidence collection. In the upcoming academic year, program teams have a goal to focus on augmenting the repository of direct evidence through the refinement and addition of rubrics, thereby enhancing the assessment of candidate and program progress. Presently, each program boasts a set of established rubrics to guide this endeavor.

Efforts are underway to enhance direct evidence collection, primarily through the refinement and addition of rubrics (CFR 4.1, 4.3). Reach University has established rubrics for each of its programs, yet there remains a deficiency in direct evidence for evaluating educational quality and student learning. Efforts are underway to bridge this gap through the development of institutional learning outcome (ILO) specific rubrics, coupled with the aspiration for university-wide ILO assessment. Establishing a crosswalk between various assessment frameworks is also necessary to ensure comprehensive evaluation. However, there's ambiguity regarding Reach University's actions to identify achievement gaps. Closing the loop on data gathering, dissemination, assessment, and decision-making is crucial. Refining current practices

and delineating evidence of competency and learning outcomes achievement are recommended steps for enhancing educational quality (CFR 4.1, 4.3).

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

Reach University demonstrates a strong commitment to student success, as evidenced by its mission as well as by the high level of support students receive, which they described in detail during the AV. In addition to feeling supported by professors, students the team met with during the AV were grateful for the support and intervention of coaches on the Candidate Support Services team, which helps them persist to a degree and a teaching or administrative role. With a student to coach ratio of 1:150, high-touch coaching helps students persist through academic, financial, and personal challenges. Candidate Support Services also includes wellness advisors who coach students in optimizing their health insurance options and who are credentialed in the states where students live to provide direct mental health counseling (CFR 2.10, 2.12, 2.13).

Reach University's definition of candidate success is built on job-embedded learning and the importance of licensure in order to be successful educators. For example, for Oxford Teacher's College (OTC), passage of the Praxis licensure exam and mastery of single-subject content and PLOs is how candidate success is measured. As the BA programs mature, it will be important for Reach to monitor alumni success and licensure pass rates, particularly outside of California (CFR 2.10, 4.1).

Component 5 of the Reach University Institutional Report provided no specific discussion regarding retention and graduation, although the report did include a "Retention Report - Spring 2023" in the appendices (focused only on undergraduate degrees); and Reach submitted a document called "Retention Overview," as a requested Lines of Inquiry document (focused more on methodology). The most recent IPEDS retention data available on College

Navigator reports that the fall 2021 to fall 2022 retention rate for first-time, full-time undergraduates at Reach was 58%.

Reach chooses not to report IPEDS retention and graduation data on its Performance and Consumer Data webpage, which they explain in the “Retention Overview” as follows:

“Calculating retention and persistence for all of our candidates provides a more useful metric than using IPEDS reporting alone.” While Reach has identified an internal methodology for calculating student success, consumers comparing institutional retention rates would typically expect to see IPEDS data, much in the way that consumers choosing a car would expect to compare different cars using the standard metric of Miles Per Gallon (MPG) (CFR 1.6). The Performance and Consumer Data webpage of the Reach University website does not currently report IPEDS retention and graduation data. Instead, Reach posts retention and persistence data for both transfer and first-time students. For example, for the fall 2021 cohort of BA candidates, Reach reported that 83% were retained to fall 2022. Candidate Progress and On-Track to Completion Data and Achievement Data are disaggregated by ethnicity and gender.

The review team heard from several stakeholders that retention is most challenging during a candidate’s first year of matriculation. Reach conducted an analysis of reasons students in the fall 2022 cohort failed to persist, with caregiver responsibilities, time management, and medical conditions being the top three reasons, comprising 65% of all withdrawals (CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.3). Reach reports that they are actively strategizing how to increase persistence after the initial year. There were several recommendations listed in the “Retention Report - Spring 2023,” including a website redesign, Praxis tracking, and enhancing the application process. These recommendations have either been paused or are awaiting implementation.

