
California State University, Los Angeles



Capacity and Preparatory Review for Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Submitted to the

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

December 2008







California State University, Los Angeles

Capacity and Preparatory Review

for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Submitted to the

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

December 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Essay 1: A Culture of Evidence: Using Student Data as Indicators of Student Success 2

Essay 2A: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals 7

Essay 2B: The Roles of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity in Supporting Students' Academic Goals 12

Essay 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability 17

Essay 4: Planning, Alignment, and Commitment to Learning and Improvement 22

Conclusions and Preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review 26

Appendix A: Crosswalk: CSULA's Themes and Essays, WASC Standards, and CFRs 30

Appendix B: Response to Previous Team and Commission Recommendations 31

Appendix C: Illustration: Using Student Data in a Culture of Evidence 36

Appendix D: Opportunities for CSULA Students to Participate in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity 37

Appendix E: Statement of Stipulated Policies 39

Appendix F: Summary Data Table 40

Institutional Portfolio (DVD)
(Includes Electronic Version of CPR Report)

Required WASC Data Exhibits to Support the Capacity and Preparatory Review:

1. Admissions and Student Preparation
   - 1.1 Admissions Activities by Level

2. Student Enrollments
   - 2.1 Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective
   - 2.2 Headcount Enrollments by Gender
   - 2.3 Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity
   - 2.4 Students Receiving Financial Aid

3. Degrees Awarded
   - 3.1 Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program
   - 3.2 Cohort Graduation, Retention and Transfer Rates

4. Faculty and Staff Composition
   - 4.1 Faculty Composition
   - 4.2 Faculty Headcount by Department/Program
   - 4.3 Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity
   - 4.4 Full-Time Faculty/Staff Turnover Over the Last 5 Years

5. Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources
   - 5.1 Information and Computing Resources
   - 5.2 Physical Resources—Current Year
   - 5.3 Sources of Revenue
   - 5.4 Operating Expenditures
   - 5.5 Assets and Liabilities
   - 5.6 Capital Investments
   - 5.7 Endowment Values and Performance

6. Institutional and Operating Efficiency
   - 6.1 Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios
   - 6.2 Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios
   - 6.3 Key Financial Ratios

7. Educational Effectiveness Indicators
   - 7.1 Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

8. Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators
   - 8.1 Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators

CSULA Portfolio:

1. Collegiate Learning Assessment (2006-2007 and 2007-2008 CLA Results for Freshmen and Seniors)
2. National Survey of Student Engagement (2007 NSSE Report and Summary)
3. Program Review Handbook
4. *Delivering Results*
5. Office of Research and Sponsored Programs Annual Report 2007
6. *Strategic Plan*
7. Student Learning Outcomes by College and Program

California State University, Los Angeles:
Capacity and Preparatory Review Report

Introduction. California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA), a comprehensive university in a diverse urban setting, is well known for educating a broad range of students and adult learners. It is distinguished by its large population of Hispanic and Asian students, many of whom are first generation college students. The six colleges of the University and its numerous programs include the arts and letters, engineering, computer science and technology, education, natural and social sciences, health and human services, and business and economics. CSULA is proud of its history of engagement with its students in research, creative and scholarly activity, and the dedication of its faculty to this endeavor. More CSULA faculty members have been recognized at the system level as outstanding professors than faculty at any other CSU campus.

As stated in the Institutional Proposal, CSULA is using the re-affirmation of accreditation process to gain further understanding and improvement of several important processes and to ensure that its policies and procedures support the capacity necessary to be effective and to support student success. This Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Report focuses on issues that were identified by the campus, through an extensive process of campus-wide self-study and input, as being the most relevant to an effective university that is becoming a teaching and learning community, supporting student success and student outcomes. The themes identified were:

(1) Supporting students to reach their academic goals;
(2) Providing enrollment and resource management;
(3) Promoting student learning outcomes and success;
(4) Becoming a teaching and learning community.

These themes will further guide the University through its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) process.

Since 2007, the WASC Steering Committee has held quarterly meetings. Research teams composed of membership from across the campus were established for each of the essays in this report. The research teams met regularly throughout 2007-08, submitting their draft essays in June 2008. In fall 2008, the draft report was shared with various campus constituencies, governance, and administrative groups, including the Academic Senate, the President and Vice Presidents, and the Associated Students, Incorporated. The draft CPR report was uploaded to the WASC website and all stakeholders were asked to review it and make comments via an open web-forum. Town hall meetings were held in fall 2008, where the final draft document was shared and input was solicited. Forums were held with colleges, with administrative managers and staff, and with students. After considering all input, this final report was completed, along with pertinent exhibits. Throughout this document, readers will find embedded hyperlinks to relevant University web sites, documents, reports, and additional explanatory materials.

While this CPR Report is organized primarily around the four WASC Standards, many of the key capacity questions are crosscutting and link to more than one standard. Therefore, this CPR Report discusses the University's ability to meet the WASC Standards and provides insight into the University's chosen themes through a series of essays. These relationships are further illustrated in the following table, Crosswalk: Standards, EE Themes, and CFRs (Appendix A). The CPR consists of the following essays which parallel the themes mentioned above:

Essay 1. A Culture of Evidence: Using Student Data as Indicators of Student Success (WASC Standards 1 and 2);
Essay 2A. Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals (WASC Standard 2);
Essay 2B. The Roles of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity in Supporting Students' Academic Goals (WASC Standard 2);
Essay 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability (WASC Standard 3);
Essay 4. Planning, Alignment, and Commitment to Learning and Improvement (WASC Standard 4).

The appendices include documents directly relevant to this report including the Statement of Stipulated Policies, the Summary Data Table, and the Response to the Team and Commission Recommendations. Other exhibits, including those required by WASC and others from CSULA are included in the accompanying Institutional Portfolio DVD. The

CSULA re-accreditation website also contains the full CPR Report and accompanying resources at http://www.calstatela.edu/wasc. Other documents and files including those relating to Program Review will also be available in the Visiting Team Room.

ESSAY 1: A Culture of Evidence: Using Student Data as Indicators of Student Success; Major Theme: Promoting Student Learning Outcomes and Success (WASC Standards 1 & 2)

In the 1999 re-affirmation of accreditation report, WASC recommended that the campus complete its plans to assess learning outcomes in academic programs, the General Education (GE) program, co-curricular programs and in technology; expand its array of indicators of institutional effectiveness to include indicators appropriate to its mission; develop a common language in regard to assessment; and examine how it is organized to support student learning and to engage the campus in a dialogue about student learning.

California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA), has made substantial improvements in implementing the assessment of student learning outcomes (SLOs) and in addressing the other concerns of the last WASC review. This essay describes how CSULA responded to the WASC recommendations through its use of data on student learning and other indicators to evaluate its capacity to support teaching and learning. Figure 1 summarizes and frames the scope of this essay in four phases:

-How institutional expectations and mandates for student learning are shared in the University community;
-How student data are collected;
-How institutional data analysis and participatory discussions occur; and
-How changes are made in response to data that, in a circular fashion, influence institutional expectations.

How Institutional Expectations and Mandates for Student Learning Are Shared in the University Community

The central mission of CSULA is to "advance a learning community built on the strengths of a culturally diverse urban population and based on academic excellence in teaching and creative scholarship." The student outcomes related to the mission statement include the following: Graduating students will be able to:

- Appreciate, engage, enhance and transform the social, cultural, civic and workplace structure of American and global societies,
- Demonstrate capabilities, skills and opportunities to take full advantage of life-long learning, including graduate and professional studies,
- Participate in research, scholarly and creative activities,
- Display use of tools for personal and academic achievement, economic mobility and healthier lives. (CFR 1.1)

CSULA's ability to document evidence of student learning and growth, as well as to use that information to inform University goals, is the result of an organizational culture that has a shared understanding of purpose. The CSULA faculty hold themselves accountable for establishing, reviewing, and demonstrating student learning. This commitment, as well as expectations and policies, are developed and communicated through a variety of institutional tools, some University-wide and others college-wide or program-specific. The examples we provide below are not exhaustive, but serve to illustrate how the CSULA community shares its expectations in regard to student outcomes. (CFR 1.1, 2.4)

In order to implement the campus mission to advance a learning community, in 2005, the University began development of the 2008–2013 University Strategic Plan (see Essay 4). It is through the dissemination and implementation of the plan that the institutional goals and objectives of CSULA for student learning are communicated to faculty and staff. The 2008-2013 Strategic Plan contains two major objectives related to student learning: Objective 1.4, Assess learning outcomes in all academic programs, and Objective 1.5, Strengthen existing programs based upon the ongoing assessment of learning outcomes. Thus, the campus has established a mandate for all programs to have student learning outcomes (SLOs). The CSULA campus is further guided by its assessment policy, which focuses on using information about student outcomes to improve teaching and learning at the individual, course, program and institutional levels. (CFR 1.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6)

