

June 23, 2014

Shelley Berkley CEO and Senior Provost Touro University Western Division 1310 Club Drive Vallejo, CA 94592

Dear CEO and Senior Provost Berkley:

At its meeting via teleconference on June 12, 2014, a panel of the Interim Report Committee considered the report of Touro University California (TUC) submitted on March 1, 2014, along with the supporting documents which accompanied it. The members appreciated the opportunity to discuss the interim report with you and your colleagues; the depth of participation precludes listing each participant, but the panel expresses its appreciation for such broad inclusion. The discussion was informative and helped the panelists to understand more clearly TUC's responses to the Commission Action Letter dated July 13, 2010 following the EER Visit of March 23-26, 2010.

That Commission letter asked the institution to address five issues related to the activities of the institution: (1) clinical education; (2) institutional outcomes; (3) program review; (4) relationships with the Touro System; and (5) faculty development. The panel commended TUC for a coherent, well-written, and comprehensive report. There was significant evidence of engagement and progress in each of the areas, achieved in a time of substantial challenge across the higher education landscape. The panel appreciated the deep thought and documentation which accompanied discussion of each of the areas. It was quite helpful to have the discussion divided and focused between the California and Nevada campuses.

With respect to clinical education, the panel noted the addition of new core sites, the augmented personnel in support of clinical education placements, the revised preceptor performance evaluations, and the alignment of outcomes with national standards. The engagement of students in evaluations is evidence of a fuller circle of review which complements the regular assessment of clinical education sites. In addition, the panel acknowledged the additional training of preceptors on how to assesses student clinical competences, and the incorporation of these evaluations in the E*Value system.

The discussion of institutional student learning outcomes provided evidence of comprehensive and longitudinal engagement of key constituencies. The institution's eight learning outcomes have been assessed in depth. The panel appreciated the clarification of how critical thinking is being assessed, and the use of patient models (actors) in providing simulations for reviewing student capabilities. These occasions are key markers for student achievement; they provide both direct and indirect evidence to assess progress. The use of these results for program review shows how the institution is closing the loop by taking action after analysis.

With respect to program review, the panel noted the extension of these reviews to all academic programs on a seven-year cycle, with results linked to budgeting and planning activities. The

linkage between program review cycles and professional accreditation timelines provides for formative assessments that lead to summative efforts tied to professional accreditation activities. The assignment of a full-time administrative coordinator to facilitate program review processes has enhanced the linkages between the outcomes of these reviews and the creation of actionable MOUs. The institution is clearly using the results of its evaluations to plan for the future of the institution.

The panel noted that relationships with the Touro University system, located in New York, have continued to mature. Roles and responsibilities have been clarified, and the inclusion of key personnel on system-wide committees is evidence of Touro University California's having a "seat at the table". The institution has the flexibility to manage its accounts, set tuition, and exercise discretion in the movement of fungible resources. The creation of unique employee benefit programs suited to each campus is further evidence of the appropriate separation of activities between the system and its individual campuses. There appears to be an appropriate balance of autonomy, collaboration, and direction between TUC and the system office.

Faculty development has likewise continued to evolve and mature. The cross-campus partnerships in research activities, supported by additional funding, renovated physical space, and designated administrative support has enhanced this area significantly. The panel noted that faculty workload is discussed and calibrated transparently, with expectations for publishing and other duties being negotiated upfront with new faculty hires, and promotion and tenure guidelines have been refined and clarified. There are numerous workshops and retreats to support faculty development, and funds are provided for travel to conferences. The campus environment is constructed to support and enhance the research and teaching agendae of all faculty.

After deliberation, the panel acted to:

- 1. Receive the institution's interim report.
- 2. Continue with the scheduled reaffirmation reviews, with the Offsite Review set for fall 2017 and the Accreditation Visit set for spring 2018.
- 3. Encourage the institution to continue its fine work in all of the areas reviewed.

With respect to the next WSCUC review, please be advised that the Commission acted at its June 19-21, 2013 meeting, to approve the final version of the 2013 Handbook of Accreditation and the new Institutional Review Process as outlined in that Handbook. Proceeding forward, the institution should rely upon the new Handbook as the appropriate guide for matters related to Standards and CFRs. Please contact me if you have specific questions about these changes.

I look forward to working with you and your colleagues at Touro University California.

Senior Provost Shelley Berkley June 23, 2014 Page **3** of **3**

Sincerely,

Christopher N. Oberg Vice President/COO

Cc: Marilyn Hopkins, Provost and Chief Operating Officer, and ALO

Members of the Interim Report Committee