For its undergraduate programs, Reach has only recently graduated its first cohort of students; therefore, IPEDS graduation data have not yet been reported. The IR as well as meetings with faculty and staff confirmed a shared goal of achieving a 70% graduation rate (defined by Reach as persistence), at the end of eight terms for first-time college students. Reach recognizes that improving retention and persistence will require cross-organizational efforts (CFR 4.5).

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program Review, Assessment, Use of Data and Evidence

The team notes that Reach demonstrates an initial commitment to quality assurance processes, but that additional work and completed assessment cycles needs to occur in order for Reach to fully realize its assessment and decision-making capacity. Reach University has demonstrated initial program review practices but needs to work to strengthen them to further assess learning through a structured, scheduled, and supportive process centered on a data-based problem of practice (CFR 2.7). The program review process is unique; they have leveraged this process to ensure a continued focus on learners' on-the-job experiences and their ability to meet and excel at performance expectations for the specific education pathway they are pursuing. The program reviews include retention data, rubrics, satisfaction surveys, and comparative data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and some national data and state-specific data. This data will be useful for Reach in providing insight into their demographic composition and assist in identifying peer institutions for benchmarking purposes. Data analysis on student learning is supported through survey data, direct data, using Domo Visualization Dashboards to support analysis, and the Critical Reflection and Data Analysis worksheets. Reach uses a Program Review Inventory to guide the program lead through reflection and analysis. Considering trend data, growth areas, and opportunities for greater depth and programmatic

impact, program leads identify a maximum of three guiding questions that will drive the program review. Notably, Reach has implemented a policy regarding mini-reviews and full reviews, underscoring their dedication to evaluation and improvement processes. They have taken proactive steps in response to recommendations from external reviewers and maintain a serious approach to continuous improvement cycles.

Reach has made initial progress to advance educational effectiveness. During the site visit the Team heard from Instructional Technology and Institutional Research staff about their collaboration to enhance data integration systems (Canvas, SonisWeb, and Microsoft Excel). The Team encourages Reach to continue advancing via the implementation of Student Information System (Salesforce Rio) to house data and to develop a communication plan and trainings (CFR 3.5). The Office of Institutional Research uploads visualization data in Domo and the OJL Tracker so that the provost, associate deans, and faculty leads can review the data and develop summary reports. The Reach Continuous Improvement Cycle (CIC) is the process used for the analysis of all program-related outcomes, including PLOs, SLOs, General Education Core Competencies, and stakeholder data (CFRs 2.3, 2.10, 4.2). Additionally, they utilize themes to focus CIC efforts, ensuring targeted and effective improvement strategies. The team discussed with faculty and staff during the site visit how they use assessment to better understand the experiences of students during the mid-semester and end of semester survey; and implemented the Annual Faculty Self-reflection form for continuous improvement. Two forms (Closing the Loop A and B) were developed to document closing the loop in an assessment cycle that needs to be completed by an academic program lead annually (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). While these forms are intended to be used to support (1) planning, design, and intervention, (2) implementation interventions, and (3) collecting and analyzing post-intervention data, without a strategic plan

and faculty governance processes to make information actionable, it may be challenging. The review team was impressed with the Monthly Data Dives to engage in their inquiry, intervention design, and data analysis; and the team encourages Reach to take these to the next level in review, assessment, and data-driven decisions (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).

The absence of students in the M.Ed. program during the 2022-2023 academic year prompts questions about the program's sustainability and effectiveness. Concerns arise regarding the small sample size for student performance, raising doubts about the reliability of assessment data. Moreover, there is a notable absence of mention regarding non-academic or co-curricular assessments, which could provide valuable insights into student development and program effectiveness. While program reviews appear thorough in most aspects, there is a notable gap in the reporting and analysis of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), indicating a need for greater emphasis on learning outcomes-based assessment. Additionally, it seems that Reach is still in the process of fully implementing institutional learning outcome (ILO) measurements across all courses, suggesting ongoing efforts toward improvement. It remains unclear how frequently faculty review course evaluation and learning outcomes data for their courses and whether this is integrated into the annual reflection process. Lastly, the program review policy lacks clarity on the procedures for securing qualified, objective external reviews, particularly those with expertise in addressing student learning outcome assessment, highlighting an area for potential refinement in the evaluation process. Therefore, Reach University is encouraged to develop and adhere to a regular assessment and program review cycle for academic, non-academic, and co-curricular programs in order to strengthen the existing assessment and program review

processes and to ensure the use and analysis of data to effectively close the loop (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.1, 4.2).