Historically, the University did not systematically monitor the degree to which SLOs were being

communicated to students. However, since the last WASC review, CSULA has adopted policies and implemented actions to increase the use of program-level student learning outcomes across the University. For example, recent changes in curriculum policy have furthered expectations of student learning outcome development. The campus syllabus policy mandates the listing of course objectives (i.e., student learning outcomes (SLOs)) at the course level. New degree proposals, course modifications and new course proposals are now required to list program and/or course level objectives or learning outcomes. (CFR 2.3, 2.6) Similarly, through recent revisions to the Program Review policy and procedures, it is anticipated that Program Review's annual reporting mandate will be a major strategy for assessing the degree to which communication of student learning outcomes is occurring in all programs, as well as the degree to which SLOs direct the evaluation of student learning for continuous improvement. (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)

As the University has made progress in institutionalizing the development of SLOs and the measurement of student learning within all academic programs, there is evidence that the academic units within the University have also begun to better communicate these outcomes to students. Communication mechanisms that are currently being used by the academic units include the catalog, department and college websites, the MyCSULA portal, department student handbooks, course syllabi, and capstone courses. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6) At the course level, all students are queried on class learning outcomes in student course evaluations. (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

Orientations are held regularly for incoming freshman and transfer students to communicate institutional expectations for student learning; orientations also help students navigate the University systems for course enrollment and financial aid. Incoming students are informed that each major has a program plan that specifies the requirements for its degree. These requirements are posted on the University website and published in the University Catalog. Students can also access program requirements and unofficial transcripts through the online GET (Golden Eagle Territory) system. Academic advisors can run individualized advisement (ADVIP) reports on GET to review with students the academic requirements they have met and the remaining requirements needed to complete their degree. Matriculation roadmaps are also available on college and department websites. Students can review on-line the two-year, four-year and six-year plans for completing their degree program. The matriculation roadmaps detail specific required courses and recommended sequences for course completion. (CFR 2.3)

As another example of how the campus communicates its institutional expectations for student learning, CSULA participates in the Lower Division Transfer Pattern Project (LDTP) to maintain articulation agreements with California Community Colleges. LDTP was developed to offer transfer students who complete specified courses that include courses in a specific degree program an opportunity to receive preferred admission into the campuses of the California State University (CSU) system. In this example, expectations for student learning have been standardized across CSU campuses to support the continuity of academic progression for transfer students entering a California State University (CFR 2.3)

Other processes that have been used by the University to assess the degree to which SLOs are communicated to students include the Student Needs and Priorities (SNAPS) Survey and the annual Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators report required of each degree program. Recent results showed that almost 100% of programs report having student learning outcomes (SLOs), and that accredited programs are the most likely to be communicating their SLOs to students at the programmatic level.

How Student Learning Data Are Collected

The University has responded to WASC's 1999 suggestion to expand its array of campus effectiveness indicators. CSULA now collects data from many sources at the institutional, program, and course levels to measure educational outcomes and to improve campus-wide and programmatic educational effectiveness. A number of existing campus databases present evidence that student data is systematically collected, maintained and evaluated at the institutional and program levels. Some of the data sources consist of direct measures of student learning (e.g., General Education assessments, program-level assessments, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment results), while others provide mostly indirect evidence of learning (Institutional Research website, program review reports, the annual Inventory of Educational Effectiveness, the

summaries of The Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results, and the report on Graduate Studies). (CFR 1.2) These, however, only fulfill a small portion of the overall campus need for access to data. (CFR 2.7)

The campus reports annually to CSU system-wide on assessment of student learning outcomes, enrollment, persistence, graduation rates, and on the progress of programs going through program review each year. Some of the campus-wide indicator data collected, including graduation rates, degree audit, transfer rate, and credits, are reported in the campus' participation in the CSU program of Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation. Another use for these data is documented in CSULA's participation in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). By fall 2009, all CSU campuses are required to post their institutional data on the Chancellor's Office website, as part of the VSA effort. (CFR 4.4, 4.5) Currently, CSULA's "College Portrait" resides on the campus Institutional Research website. The VSA contains online "report cards" for each CSU campus. The CSU currently mandates a number of indicators to be reported to VSA, including student characteristics, degrees and areas of study, undergraduate cost per year, enrollments and graduation rates, indicators of student engagement from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and a measure of students' learning and gains in learning (e.g., Collegiate Learning Assessment). (CFR 1.2, 2.6, 4.4) A website created by the Education Trust has data tables for CSULA graduation rates overall, by gender and race, and in comparison with similar institutions.

Other institution-wide sources of data include the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), administered to freshmen and seniors at CSULA in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Findings showed that freshmen scored higher than expected, but that the gain from freshman to senior year was below expected. The assessment website contains a report on CLA findings. (CFR 4.4) Another institution-wide survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), was given in 2000, 2002, 2003 and 2007 to freshmen and seniors at CSULA. Findings from the survey indicate that for first year students, CSULA performs better than other comparable institutions in four out of five scales: Supportive Campus Environment, Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, and Student Faculty Interaction. For senior level students, CSULA performs about as well as comparable institutions on four scales. CSULA was found to provide a supportive campus environment for students, especially in terms of non-academic and social support, but it could improve its administrative offices and staff support for transfers. Trend data indicate that active and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction increased over time (further detail on the NSSE findings can be seen on the assessment website; see also Essays 2a and 2b for NSSE findings). (CFR 2.10) The Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS), a satisfaction survey, was given in 1999 and in 2006 to assess CSULA's overall institutional effectiveness in meeting students' needs (see Essay 2a for recent findings). These campus-level effectiveness indicators provide important data for improving our educational effectiveness. CSULA's participation with community colleges in an Electronic Data Interface (EDI) that allows electronic submission of transcripts from community colleges to CSULA should facilitate analysis of transfer student issues. (CFR 2.4)

CSULA has several policies in place to collect data on student learning for both GE and program-level learning outcomes. CSU Policy holds that entering freshmen are required to pass all required remedial classes within one year, or they will be disenrolled. Also, as part of CSU policy, all students are required to pass the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE) before completing 135 quarter units. The GE program's assessments ensure that students meet GE's student learning outcomes, such as critical thinking and information literacy. (CFR 2.6, 4.5) As an example, CSULA is one of only six campuses in the CSU that has information literacy as a general education requirement, embedded in the GE student learning outcomes. The campus created an information literacy plan in 2005, one of a handful of campuses to do so in the CSU. This campus policy on information literacy makes information literacy and communication technology two foundational skills on campus, and places responsibility for student learning both in GE courses and in major programs. Students are introduced to information literacy in the freshman UNIV 101 Introduction to Higher Education (IHE) class or the UNIV 301 Transition to the University for transfer students, and then later on are assessed in GE courses and in discipline-specific courses. In addition, the CSULA Library has a proactive program to build research and information literacy skills at entry and intermediate levels (including assessment), reaching over 19,000

students a year. The campus also participates in the beta testing of the Educational Testing Service's (ETS) iSkills test, which measures information skills. (CFR 4.5)

At the program level, CSULA assessment policy mandates regular reporting on student learning outcomes data and on the improvements made as a result of data analysis. Beginning in spring of 2006, CSULA began annual program level assessment reporting. Major degree programs provide annual evidence from assessment of their student learning outcomes, which assessments they use, which SLOs they assessed, what their findings were, and how findings were used. Results from the annual reporting have been shared with deans and have been used to identify programs that have weak compliance with the assessment policy (see the assessment website for program-level results of the annual Inventory of Educational Effectiveness data). (CFR 1.2, 2.6, 4.4, 4.5)

Data from student learning assessment at the program level also informs the campus dialogue on effectiveness. In terms of program level outcomes, about one half of the undergraduate degree programs (generally not accredited programs) require graduating students to take a capstone course, with a culminating experience such as a portfolio or a project. At the graduate level, the most common method of assessing graduate's competencies is a comprehensive exam, which is mandated by five and an option in 39 of 54 master's degree programs. Approximately 64% of the graduates from academic year 2007 – 2008 completed a comprehensive exam as their culminating experience. Theses/projects are mandated by nine and are an option in 36 of 54 master's degree programs. Thirty-nine of the master's degree programs provide a choice of thesis/project or comprehensive exam as the culminating experience. (CFR 2.6) CSULA's sixteen accredited programs generally have policies and procedures in place to collect data to indicate that candidates demonstrate proficiency in specific SLOs before they can graduate. The most commonly used assessments by these programs are national or regional tests, portfolios, or performance assessments, compared with the comprehensive exams used by non-accredited programs. (CFR 2.6, 4.4) Accredited programs have been the most successful in formulating and adopting SLOs and in collecting and using student data.