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

In response to WSCUC recommendations, Reach has made progress in strengthening its fiscal health since the Progress Report in 2019 and Special Visit in 2021. The recent merger between Reach and Oxford has created some financial stability for both institutions through philanthropic support. A \$1.5M operating surplus contribution to reserves and net asset balance of \$4M in fiscal year 2023 is commendable.

Continued reserve contributions for fiscal year 2024 and beyond is an area of concern considering a miss in budgeted enrollment for spring (470 on a budget of 500) and a substantial increase in personnel and technology purchases in March-April 2024, which are not clearly reflected in the budget. Conversations with department leaders indicated a lack of regular and systematic dissemination of financials for use in institutional decision-making and budget tracking. A three-year plan showing revenue and expenses for fiscal years 2025, 2026, and 2027 developed in February 2024 reflected a surplus of \$2.7M, \$5.2M, and \$13.9M, respectively. Two months later, in April 2024, the projected surplus for the same timeframe had dropped to \$0.6M in 2025, \$1M in 2026, and \$1.5M in 2027. Both versions show declining philanthropy and grant revenue, despite intentional resourcing, increased hiring, and support in the Development Department. Tuition revenue is driven by enrollment growth from partnerships; however, there is no clear direction on future partnership pipeline strategy indicating high risk and volatility in the areas of enrollment and tuition revenue.

A more realistic, comprehensive, and transparent plan to reduce risk of future operating deficits, eliminate misalignment with strategic resourcing, and reduce inconsistencies to increase financial stability remains necessary for Reach (CFR 3.4, 3.5).

H. Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and plans for improvement

Reach University has a compelling mission that innovatively addresses public education teacher shortages in rural and urban unserved areas. The review team was impressed with the commitment of the administration, staff, and faculty to the mission and future of the university and the growth mindset the leadership team exhibited during the site visit. Reach has made significant progress post-merger in supporting a unified vision and philosophy towards teacher education, although the recommendations in the 2021 Special Visit Team Report have not been fully addressed. A consistent response the review team heard throughout the April 2024 visit was an awareness of the need for continuous improvement and plans to fully implement key initiatives, some of which were in progress.

In many ways, Reach still operates like a startup and will need to be intentional about creating the appropriate organizational structures, infrastructure, processes, partnerships, and resources required to advance the university sustainably, while continuing to embrace innovation through initiatives such as the National Center for the Apprenticeship Degree. While Reach has adopted more realistic growth goals since the previous site visit, the goals are ambitious and will require leadership to craft a detailed strategic plan built on realistic enrollment growth, adequate staffing, and aligned resource allocation. The review team's recommendations reflect appropriate next steps for Reach, which should be addressed fully prior to the next WSCUC accreditation action defined by the Commission.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Commendations:

The team commends Reach University for the following:

1. A cohesive and collaborative team that is passionate about education, working to move the mission forward.
2. The internship job-embedded model that provides opportunities for education and trains teachers who are committed to their communities in underserved areas.
3. Identifying the potential of apprenticeship-based degrees and leveraging the National Center for the Apprenticeship Degree (NCAD) to scale the Reach model, access federal funding, and establish Reach as a thought leader.
4. Curriculum Developers continuously working to update curriculum, ensure rigor, and academic engagement.
5. A Candidate Services team that provides tireless support for ensuring candidate success.