Institutional Data Analysis and Participatory Discussions

The campus makes use of a number of institutional offices as well as a variety of other mechanisms to analyze data and spark participatory discussions on student learning. For example, as part of the Capacity Review and the newest (2008-2013) Strategic Plan, faculty are discussing the adoption of new indicators or benchmarks. Historically, the Institutional Research (IR) office has been active in institutional data analysis. The size of the institutional research office staff has been relatively small at CSULA, compared to similar CSUs, but the recent increase to four full-time staff positions and creation of the data warehouse greatly increased the productivity of this office in terms of data analysis. (CFR 4.5)

The campus engages both the community and other stakeholders in assessing the effectiveness of degree programs at CSULA. Stakeholder input occurs at two locations: during the data collection phase and during the analysis and program modification phase of the process. An internal University survey of programs conducted in 2007 showed that 71% of respondents solicited input from external stakeholders to assess student outcomes. Fully 94% of responding programs used alumni input, 41% used employer input, 53% used input from community-based organizations (CBOs) and 53% used input from practitioners in the field. In addition, 88% of responding programs also reported soliciting input from within the University community to assess student outcomes. Finally, the survey also showed that 100% of programs that solicited input used it for program development, assessment, or updating. (CFR 2.6, 4.5)

Student learning outcome assessment activities and discussions are stimulated through activities sponsored by the Director of Assessment, such as annual competitions for program-level assessment mini-grants; workshops on program-level assessment; meetings with the deans, department chairs, and faculty; and provision of technical assistance to academic units developing self-studies for program review or developing assessment plans for the degree. The campus disseminates information about assessment through the assessment website for academic programs as well as a website for general education. (CFR 2.4)

Most of the colleges at CSULA use an Assessment Committee to monitor college-wide requirements and processes. College Assessment Coordinators have been reinstituted, effective fall 2008. Many departments also use Assessment Committees to carry out activities such as creation of assessment plans and assessment instruments (surveys, comprehensive exams). The ultimate goal of the assessment process is for a program to determine how well it is performing by evaluating student performance on the learning outcomes, at or near graduation. The assessment of an individual academic program is a continuous loop that starts with the specification of student learning outcomes and benchmarks for expected performance, which program faculty determine with the aid of stakeholder input. The loop continues with data collection from the students in the program and data analysis, which compares actual student outcomes with the program's benchmarks for acceptable performance. Finally, the program closes the loop by using the findings for program improvement.

The Academic Senate's General Education Subcommittee is responsible for assessing the GE program. The achievement of GE learning outcomes applies to native students as well as to transfer students who enroll in GE courses at the upper division level. A General Education Assessment Plan was developed by a faculty task force over a two-year period, and academic governance committees approved the plan in 2001. Since GE contains a broad curriculum, the assessment plan consists of a staggered schedule, with one or two outcomes being assessed each year. Results from assessments are generally posted on the GE website. (CFR 2.6, 4.5)

The 1998 program review of the GE Program produced a self-study as well as an evaluation from external reviewers of the extent to which student learning outcomes assessment is being used to improve the program. Both the self-study and the external review concluded that CSULA's mission, goals, and SLOs needed to be revised to reflect "the qualities of an educated person living in the 21st century in the nation's most diverse city." In addition, recommendations were made to integrate curricula and learning by using capstone courses and projects, to update the timeline for assessing the program, and to hire a full time GE faculty coordinator. (CFR 1.2)

The campus heeded those recommendations and the Educational Policy Committee successfully created a GE policy and also developed GE assessment plans and assessments instruments. A GE website has been operational for five years. The website includes the GE policy; GE goals and objectives; and the GE assessment policy, assessment plan and assessment reports. A timeline for implementation of GE assessment has been established. GE outcomes are assessed on a periodic basis, and include both lower division and upper division GE courses and students. Assessment results have informed GE and have been used to improve courses. Based on the results of GE assessments, changes have been made to include information literacy in GE courses. However, while CSULA has made substantial improvements in developing GE assessment plans and assessment, a recent program review recommended that GE update the timeline for assessing GE outcomes, and increase dissemination and use of GE reports and results. A GE Faculty Coordinator has been appointed to ensure that the GE program is fulfilling its mandates. (CFR 4.4) On May 16, 2008, CSULA held the first in a series of half-day "campus conversations" to discuss the mission, goals, and SLOs for the GE program, as part of its ongoing response to previous WASC recommendations. The second Campus Conversation in General Education was held November 21, 2008. Two more are scheduled for this academic year, one in the winter quarter and one in the spring quarter.

Changes Are Made in Response to Evidence

CSULA has made improvements in developing common assessment language and has become more systematic in applying and using assessments. A campus assessment website was created in 2005 to disseminate information. The University established two faculty assessment coordinator positions to guide and assist in assessment of SLOs since 2000, one for major degree programs and one for GE. (CFR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7) Additional special attention has been directed to general education with the recent appointment of a GE Faculty Coordinator. (CFR 2.4, 4.4, 4.6)

As part of the campus Program Review policy and procedures, every six years each department (including some co-curricular units) is required to submit program review data that will be used to inform the department faculty about trends in relation to its programs and about changes to be made in response to data analysis. Further, all departments are required to create assessment plan

documents that include student learning outcomes. As part of the newly revised procedures, programs are also required to create a five-year strategic plan that echoes the campus plan.

The English Department offers an example of how analysis of data on student learning is used to improve curriculum and student skill development. A portfolio review of student papers from a required English composition course confirmed the course's general effectiveness, but also revealed the need for greater emphasis on sentence-level writing and editing skills. Consequently, the course curriculum was revised to include skill development exercises and assignments to improve students' sentence-level writing and editing skills. (CFR 2.6)

Another example of how student outcome data is used to improve curriculum is illustrated in the assessment of CSULA's upper division GE theme courses. In our last WASC review, it was suggested that CSULA examine the "three upper division courses that are thematically linked, as these courses are required for both native and transfer students." To assess upper division GE theme courses, faculty evaluated reflective essays to judge how well students could integrate knowledge from different courses. The assessment revealed that students showed greater ability to synthesize interdisciplinary knowledge as they progressed in completing the three-course upper division GE sequence. (CFR 2.6)

At the campus level, deans regularly review and discuss student outcome data at the college and program level. They monitor use of SLOs by college programs and institute new policies and practices to ensure educational effectiveness. Some colleges (for example, the Charter College of Education) mandate annual retreats and creation of assessment plans and action plans for the following year. (CFR 2.6)

Essay 1 Summary. The University has thoroughly examined how the campus is organized to support student learning, and has engaged in dialogues to that effect. For example, the Strategic Plan includes two objectives regarding assessing SLOs and the use of evidence of student learning to improve programs. Administrators in each division have developed further strategic initiatives in each area. This effort needs to be linked to program-level assessment planning. Another challenge is using evidence to raise the 6-year graduation rate. Although CSULA's six-year freshman graduation rate is somewhat low (32%) as compared with similar institutions, it has increased by 3% in the past 6 years. Overall, CSULA has made great strides toward using student data as indicators of student success, in the continued institutionalization of a culture of evidence on campus. (CFR 4.1) Finally, while there is evidence that the campus has implemented assessment of student learning outcomes in many academic programs, co-curricular units, GE, and technology, one challenge that remains is to collect student learning outcome data from all academic programs.

ESSAY 2A: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals; Major Theme: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals (WASC Standard 2)

In the last reaccreditation, WASC urged CSULA to develop means for understanding how best to support students in achieving the educational goals set by the students themselves and by the University. WASC also recommended increasing the staffing in student support services and improving student satisfaction.

This essay analyzes 1) how the University has determined the global concerns that have emerged from student interaction with support services; 2) the capacity of CSULA's student support services to support its diverse student population in achieving their educational goals, with a focus on the administrative units and offices that support students, especially advising; and 3) how the campus is engaged in a continuous dialogue to better understand and address student learning needs, to support student success, and to maintain an ongoing process of institutional improvement.

Determining Global Student Concerns

The University is aware of the importance of evaluating how well student services support students, from the time of their initial interface with the University at application, through their entire academic career at CSULA. The University has adopted a number of measures to assess the effectiveness of the support services and to assess student satisfaction with them. Student perceptions of the quality of student support services at CSULA 360are primarily ascertained by collection and analysis of student opinion data. Surveys, focus

groups, and other tools (detailed below) have been employed periodically to collect data since the last reaccreditation review. A web-enabled briefing book for all surveys with historical data is available at the 2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey Results website. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

SNAPS. CSULA administered the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) in 1999 and 2006 to assess the institution's overall effectiveness in meeting student needs. Via SNAPS, students expressed as strengths the library, computer resources, lab facilities, bookstore, student health center, career advising by faculty, the Career Center, the University Tutorial Center, and the University Testing Center. In both 1999 and in 2006, students rated the quality of instruction and courses highly. (CFR 2.10)

In 2006, 69% of SNAPS students rated the quality of faculty advising as of high quality. However, fewer students rated the quality of academic advising centers in departments or colleges highly (57%). Only 54% of students rated the University orientation as of high quality and only 50% rated the University Advising Center as of high quality. The 2006 SNAPS satisfaction survey found that few students (38%) rated Financial Aid as being of high quality; similar ratings were obtained for Admissions (42%) and Records/Registration (38%). Financial Aid showed the largest decline in satisfaction from 1999 to 2006, where the percentage of students rating the office as of high quality fell from 64% to 38%. (CFR 2.10, 2.13)

In 2006, only 62% of students reported that the campus helped them meet their goals. When asked for the greatest obstacle to reaching their educational goals, "campus-related factors" was chosen by the largest percentage of students (36% in 1999 and 38% in 2006). When asked "what would be most helpful to meet your goals," 64% of students in 2006 reported "online degree audit." To respond to student demand for access to an online degree audit, CSULA has made this possible with enhancements to the GET system in the past year. (CFR 2.10) Effective spring quarter 2008, students can also use GET to produce an unofficial academic advisement report that lists the work they have completed under the requirements of the degree they are pursuing. (CFR 2.12)

NSSE. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was administered in 2000, 2002, 2003, and 2007. In the 2007 NSSE, freshman students indicated higher levels of engagement than students at peer institutions on four out of five scales. They scored particularly high on the Active and Collaborative Learning scale, the Student-Faculty Interaction scale, and the Supportive Campus Environment scale. However, seniors scored at about the same level as students at peer institutions on four scales, but at a lower level on only one scale. (CFR 2.10)

Focus Groups. In spring 2006, the University used student focus groups to investigate the experiences of students enrolled at CSULA, including (among other subjects) their assessment of customer service, the registration process, and academic advising. (CFR 2.10)

Customer Satisfaction. At the campus level, customer satisfaction surveys have been regularly administered in selected student support services, including the University Writing Center; the University Tutorial Center; the University Academic Advisement Center; and the University Computer Labs. (CFR 2.12, 2.14) Co-curricular programs, such as the University Writing Center and Tutorial Center, are also evaluated in 6-year intervals of program review that includes visits by external evaluators. (CFR 2.7, 2.11, 2.13) The University regularly uses the expertise of external evaluators to assess the effectiveness of the units that support student services. For example, in summer 2008, an external evaluation team reviewed the Office of Financial Aid, resulting in changes in practices to make the functions of the office more streamlined and effective.

pbviews. To assess and monitor performance of student support units, CSULA uses one of the new performance management tools available from the CSU Quality Improvement Program: pbviews. In 2001, the CSU began implementing pbviews to provide system-wide access to data on performance measures and customer satisfaction for 16 functional areas. During the 2005-06 academic year, CSULA administered pbviews customer satisfaction surveys assessing two student support services: Library Services, and Career Services. The CSULA Library Services Student Customer Satisfaction mean scores for 17 questions were comparable to those of other CSU campuses participating in pbviews (Long Beach, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Jose and San Marco) as well as to the CSU average. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

To help assess the significance of the data produced by these customer satisfaction and other surveys, CSULA recently convened a Quality Service Committee (QSC) comprised of the Chair of the Academic Senate, students, and administrators and staff from all the divisions of the University. The QSC is currently preparing a report with specific recommendations for improving quality service in all University areas, particularly those that affect students, including one recommendation for an ongoing structure charged with the responsibility of overseeing the implementation of its recommendations. The expected completion date for the report is winter quarter 2009 (CFR 2.10, 2.13)

Student Support Services Capacity

Student support services can have a significant effect on retention and graduation rates as well as supporting students in achieving all aspects of their educational goals. CSULA provides a wide array of student support services, including financial aid; registration; academic advising; career counseling; computer labs; library and information services; and learning assistance through the Tutorial Center and the Writing Center. (CFR 2.11)

As an institution that serves a diverse population, the University is particularly committed to providing outreach, advisement, incentive and bridge programs to interested students. Programs such as the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), Summer Bridge, the Students Learning in Communities (SLIC, a Student Learning Community Support Program), the Accelerated College Enrollment Program (ACE), the Pre-Accelerated College Enrollment Program (PACE), the Office of Students with Disabilities, and the Early Entrance Program provide specialized academic advisement and monitoring of academic success for diverse student populations. (CFR 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

Institutional Capacity for Orientation, Advising, and the First-year Experience

In response to student ratings of the University orientation, the process has been redesigned. As of fall 2007, freshmen are required to attend an orientation session that introduces them to the University, emphasizing first-year requirements. These orientations involve meetings with college and/or department representatives who review requirements with prospective majors. Students are informed about the University Advisement Center, advised about their first quarter classes, and encouraged to meet with major advisors when the quarter begins. Students in certain majors also meet with major advisors that same day. At the conclusion of the orientation advisement session, students register for their first quarter classes. (CFR 2.12)

Providing Appropriate Advisement

To respond to students' concerns about the quality of the University Advising Center, as well as advising in departments and colleges, CSULA has taken several steps. To enhance the effectiveness and consistency of advisement and to support increased retention and persistence rates, the University has implemented centralized GE advisement in the University Academic Advisement Center (UAAC) in the fall quarter of 2008. The UAAC focuses on providing advisement on general education and other University requirements, on identifying students having academic problems, and on providing timely and effective interventions. To accomplish these goals, professional student support positions have been added to enhance the service that had previously been provided by faculty alone.

The University Academic Advisement Center (UAAC) has the primary responsibility for advising students regarding General Education (GE). In addition to advising students regarding GE, the UAAC has assumed a number of related roles that complement the role of the colleges and departments. These include: 1) an early warning and intervention program for students with 72 units or less; 2) reinstatement from first disqualification; 3) freshmen orientation; 4) upon identification and/or referral, assessment of students who have been identified of being in jeopardy of academic difficulty or of leaving the University in good academic standing; 5) based upon this assessment, develop and monitor student's Plan for Achieving Student Success (PASS); 6)advisement of all pre-nursing majors; 7) advising of students in undergraduate multiple subject teaching credential programs of the 112 unit common core; and 8) probation and disqualification/reinstatement workshops for all students.

For most students, 72 units is the number of units required to complete GE. In reality many students will have more than 72 units before they complete GE. The intent of establishing the 72 unit milestone is to underscore the point that the UAAC is responsible for advising students while their primary

focus is on completing GE. When a student's primary focus is either beyond GE (completing prerequisite courses for the major but still not taking major courses) or on the major, advising of the student is the responsibility of the college and/or major department.

Departmental advisement is supported by reassigned units provided by the colleges, units generated within departments by Full Time Equivalent Student (FTES) enrollment in classes, and some staff support. Departmental advising consists of initial advising to new students, ongoing advisement including academic plans and degree progress, and graduation applications. (CFR 2.12, 2.14)

Assessing Student Progress

The University monitors student progress through advising at various points in their academic career: at entry; upon completing 45 units (for undeclared students); and prior to graduation, as students progress through the major program requirements. There are various mechanisms in place at CSULA that assist University personnel and students to monitor student progress in meeting academic goals. When freshmen or transfer students start their academic career at CSULA and take the required Introduction to Higher Education (IHE) course, they learn about the means available to track their progress through the University. Campus expectations for student learning are clearly communicated in this course. For example, students are informed about utilizing University Academic Advisement Center to assess their progress toward fulfilling general education requirements and University requirements and urged to obtain advisement about the major and about the necessary steps toward graduation. Moreover, students are informed about degree roadmaps and are encouraged to meet with faculty advisors to set up program plans and to find out how they are progressing toward their degree objectives. (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

Students are required to declare an academic major by the time they complete 45 quarter units, so that they can be advised about the major, while allowing them the option of changing their major at a later time (see policy on Undeclared Majors in chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook). The purpose is to require students to meet annually with an advisor at the University, college, or department level, as appropriate, as they progress through their degree program (see Policy on Timing of Advisement in Chapter 4 of the Faculty Handbook). (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.12)

Recently, an existing policy on the timing of advisement was modified to require that students meet with an advisor when they have earned 90-120 units for an evaluation of progress toward their degree, and again once 180 units have been reached if no graduation application has been filed. When students are eligible for graduation, they must meet with an advisor as part of their graduation application process. To file for graduation, students are required to meet with a department advisor to verify their progress toward their degree objective. They review with their advisor the University Bachelor's Degree Worksheet that specifies the general education and University requirements needed for graduation. Advisors use the electronic advisement system on PeopleSoft, which is available through the GET portal, to set up the appropriate graduation template and assess what requirements have been met or remain to be met. (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

A University-wide orientation for new graduate students did not prove successful. Orientation for new graduate students has now been moved to the level of the degree program where it takes various forms and has proven to be highly successful. Graduate students are required to meet with a major advisor to set up an approved study plan prior to being classified in a given degree program. To align information, the Office of Graduate Studies and Research organizes a semi-annual meeting for all principal graduate advisors across the campus to discuss issues related to advisement for graduate students. There is also a graduate student handbook available on the website for the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. This website also provides a list of the graduate advisors in each department. In graduate programs, departmental advisors develop and monitor individualized study programs for graduate students to meet their academic goals that are maintained at both the department and college level. Students are expected to meet with their advisors to review their progress toward their degree. (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