Recommendations:

The team recommends that Reach University:

1. Develop and implement a comprehensive, institution-focused strategic plan spanning 3 to 5 years to serve as a roadmap for the institution, ensuring adherence to timelines and goals, allocation of adequate resources linking to both a strategic enrollment management and a strategic hiring/staffing plan, and includes monitoring and evaluation. (CFR 3.7, 4.6)

2. Develop and implement a detailed, realistic, and transparent budget that supports anticipated growth and long-term sustainability. Regularly and systematically analyze and disseminate financials for use in budget tracking and institutional decision-making. (CFR 3.1, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.10)
3. Enhance Board functions by updating by-laws to include annual evaluations of the President and Chancellor, by implementing formal self-assessment of board effectiveness, and by participating in board development. (CFR 3.7, 3.8)
4. Reconceptualize the faculty governance (Senate) to be representative of all faculty, ensuring there is significant faculty representation and voice appropriate to influence university operations, academic policies, academic programs, faculty development, and academic procedures. (CFR 3.2)
5. Strengthen the existing assessment and program review processes to ensure the use and analysis of data to effectively close the loop. Develop and adhere to a regular assessment and program review cycle for academic, non-academic, and co-curricular programs. (CFR 2.7)
6. Analyze retention and attrition data to inform decisions and create strategies to enhance retention and success. (CFR 2.10, 4.1)
7. Develop and implement a comprehensive strategic enrollment management plan that is directly aligned with the initiatives identified in the institution's strategic plan. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)
8. Develop and implement a comprehensive strategic hiring/staffing plan to include hiring full-time faculty to ensure effective oversight of programs and appropriate higher education administrative support aligned with institutional growth. (CFR 3.1, 3.2)

APPENDICES

A. Federal Compliance Forms

1. Credit Hour and Program Length Review Form

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? Yes
	If so, where is the policy located? https://www.reach.edu/disclosures
	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)? Yes
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? Yes, this institution does adhere to the procedure.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? YES NO.
	Comments: This institution has Zoom meetings. The schedule on the website was outdated from 20-21 for ILA, GTA. But there was no evidence online for the other programs.
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 8
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? online
	What degree level(s)? AA/AS BA/BS MA Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Writing, Science, Math, History and First Year Placement. Reach 231, Reach 272, and Reach 320
	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 syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? Does not apply
	What kinds of courses?
	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? One
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
	What degree level(s)? AA/AS BA/BS MA Doctoral
	What discipline(s)? Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? YES NO
	Comments:

Review Completed By: Ja Ne't M. Rommero
Date: May 1, 2024

2. Marketing and Recruitment Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students?</p> <p>X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree?</p> <p>X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?</p> <p>X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>https://reachinstitute.reach.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/11/School-Performance-Fact-Sheet-2023-Induction.pdf</p> <p>https://www.reach.edu/costofattendance</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? X YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>

	Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: https://www.reach.edu/academics/undergraduate-old See Program Statements https://www.reach.edu/find-a-career-opportunity

*§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: Joline Pruitt

Date: 5/13/2024

3. Student Complaints Review

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	<p>Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where?</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The policy describing the grievance process is available online, but the form is not on the Candidate Rights and Policies website.</p> <p>https://www.reach.edu/candidate-rights-and-policies</p> <p>https://app.box.com/file/1300343426095?s=v64n59wmpil0h9mjqrnx1bfbt4ja5ps8</p>
Process(es)/ procedure	<p>Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>There have been no student grievances submitted, although the procedure is published as described below.</p> <p>If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>https://www.reach.edu/candidate-rights-and-policies</p> <p>Undergraduate Grievances and Appeals Undergraduate Informal Grievance Procedure</p> <p>A candidate who has problems arising from conflicts with faculty, evaluation results, advancement, degree/credential requirements, policies, probation conditions, or disqualification should discuss them first with either a Candidate Success Advisor or a faculty member. If a candidate wishes to review a problem or to appeal a decision, s/he should then consult with the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Should questions arise beyond this point with respect to where or to whom a specific appeal should be directed, the Candidate Services lead may be consulted for advice. After all of the informal procedures for grievances and appeals have been exhausted, the formal grievance procedures may be initiated.</p> <p>Undergraduate Formal Grievance Procedures</p>