Recently, additional improvements have been made to streamline procedures and facilitate advisement. The time required to evaluate transcripts has been reduced so that students generally have their transfer credits evaluated before they finish their first quarter in residence. The timeliness of transfer credit

evaluations has been significantly aided by the utilization of the Electronic Data Interface (EDI) system with certain feeder institutions that facilitate transitions for students from those campuses to CSULA. Additionally, upgrades to the PeopleSoft operating system used in academic advising enable students to view (through improvements in system navigation) their transcripts, quarterly progress, and academic advisement records. There are materials and instructions for navigating the system available online. Training in the updated GET information management system for student records has been initiated campus-wide for personnel with direct access to and responsibility for the maintenance of student records [see GET ad hoc group). (CFR 2.12)

Interventions

The University provides interventions to assure compliance with CSU policies and University requirements, such as timely completion of remediation and of the Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE). One mechanism for assessing student progress is the University's policy of tracking student grade point averages. It identifies students who fall below the requisite average and places them on academic probation or disqualifies them if necessary (see policy on Scholastic Status for undergraduate and graduate students in the Procedures and Regulations chapter of the University Catalog). Disqualified students receive a letter that requires them to meet with an advisor to discuss their academic standing and to discuss the conditions under which they will be allowed reinstatement. (CFR 2.4)

Beginning in fall quarter 2008, students identified to be at the highest level of academic risk (those requiring three quarters of remedial math and two quarters of remedial English) will be placed in learning communities. Cohorts of thirty students are enrolled in the same remedial math and English courses, and in the Introduction to Higher Education course. The math class has a required study group associated with it. The learning community program will also provide additional academic and social support as well as coordination among the instructors of the learning community courses. This program is being expanded over the next several years, with the goal of providing all high-risk students with a learning community experience in their first year on campus. (CFR 2.13)

Campus Dialogues

Based on assessment results, the University has acted through dialogue and various other initiatives, to improve services to its diverse student population in areas that enhance student retention, learning and graduation, and that support student success. As part of the institution's commitment to evaluating and improving the quality of these student support services, CSULA established the half-time position of the CSULA Quality Improvement Coordinator, in 2006. (CFR 2.10)

Precipitated by student satisfaction data, and also by the challenges of enrollment management, an Enrollment Management Task Force was formed to respond to the recognized need to provide better access to information and better service to students. Initiated in 2006 and continuing to the present, the Task Force is composed of leaders from units across the University. This Task Force analyzed an array of indicators that are pivotal in the recruitment and retention of students. To document this multi-pronged approach, the Task Force developed Delivering Results, a report that recorded proposed initiatives, expected outcomes, assigned responsibilities, preliminary actions plans, and dates for completed actions (see Essay 3 for more information). (CFR 2.10) For example, to increase student access to services, the Task Force established uniform business hours as well as extended hours for all offices serving students. To assure that clear and consistent information is provided to students, a Catalog Review Committee was formed to complete a review of both the print and on-line catalogs. As a result, recommendations were developed to improve the overall organization of the catalogs to make them more user-friendly and readable, and to assure consistency of language and accuracy. (CFR 2.10) The Introduction to Higher Education course for entering freshmen and the Transition Cal State LA course for transfer students were evaluated and are now regularly monitored to ensure that students consistently receive accurate information to assist them in navigating the University and in making informed academic decisions. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14)

Essay 2A Summary. CSULA has the capacity to provide services that support student success, to monitor and evaluate those services, and to take action to improve educational effectiveness. CSULA continues to streamline these processes by using task forces, data collection, quality service

initiatives, and technology enhancements to assist students in reaching their academic goals. While CSULA is monitoring and evaluating the performance of its student support services with greater regularity and thoroughness since the last WASC review, it is still facing the challenge of effectively meeting, within the limited resources of the CSU, the needs of all students. Nevertheless, the campus strives to completely institutionalize the systematic and rigorous internal review of the various student support services and student satisfaction with them, define the needs for improvement, and take coordinated action that produces measurable results.

ESSAY 2B: The Roles of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity in Supporting Students' Academic Goals; Major Theme: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals (WASC Standard 2)

In the last re-accreditation, WASC recommended that CSULA make revisions to its retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) process to more accurately define and describe diverse faculty roles. WASC also recommended evaluating and revising procedures for awarding innovative grants and mentoring programs to enable greater faculty participation.

Faculty Recruitment, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Excellence in teaching and learning is a primary focus of the University; students consistently rate the quality of the faculty at CSULA highest among all of the facets of their university experience (SNAPS Survey). In addition, recent NSSE findings showed that freshmen at CSULA were much more likely to report a high level of student-faculty interaction than were students at other, similar institutions. More faculty members at CSULA have been recognized at the system-wide and state levels as outstanding professors than at any other CSU campus. CSULA faculty have been nationally recognized for excellence in research, scholarship and creative activities, mentoring and teaching. In addition, the ethnic make-up of the faculty reflects the University's strong commitment to diversity. (CFR 3.2)

Valuing quality faculty as one of the University's more important resources, CSULA places significant emphasis on recruiting well-prepared, outstanding teacher-scholars. Over the last six years, the campus has assertively sought new faculty to further the academic mission and reflect its culture. This has resulted in 398 faculty searches (an average of 57 per year) between 2002-03 and 2008-09, and a total of 207 faculty hires (an average of 34 per year) between 2002-03 and 2007-08. The University offers initial compensation that is competitive with other CSU institutions, with average starting salaries above those of sister campuses (page 10, Faculty Recruitment Survey). Credit toward tenure is granted when warranted based upon an individual's professional experience. Resources are provided to assist new faculty members from outside of the Los Angeles area relocate in proximity to the campus. (CFR 3.2)

Finally, one of the directions in the new Strategic Plan is to make the University a thriving place to learn, work, and live. A goal under this initiative is to foster the personal and professional growth of faculty and staff. Actions have been taken to gather all faculty development initiatives under one umbrella that, if not physically linked, are at least virtually linked. Thus, for help and guidance in their professional development activities, faculty have one clear place to go. (CFR 3.4)

The University's Capacity to Support Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

CSULA has a historically strong commitment to student learning through direct involvement in research, scholarship and creative activities (RSCA). Participation in RSCA transforms the lives of our undergraduate and graduate students, as they discover new knowledge and develop new creative works. Through RSCA, learning moves out of the classroom and into the real world, giving students a competitive edge in a very competitive global economy. The Strategic Plans and Missions of the CSU system, the University, and several of its Colleges (Natural and Social Sciences, Engineering) specifically address the role of RSCA in student learning, reflecting the long history of student involvement in RSCA in the University. (CFR 1.1)

As a means of supporting faculty recruitment, evaluation, and development, and thereby also student success, CSULA has established significant resources, structures, processes and policies

designed to increase student and faculty participation in RSCA.

The involvement of students and faculty in RSCA at CSULA takes many different forms. Faculty members and students conduct basic and applied research in specialized campus-based laboratories and at field sites throughout the world. Others use on and off-campus resources based on as well as off-campus to produce scholarly publications and/or presentations that contribute to the knowledge base in their particular discipline. In addition, faculty and students in the arts produce creative works such as plays, exhibits, and performances that are presented to their peers and to the public on and off campus, thereby enriching the lives of many people. Still other faculty and students use Service Learning as a means of pursuing RSCA, while benefiting the surrounding community. The offices described below provide only a few examples to demonstrate the capacity of units within the University to provide essential support to faculty and student RSCA. (CFR 2.8)

Institutional Offices: The Office of Graduate Studies and Research, a unit of the Division of Academic Affairs, provides leadership and service to promote graduate studies and to help faculty and others obtain external funds for projects that support student and faculty research, scholarship, and learning, and that contribute generally to strengthening the institution. The Office for Research and Development (ORAD) assists faculty and staff in applying for extramural funding, of which over $30 million (see page 7 of ORSP Annual Report) was awarded in 2006 (fourth highest in the CSU system). ORAD works closely with the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (ORSP), the unit in the University Auxiliary Services (UAS) that serves as Sponsored Programs Administrator for the campus and provides the fiscal management services for grants and contracts. While ORAD provides compliance support for projects involving research with human subjects and vertebrate animals, and provides information on University policies and procedures that impact the award and utilization of extramural funding, both the pre-award and post-award fiscal operations are consolidated under ORSP. This consolidation of services and close collaboration allows the University and UAS to work in tandem to deliver services when pursuing new funding opportunities, and for UAS to maintain the highest level of fiscal compliance, as required by external sponsors. ORAD and ORSP work closely during the proposal submission and pre-award process, and ORSP also provides post-award administration for all funded proposals. (CFR 2.8)
ORAD also facilitates dissemination and awareness of student and faculty RSCA activities. This office, together with the Office of Graduate Studies and the Honor Society of Phi Kappa Phi, sponsors and organizes the annual Student Research Symposium where students share the results of their RSCA activities, and gain experience presenting their findings in a research symposium setting. In addition, ORAD presents a seminar series (Research Seminar at ORAD Cafe) in which faculty from diverse fields highlight their work. These activities, combined with the numerous departmental research seminars, readings and presentations held on campus provide vibrant settings for sharing and discussing the scholarly and creative work of students and faculty. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

Other University offices provide essential services that support the research infrastructure at CSULA. These include the Office of Academic Support, the Division of Animal Care, and the Environmental Health and Safety Office, which is responsible for oversight of Chemical and Laboratory Safety, Biological Safety, and Radiation Safety, including appropriate training programs. In addition, the Educational Participation in Communities (EPIC) Office promotes student scholarship and creative activities through participation in Service Learning and other activities in the surrounding community. Colleges also sponsor numerous activities that provide venues to demonstrate their students' accomplishments, such as those in the College of Arts and Letters.

Financial Support Mechanisms: In addition to external funding, a variety of University financial support programs also support students and faculty in RSCA. The CSU system provides funding for Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity Awards on each CSU campus. At CSULA, these funds are augmented by the campus and are used to provide competitively awarded Creative Leaves (one quarter release from teaching) and Mini-Grants of up to $5,000. In 2006-07, thirteen faculty received such awards from the University (ORSP Annual Report, pages 18-19). In addition, campus funds are also used to provide a limited number of faculty Seed Grants (usually four units of release time) which support activities directly related to preparation of a major competitive grant proposal to an external agency. Seven faculty received Seed Grants in

2006-07 (ORSP Annual Report, page 18). The University also provides in-kind support that facilitates the acquisition of external grants and contracts. In 2006-2007, $6.3 million, including both in-kind and matching funds, was provided for this purpose. (CFR 2.8)

CSULA and the California State University system also invest heavily in the professional development of faculty. The University provides significant levels of startup funds to new faculty to support professional scholarly activities. Of the 23 CSU campuses, CSULA had the seventh highest average funding for new faculty startup (Faculty Recruitment Survey, page 12) in 2006 (a total of $244,530). New faculty at CSULA also receive four units of release time (1/9th of yearly teaching assignment) from teaching during their first year, to facilitate their professional growth. In addition, CSULA provides each tenured/tenure-track faculty member with $1,000 annually in faculty development funds, which are most commonly used for travel to professional meetings and to further faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. Under terms of the negotiated contract between the CSU and the California Faculty Association, faculty may apply for a sabbatical leave to pursue research, scholarly and creative activity after six years of service. It is evident that CSULA strives to recruit, retain and develop faculty with high professional qualifications who pursue RSCA in support of the University's educational objectives and to maintain the integrity and continuity of its academic programs. CSULA maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning, as supported and informed by RSCA, consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes (CFR 3.4)

CSULA supports student involvement in RSCA through Student Travel Grants to Professional Meetings (awarded to 30 students (ORSP Annual Report, page 20) in 2006-07). These awards provide students with first-hand experience in presenting scholarly work at regional, national and international meetings. The Student Travel Grant program is funded through the state-supported Instructionally Related Activities Program and administered jointly by the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Research Advancement and Development. (CFR 2.9)

These examples demonstrate that CSULA actively values and promotes research, scholarship and creative activities, as well as their dissemination, at a level appropriate to the mission and character of this urban comprehensive university. (CRF 2.8) The high capacity of the University in supporting research, scholarship and creative activity reflects a keen recognition of the linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service. (CFR 2.9)

The University Provides Undergraduate and Graduate Students with Opportunities to Participate in RSCA to Support their Academic Goals

Students at CSULA engage in RSCA in settings that include the academic curriculum, student research training programs, research collaboratives, funded and non-funded faculty research, and extracurricular programs and activities. The following are representative examples of such activities.

RSCA Opportunities in the Curriculum. Research opportunities in many of CSULA's academic departments and programs are provided through classroom curricula either as required or elective components of degree programs. For example, in Fall 2007, over 300 students were enrolled in Undergraduate Directed Study (499) courses in a wide range of disciplines. In addition, students can enroll in Honors Thesis, Senior Project, and Capstone courses offered by various departments. In fall quarter 2007, at the graduate level, 218 master's students were enrolled in thesis or project courses offered by 36 different departments, and a total of 375 approved theses and projects were received by the Library during Academic Year 2007-2008. (CFR 2.2a)

Some courses include RSCA as essential components of an active-learning-based curriculum. For example, the Department of Computer Science offers a series of software design courses that provide students with information on approaches to software design, including initial phases of planning and designing typical civil engineering projects as encountered in practice; integration and synthesis of acquired knowledge; and consideration of alternative solutions, methods, and constraints. At the end of the series, each student is given the opportunity to propose a substantial, individual software project, resulting in a preliminary report and project presentation. The effectiveness of such instructional approaches in preparing students for real-world applications is evidenced by the success of our

students in competitions to develop business and marketing plans, and to design miniature robotic devices. Other courses provide students with opportunities for creative performances and activities. For example, the Theatre Arts 276/476 Playwriting courses culminate in the writing of one-act plays. Students in Theatre Arts present productions of their plays in the John Lion New Plays Festival on campus, and the Kennedy Center American College Theater Festival (held at CSU Fullerton in 2008). (CFR 2.2)

Student Participation in Externally Funded Research Training Programs. A number of established programs at CSULA have as their specific intent the involvement of students in research. The goal of several of these programs is increasing minority/underrepresented students' participation in research and creative activities. These programs fall under the auspices of specific colleges across campus. Programs include the federally-funded Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation, Minority Access to Research Careers (MARC-U*STAR), and Minority Biomedical Research Support (MBRS) programs, as well as the CSULA-Caltech Partnership for Research and Education in Materials (PREM) and others. See Appendix D for a description of the numerous programs, grants, and research collaboratives in which students participate.

Despite the large amount of faculty research performed at this comprehensive university, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2007 found that our undergraduate seniors reported being somewhat less likely to be engaged in faculty research projects than those at peer institutions. While this NSSE item specifically focuses on research projects, rather than on the broad range of activities that comprise RSCA, the University could better inform students of the opportunities for RSCA available to them, and continue to develop opportunities that engage an even greater number of students. The 2008-2013 campus Strategic Plan contains two goals in the area of research and scholarship. Goal 3.6 is to "Promote programs that provide professional mentoring through research, creative activity and other forms of scholarship for students preparing for careers that require post-baccalaureate study." Goal 4.1 is to "Increase support for collaboration among students and faculty in research, creative and professional activities." It is anticipated that the CSULA administration will develop strategic initiatives in each goal area, with related funding. (CFR 2.5)

Extracurricular Creative and Service Activities. CSULA also offers its students the opportunity for involvement in service activities. One example is the School of Social Work's Lobby Days, in which undergraduate and graduate students participate each year. Lobby Days is a statewide program in which Social Work students from across the state visit the State Capital one weekend in March to meet with elected officials and discuss various social issues affecting the state's population. In the Criminal Justice and Criminalistics major, students become involved in a variety of community-based, service-learning activities in a number of agencies in the criminal justice system. Criminal Justice students learn from internships in police agencies, the courts, correctional institutions, and community-based justice agencies. (CFR 2.11)

RSCA is an Important Component of Faculty Recruitment, Evaluation, and Development

Role of RSCA in Faculty Recruitment. The importance of RSCA in faculty roles is evidenced by the fact that job announcements across disciplines regularly state that candidates must show a record of or potential for scholarly activity, typically stating specifically an expectation for research and publication in the candidate's field. Depending on the discipline, faculty receive significant amounts of startup funds (see previous section), and all receive release time from teaching in order to initiate their RSCA. While the CSU system is structured to fund CSULA as a comprehensive rather than a research university, CSULA has found avenues to support a robust RSCA agenda that is linked to the teaching and learning process. The University maintains a fairly high faculty search success rate (73% in 2006, Faculty Recruitment Survey, page 7), slightly below the CSU system-wide average of 77%. Current University initiatives to procure affordable faculty housing may further increase this percentage. (CFR 2.8)

Role of RSCA in Faculty Evaluation. Consistent with the University's recognition of the importance of RSCA to student success are the requirements of the contractual agreements between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the CSU Board of Trustees. The Contract specifies professional responsibilities of instructional faculty to include research, scholarship, and creative activity, which contribute to faculty currency and which "are

essential to effective teaching" (Article 20: Workload; 20.1 a, c, d). The University's Policies and Criteria Governing Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) in the CSULA Faculty Handbook further define how RSCA are critical components of faculty roles and evaluation. CSULA requires annual retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) reviews for tenure-track faculty, and periodic post-tenure evaluation (every five years) of tenured faculty. As a result, junior and senior faculty are continuously focused on their productivity as teacher/scholars. The RTP process creates a culture and environment that helps sustain faculty productivity in RSCA both before and after tenure and promotion.