Upon request made in writing to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, or should the program director deem it necessary, a disciplinary/grievance committee will be assembled. Prior to assembling the committee, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will determine whether the informal grievance procedure has been exhausted and may require additional steps be taken through the informal grievance process, and a new written notice be given, prior to convening a committee. Once it is determined that a disciplinary/grievance committee is appropriate, the committee will be assembled within 30 calendar days of receiving the written request, and members will include, but are not limited to a member from the executive leadership at Reach and a Reach faculty member. Findings of the disciplinary committee may be appealed to the full Board of Directors as necessary. The decisions of the Board of Directors are final.

Graduate Grievances and Appeals
Graduate Informal Grievance Procedure

In the area of academics, protocol requires that candidate concerns or grievances about course content, grading, pedagogy, and the like, be taken up first with the instructor of the given course.

A candidate who experiences problems arising from conflicts with faculty, evaluation results, advancement, degree/credential requirements, policies, probation conditions, or disqualification should discuss them first with their candidate services associate. If a candidate wishes to review a problem or to appeal a decision, they should then consult with the supervising program director. Should questions arise beyond this point with respect to where or to whom a specific appeal should be directed, the program director may be consulted for advice. After all of the informal procedures for grievances and appeals have been exhausted, the formal grievance procedures may be initiated.

If the informal grievance is related to tuition payment or other financial concerns, please refer to the Fees, Expenses and Refunds section of the handbook.

Graduate Formal Grievance Procedures

Upon request made in writing to the Director of Academic Operations and Graduate Candidate Services, or should the supervising program director deem it necessary, a disciplinary/grievance committee will be assembled. Prior to assembling the committee, the Director of Academic Operations and Graduate Candidate Services will determine whether the informal grievance procedure has been exhausted and may require additional steps be taken through the informal grievance process, and a new written notice be given, prior to convening a committee. Once it is determined that a disciplinary/grievance committee is appropriate, the committee will be assembled within 30 calendar days of receiving the written request, and members will include, but are not limited to a member from the executive leadership at Reach and a Reach faculty member. Findings of the disciplinary committee may be appealed to the full Board of Directors as necessary. The decisions of the Board of Directors are final.

The candidate must file a grievance within 30 days from the end of the semester in which the candidate's concern occurred. The time limit may be extended by the Director of Academic Operations and Graduate Candidate Services, at their sole discretion, upon presentation of good cause.

Records	<p>Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, where?</p> <p>Reach University's Office of Candidate Affairs maintains records of student complaints.</p>
	<p>Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>If so, please describe briefly:</p> <p>Reach has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts.</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Alma Boutin-Martinez

Date: May 1, 2024

4. Transfer Policy Review

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

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, is the policy publicly available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Reach has an undergraduate specific policy and a graduate specific policy found on the website under Admissions. Links here: https://www.reach.edu/undergraduate-transfer-policy https://www.reach.edu/graduate-transfer-policy
	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? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> 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: Melea Fields
Date: 4.25.24

DISTANCE EDUCATION

Please complete either Section A for institutions that offer distance education programs approved by WSCUC or are 100% distance education institutions OR Section B for institutions that utilize distance education in the delivery of programs that do not rise to the level of a WSCUC approved distance education program.

Institution: Reach University

Type of Visit: Reaffirmation

Name of reviewer/s: Melea Fields

Date/s of review: April 24-26, 2024

Section Completed: x A OR B

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

SECTION A: Institutions with Approved Distance Education Programs

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

NS 100: Integrated Science (SP24E0) - Undergraduate
 NS-100-CASYD - Human Development Cohort D - Undergraduate
 WC-100-CSYA-Metacognition and Mastery - Undergraduate
 TIS 252: Field Experience
 Reach 231/261 B- Knowing About Students and Planning for Their Learning - Graduate

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

All programs at Reach University are through distance education modality.