University RTP policies were expanded within the past five years to include the scholarship of teaching and learning. The current guidelines acknowledge that programmatic assessment of student learning outcomes can be recognized under either Related Educational Activities (Category A) or Professional Achievements (Category B). Some College RTP guidelines further emphasize the important role of faculty in assessment practices. For example, the Charter College of Education (CCOE) recognizes authentic assessment practices and faculty use of student outcomes for program improvement in Related Educational Activities (section B.1.d). Because of the recognition and encouragement of assessment evidence in the college RTP process, some Education faculty are now focusing on their students' learning in their research, scholarship and publication efforts. Thus, RTP policies recognize and reward faculty for their scholarship on teaching, learning, and assessment. (CFR 2.8)

Recently, the University has expanded its service learning initiative to encompass the broader goal of Community Engagement: facilitating development of faculty engaged in community-based research. In February, 2008, in a campus-wide conversation on Community Engagement sponsored by the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of Service Learning and moderated by Dr. Amy Driscoll (Carnegie Institute), sixty-three participants representing faculty and administrators from each of the CSULA Colleges considered what it would mean for CSULA to distinguish itself through community engagement and how it might begin to do so. In a follow-up roundtable discussion in April, 2008, faculty participants agreed to form a Community Engagement Collective that will meet quarterly. Through this activity, faculty will explore ways to support an institutional culture that fosters, supports, and values linkage of community-based research, interdisciplinary community engagement, and service-learning. (CFR 2.9) RSCA plays a central role in a wide variety of faculty development activities on campus, and many mechanisms designed to nurture such development are in place.

.

Essay 2B Summary. As is evident from the above, CSULA has developed policies, practices and structures that support the pursuit of RSCA by faculty and students, in support of students' academic goals. These findings demonstrate an institutional capacity that supports faculty and undergraduate and graduate students in RSCA, providing intellectual challenge and engagement and an academic culture that are essential to the offering of quality undergraduate and graduate programs. (CFR 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.5) It is clear that the University promotes, rewards and values RSCA and the dissemination of the works of faculty and students (CFR 2.8), and has established appropriate linkages between scholarship, teaching, learning and service. (CRF 2.9) CSULA employs faculty members with high professional qualifications, who actively pursue RSCA in support of the University's objectives. (CFR3.2) The University provides faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning (CFR 2.9, 3.4) and recognizes and rewards faculty for their scholarship on teaching, learning and assessment. The institution implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals. (CFR 2.11) Future efforts will concentrate on developing further the infrastructure for RSCA on this comprehensive campus, developing additional opportunities for students to engage in RSCA, and better informing students (especially upper division and transfer students) of these opportunities.

ESSAY 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability;
Major Theme: Enrollment and Resource Management (WASC Standard 3)

In the last review, WASC made recommendations regarding coordinating technology initiatives with campus endeavors in assessment and strategic planning. In addition, WASC recommended upgrading of the library, particularly with respect to adding additional network access, instructional space, group study rooms, and materials and information resources that adequately support the academic programs of the University. Another recommendation was increasing the library's role in supporting technology initiatives through information literacy instructional support sessions provided by library staff to both students and faculty.

This essay explores California State University Los Angeles' organizational structure and decision-making processes with a focus on information technology, enrollment management and resource development. Despite limited resources from the state, the University's organizational structure and management practices have allowed CSULA to maximize its effectiveness. In the years since the last WASC report, CSULA has:

- developed a comprehensive enrollment management plan;
- established itself as a leader in using information technology to support its educational mission;
- continued to hire outstanding teacher-scholars whose quality the students consistently rate as highest among all of the facets of their University experience;
- updated the University library, particularly with respect to electronic collections and information literacy; and
- made significant improvements in the physical plant.

Organizational Structure

It is clear that the campus is organizing for success: it has implemented both the leadership responsibility that must be in place and the collaborative planning and implementation that must take place in order to move forward. (CFR 3.7) The University ensures sustainability through the prudent and effective development and management of its resources. Dr. James M. Rosser, in his 29th year as University President, sustains the administrative leadership of the University. The President is responsible for the implementation and execution of both the internal policies of the University and those established by the CSU Board of Trustees and Chancellor. The principal administrative officers of the University hold regular Executive Officers' meetings to address issues impacting the campus. Recent administrative changes include a new Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs in 2007-2008 and several new Deans. The Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer is currently serving through the 2008-09 academic year; a search for a new VPA/CFO is underway. (CFR 3.8, 3.10)

The University operates in an environment of shared governance. The Academic Senate is the official representative body of the faculty of the University and speaks on behalf of the faculty on matters within its purview. Faculty members and students have a voice in the governance of the University through their service on various standing and ad hoc committees of the Senate that recommend policy on curricular, promotion, retention and tenure matters, and other matters that affect faculty. The Senate is consulted either formally or informally on the hiring of all academic personnel at the Dean level or above. (CFR 3.11)

Budget Planning Process

The University builds support for its strategic initiatives by ensuring that all campus stakeholders have representation in the budget planning process of the University. With the development of the new University Strategic Plan, there is more transparency and potential for greater sharing in the budget decision process. The 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, which will help prioritize how resources are allocated for the next few years, was authored by a University Strategic Planning and Coordination Committee composed of all Vice Presidents of the University, several Deans, a student, and faculty members from each college (see Essay 4). (CFR 3.5, 4.1)

Each year the University President issues Preliminary Budget Guidelines with budget priorities linked to CSULA's Strategic Plan and the Governor's Budget compact. These are further developed by the vice presidents of the University with the Vice President for Administration and

Chief Financial Officer in the leadership role. This is followed by consultation and recommendations of requests from senior administrators, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the President of the Associated Students, Inc., and the leadership of the various collective bargaining units. Recommendations are incorporated into the Preliminary Budget Guidelines and a Preliminary Resource Allocation Plan for the upcoming fiscal year is initiated. The President then convenes the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC), which is composed of the vice presidents of the University, Chair of the Academic Senate, another faculty member, the President of the Associated Students, Inc., a college dean, a non-academic administrator, and a senior, non-voting administrator for the Division of Administration and Finance. The Committee, which is chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, reviews the Resource Allocation Plan and makes recommendations to the President. Once the state budget is approved, RAAC is reconvened to consider any changes necessitated by the final state budget and to make final recommendations to the President, who then approves a fiscal year Resource Allocation Plan. (CFR 3.5) Although previous budget priorities were linked to CSULA's Strategic Plan, specific dollars were not always tied to each initiative (see essay 4 for more recent practices). In most cases, units made decisions on how to spend their allocation and then reported on how much was spent. Recently, in alignment with the new Strategic Plan, each unit has developed a list of strategic initiatives and action items that are directly linked to specific goals of the Plan. The action items are prioritized, and the fiscal and/or other resources needed to address each action item have been identified.

University Fiscal Resources

Generating additional funds is one of the major initiatives of the new University 2008-2013 Strategic Plan. The University's Office of Institutional Advancement exists to promote CSULA's mission and to foster advocacy for the goals of the University by securing private support, increasing affiliations, and creating effective communication strategies with targeted internal and external constituencies. Recently, this office was successful in raising substantial levels of funding for the University. In 2006-07, $1.8 million was raised, but there was a significant increase in 2007-08, when $9.1 million was raised. The Annenberg Foundation recently announced that it has donated $5,000,000 to CSULA, for the completion of a second wing to the integrated sciences complex, which will provide state-of-the-art laboratories, lecture halls, and a possible planetarium for the advancement of the science enterprise as well as for faculty and student research.

CSULA is currently exploring additional ways to increase our visibility to allow us to capitalize on business partnerships. For example, negotiations are underway to bring more outside activities to the campus, which will bring recognition to the campus and may help to negotiate enhanced revenue opportunities. The University is exploring the possibility of building a hotel on campus. This will allow the University to host more functions that use the conference rooms of the Golden Eagle building and new Student Union building and may lead to greater attendance of performances in the Luckman Theater. With a large base of prominent alumni in the LA basin, an active campaign for alumni contributions could serve to provide substantial support for campus development. Finally, one objective in the new Strategic Plan ties together the expansion of information technology capacity and the augmentation of fiscal resources by calling for the use of technology to enhance revenue, as well as to expand and strengthen programmatic excellence. (CFR 3.5)

The realities of CSULA's status as a publicly funded university provide ample reasons for the continuing need for the University to effectively use the resources available and to increase its resources above state funding. California State University, Los Angeles has two main sources of operational funding: state appropriations (general funds) and student fees. State general funding is based on the number of Full Time Equivalent Students (FTES) enrolled rather than the actual number of students matriculated (headcount). In fall quarter 2006, CSULA had a headcount of 20,565 students, and FTES of 16,271 (CSU enrollment). While the number of units taken per quarter by our students has slowly increased to an average of 11.15 over the last few years, the typical student at CSULA still takes fewer units than the system-wide average of 11.7 units per semester. Because of the CSU funding formula, CSULA gets significantly less funding per student, based on headcount, than many of the campuses in the system; however, CSULA still endeavors to meet the needs of all of its students. Nor does state funding recognize the fact that many of our students come from disadvantaged

backgrounds and need more help in traversing the landscape of the academic world than students at other campuses. In addition, FTES-based funding does not factor in the costs of many unfunded mandates such as the Accessible Technology Initiative or student recruitment, retention, and remediation. (CFR 3.5)

FTES-based funding does not differentiate between high or low-cost programs, take into account the increased costs of faculty and staff salaries and benefits, or provide for the increased costs of facilities and utilities. This results in a continuing erosion of our purchasing power. No money is provided specifically for infrastructure improvements or for maintenance, and the amount of deferred maintenance on campus has increased. For example, enhancing our classrooms by adding more technology often requires expensive upgrades in the infrastructure of aging buildings.