Degree Level	Number of Programs
Associate of Arts	1 (approved but not activated)
Bachelor of Arts - Liberal Studies Bachelor of Arts - Global Education	2
Master of Arts in Teaching	3

Masters of Education in Teaching	
Masters of Education in Instructional Leadership	
Non-degree / Credential Programs (Post Bac)	6

The FTE enrollment data by course and by program below were provided to the team on 5/2/24. FTE is based upon their IPEDS attendance level, and the calculation is also based on IPEDS definitions.

Course	FTE
DEP 102	243
DEP 103	239
DEP 201A	302.18
DEP 201B	240
DEP 202A	291.39
DEP 202B	322
DEP 303A	138
DEP 303B	106.39
DEP 400	8.39
DEP 403A	8.39
DEP 410	8.39
DEP 420	8.39
LIT 301	134.79
LIT 302	133.79
LIT 303	133.79
MR 101	322
MR 102	322
MR 103	322
NS 100	308.79
NS 200	139
NS 419	139
NS 423	139
OTM 221	289
OTM 223	320
OTM 321	137
OTM 323	106.39
OTM 330	29.39
OTM 421A	8.39
OTM 421B	25.79
OTM 430	25.79
OTM 440	25.79
OTM 450	25.79

Reach 231	14.14			
Reach 251	6.50			
Reach 260	4.97	Program		
Reach 261	16.43			
REACH 262	7.64			
REACH 263	1.15			
Reach 310	1.15			
Reach 330	1.15			
Reach 335A	21.40			
Reach 335B	11.08			
Reach 510	1.53			
Reach 515	1.91			
Reach 525	1.91			
Reach 530	1.53			
Reach 540	1.91			
SSP 102	242			
SSP 104	290.39			
SSP 201	290.39			
SSP 202	290.39			
WC 100	299.57			
WC 101	314.18			
WC 104	303.57			
WC 105	239			
			Spring '24 FTE enrollment	
			% Growth from Fall '22 to Spring '24 FTE enrollment	
Associate of Arts in Liberal Studies			0	N/A
Bachelor of Arts in Global Education			920.14	77.60%
Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies			555.79	169.89%
Master of Arts in Teaching			8.79	N/A
Master of Education in Teaching			1.15	300%*
Master of Education in Instructional Leadership			1.53	300%*
Intern Teacher Credential Program			27.51	12.50%
Professional Teacher Induction Program			32.09	-3.45%
ILA – Preliminary Administrative Services Program			0	-100%*
ILA – Clear Administrative Services Credential Program			1.91	0%*
Coaching Certificate Program			0	0%
Facilitation Certificate Program			0	0%

Note: The 'n' for the ILA and MEd Program are so small that the % growth isn't reliable.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Reviewed courses in LMS

Interviewed Chief Academic Officer/Provost; IT Director & Staff; Faculty, & Students

Observations and Findings:

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</p>	<p>Reach University views distance learning as an integral component of its mission to provide accessible and high-quality education to a diverse student population. In alignment with its mission, the institution ensures that distance education offerings are planned, funded, and operationalized. Funding for distance education initiatives is allocated based on strategic priorities and resource availability, with investments made to support technology infrastructure, faculty development, and student services.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</p>	<p>The culture is as an all-online institution so there is no need to integrate to in-ground activities.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</i> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the institution conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</p>	<p>Reach uses Canvas for their LMS. The platform is conducive to learning and supports interaction between faculty and students. It is adequately supported with frequent backups.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Student Support Services:</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?</p>	<p>Candidate Support Services are provided for grad and undergrad programs. These services include admissions, advising, and coordination of faculty advising. All services are available to students online and students can easily connect via department webpages.</p> <p>Library resources are online and always available and accessible. Faculty as well as students access the library and its resources at reach.edu/library. They can also contact the librarian directly for one-on-one help. The library itself does not currently hold any memberships, although the librarian is a member of several library professional associations including the American Library Association (ALA) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL). The librarian provides trainings for faculty and students via classroom visits, orientations, and onboardings in addition to one-on-one sessions and research consultations.</p>	<p>Did not get a clear idea on how these departments assess themselves.</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?</p>	<p>Full-time and adjunct faculty teach. All courses/programs are taught through distance learning only.</p> <p>Faculty teams develop the curriculum.</p> <p>Faculty learn in synchronous sessions themselves on the Oxford method. Reach also conducts live trainings 2-3 times a year.</p> <p>Academic life consists of being a part of the Reach team; every aspect is built around a team.</p>	<p>Director of Faculty Learning and Development started in December of 2023.</p>

<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</p>	<p>Faculty teams design the programs and courses. All programs and courses are online so no comparison is available for on-ground.</p> <p>Curriculum and Instruction Continuous Improvement Council (CI2) – reviews and approves programs.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Faculty Initiated Regular and Substantive Interaction.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “faculty-initiated, regular and substantive interaction”? How is compliance monitored? What activities count as student/instructor substantive interaction”?</p>	<p>Created a statement, with examples. FIRSI is met with the synchronous space in the courses, which is part of the core of Reach programming.</p> <p>Program leads join courses to see firsthand the experience. There are also hours documented required by CTC, along with an attendance tracker.</p> <p>Reach implements and requires synchronous activities.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Academic Engagement.</i> How does the institution ensure compliance with the federal expectation for “Academic Engagement”? How is compliance monitored? What activities contribute to academic engagement?</p>	<p>Credit hour reviews and credit hour policy, syllabi reviewed for credit hour compliance.</p> <p>All programs have appropriate activities and expectations for academic engagement.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>State Licensure Requirements.</i> Describe, as appropriate, the institution's process for disclosing to students how state licensure requirements are met by distance education programs, whether licensure requirements are not met by programs, or whether the institution has not determined where licensure requirements are met by the programs.</p>		<p>Reach needs to re-do their disclosures to make sure they meet the actual ED language. Each program needs to be listed with states they meet and do not meet licensure requirements. Currently the states are listed on an accreditation page, and they need to move this to the Disclosures page.</p>
<p><i>Student Identification Verification and Privacy.</i> What is the institution's process for student verification, e.g., a secure login and pass code; proctored examinations; other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identification? What precautions are taken by the institution to protect technology from cyber security intrusions on its or outsourced systems? Are additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity disclosed at the time of registration or enrollment?</p>	<p>Reach uses SSO (Google suite); each student has a unique identifier, paired with their email address.</p> <p>Security policies are published.</p> <p>Periodic vendor reviews to look at breach policies and privacy policies.</p> <p>No additional student charges.</p>	<p>Next steps: Salesforce RIO Student Information System gives candidates better monitoring system.</p>

<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions' online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</p>	<p>Reach University collects data on retention and graduation rates for students. These data provide insights into retention rates, indicating the percentage of students who continue their enrollment from one term to the next, and graduation rates, reflecting the percentage of students who successfully complete their programs within a specified timeframe.</p>	<p>First-year retention has been identified as an issue. Data on website does not include IPEDS reported data.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning.</i> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</p>	<p>Reach is an online only institution, there is no comparison to on-ground. Their assessments are all developed for online.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Contracts with Vendors.</i> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on <i>Agreements with Unaccredited Entities</i>?</p>	<p>Vendors: Canvas, Sonis (Jenzabar), Torsh, RIO, Element 451, study.com (undergrad), OJL tracker, study.net (graduate), SurveyMonkey.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective?</p>	<p>Reach University's quality assurance processes are designed to ensure coverage of distance education offerings. These processes are specifically tailored to distance education, quality assurance protocols address key factors such as course design, instructional delivery methods, technological infrastructure, student support services, and assessment strategies. Faculty members undergo training in online pedagogy and instructional technologies to ensure effective course delivery in virtual environments. Additionally, course materials are regularly reviewed.</p> <p>To provide evidence of the educational effectiveness of distance education programs and courses, Reach University employs a variety of assessment measures.</p>	<p>It is unclear what, if any benchmarks Reach uses.</p>
--	---	--

Revised September 2022