In 2006, the CSU acknowledged that graduate education is more expensive than undergraduate education and lowered the definition of a full-time graduate student equivalent from 15 units per semester to 12. However, the potential benefits of this new benchmark were offset by a concurrent increase in the campus' enrollment targets but no increase in resources. In the current environment of marginal cost funding, CSULA, with an already large percentage of graduate students (~20%), does not financially benefit from the re-defining as much as other CSU campuses with smaller, but actively growing, graduate programs. Finally, in January 2008, it was announced that all CSU campuses would be held to their 2007-08 target numbers for both graduate and undergraduate students, due to state budget cuts. This added new challenges to enrollment management, to access for students, to CSULA's efforts to improve our service programs, and to our efforts to improve our recruitment and retention practices. Nevertheless, the University is assessing its readiness for conversion from a quarter to a semester system as one way to better manage administrative costs, increase interest earnings generated from student fees deposited in interest bearing accounts, and become better aligned to the academic schedules of the high schools and community colleges in our service area and across California.

University Physical Resources

There have been many significant improvements in the physical plant of the University since the last WASC visit, e.g., remodeling of the transit and welcome centers located near entries to the campus and of the Music and Engineering and Technology buildings. Construction of the Hertzberg Davis Forensic Science Center was achieved through a Joint Powers Agreement between the CSULA, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, and the Los Angeles Police Department. Construction of the Golden Eagle building, which houses campus food services, the bookstore, Extended Education, Grants and Contracts management, and meeting facilities, was completed, as were the Intimate Theater of the Luckman Fine Arts Complex, the Parking and Transportation Service Structure, a new tennis complex, and a new Student Union. The construction of La Kretz Hall (Wing A of a new Integrated Science Complex that houses the laboratories of several science-focused majors) is nearly complete and a recent donation from the Annenberg Foundation will allow us to begin construction of Wing B. Many other construction projects, including a new Public Safety building, faculty/staff campus housing, and new student housing are currently in the planning stages. (CFR 3.6) Notwithstanding these improvements, the majority of classrooms in the University are in older buildings, some of which need refurbishing.

The University Library serves as an important resource for faculty, staff, and students. Services offered to students include computers, graduate cubicles, group study rooms, interlibrary loan, reference services, information literacy instruction, research help, and wireless access. Services to faculty include course reserves, information literacy instruction, interlibrary loans, and purchase requests. Funding to the University Library has decreased and currently stands at only 2.4% of the University's entire budget. This is at a time when, over the last three years alone, the cost of journals has risen between 51 and 94 percent.

Journals	2004-2005	2006-2007
# Print	1,914	777
# Electronic	3,293	23,254
Total	5,207	24,031

Despite the cuts to the library budget, new wiring was installed for all of the Library's applications, a new electronic instruction room was added, and over one hundred new public workstations have become operational in the past few years. Since the last WASC review, the library has substantially updated

its electronic journal and database collections. While there is some overlap of journals in these two formats, even if all of the print journals were included in the overlap, the increase in journal access over the last three years has been impressive. The number of databases provided by the library has also increased considerably to a total of 169 in 2006-2007. During that same period, the number of instructional support sessions (mainly on information literacy) provided by the library staff has jumped from 673 to 705, an increase of 17%. (CFR 3.6)

University Information Technology

Due to its efforts in using information technology to support its educational mission, CSULA is now in a leadership position nationally. In 2003 the University created the position of Vice President for ITS and Chief Technology Officer (VPITS/CTO), an administrator who reports directly to the President. While separate units of Information Technology Services (ITS) and Educational Support Services were formed in 2002, the management of information technology at CSULA is now centralized under the new VPITS/CTO, which has resulted in uniform enforcement of server standards.

CSULA's new draft Information Technology Strategic Plan establishes an initiative for ITS to build and promote an in-house culture of quality technology service based upon collegiality. The IT strategic plan initiatives are also linked to the campus' WASC themes.

CSULA has been developing its information technology resources for several years. In 1996, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted an Integrated Technology Strategy. Although this placed tremendous stress on campus resources, CSULA continues to successfully implement this initiative. CSULA has made major advances in developing the "Baseline" facilities and services sufficient to meet the CSU's vision of providing students, faculty, and staff with anywhere, anytime electronic access to the information resources needed to support the teaching and learning mission of the University. CSULA has implemented more fully compliant ports than is called for in Baseline, but it has lower than average wireless coverage compared with the system-wide average in the CSU. Information Technology Services continues to expand more wireless coverage, and expects full campus coverage by 2009. Its success in providing faculty, staff, and students access to workstations is good and it maintains a 4-year refresh program for full-time faculty workstations. In addition, CSULA is the only campus that has implemented 100% of all Baseline recommended policies and practices for providing technology training for faculty, staff, administrators, students, and IT professionals. (CFR 3.6, 3.7)

Other related CSULA initiatives include the establishment of eLearning Program Lab (eLPS), which houses pedagogical support to assist faculty who wish to use technology to enhance their teaching and their students' learning experience. At present, 70% of CSULA's general lecture rooms have been permanently equipped to accommodate computer-based, multimedia presentations, and the use of mobile units increases that number by another 10%. Twenty-five more general lecture rooms are slated for upgrading in 2008. CSULA has been evaluating open systems learning management system (LMS) packages and is poised to integrate a new open systems LMS with its student administration system within the next two years. CSULA has been a leader in implementing all three major applications of the Common Management System (CMS) and is participating in the development of data warehousing applications to enhance management reporting.

Enrollment Management

The University has begun to implement several programs to improve student enrollment rates. For example, until recently, responsibilities for enrollment management were divided among different divisions at California State University, Los Angeles. This, coupled with a low degree of coordination among those divisions, contributed to enrollment drops in 2000-01, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06 at CSULA; changes at the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing contributed to enrollment drops specifically in the Charter College of Education. To collaborate and help in the implementation of a comprehensive enrollment management plan, CSULA hired an experienced Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management in 2006. (CFR 3.1)

In another effort to address this problem, campus enrollment targets were renegotiated in 2004-2005, and in 2005 management reviewed its work processes and practices across all areas of the University through a newly created Enrollment Management Task Force (see Essay 2a for more

details). The charge of the Enrollment Management Task Force was to review, over all offices and divisions, all processes and procedures that directly or indirectly influence student enrollment and services. These included customer service for students, facilities, outreach and recruitment, and class scheduling. The Delivering Results document delineates actions needed to create a more satisfying environment for students and those with whom they interact, as well as completion dates for those actions. (CFR 3.1, 3.6) At the time of the writing of this essay, the Enrollment Management Task Force's efforts are now focused on an enrollment and retention study, asking the following questions: Why don't more undergraduates who enroll at CSULA persist to completion of their degree programs? Is the quality of campus services an important factor in students' decisions to enter and/or leave the University? Does the University provide adequate quality, quantity, and timeliness of communication to feeder high schools and community colleges? The results were expected to be presented in fall 2008, and will be used in the Educational Effectiveness Review report. (CFR 2.10)

Some of the Task Force's most important accomplishments include improving recruitment and retention efforts. While recruitment issues are normally addressed by Student Affairs and retention issues are normally addressed by Academic Affairs, these issues are now being addressed collaboratively by both divisions, along with appropriate representatives from other divisions, as a shared effort for enrollment management. There is also now shared use of staff on a variety of efforts, such as on-site admission at high schools and community colleges, as well as for campus recruitment events such as Eagle Fest and VIP day. (CFR 3.1)

An electronic data interface that allows us to receive transcripts electronically from our major feeder community colleges was made available in 2006 (see Essay 2a for more details). This has allowed us to improve services to our transfer students and advisement staff. We are in the process of expanding this service to include other Los Angeles area community colleges. (CFR 3.6)

In 2006, Hobson's Enrollment Management Technology software was purchased as a tool to help us improve communications with prospective undergraduate students. In the first quarter, approximately 50,000 e-mails were generated to prospective students and these e-mails were followed up with additional e-mails every few weeks. This software also allows us to create a CSULA website that each prospective student can visit to input personal information to create his/her own CSULA home page. This homepage contains data on the student's interests (sports, academic major, local area, catalog, class schedule, etc.) that can be used to personalize communication with the students. (CFR 3.6)

In 2007, e-mail became the official mode of communicating with prospective and current students. It is widely used to inform students of all upcoming dates and deadlines and to inquire about incomplete admission application or problems.

A new ongoing program called "It's All About You" was initiated in the fall quarter of 2007. Canopied tables and booths are placed in the main walkway the first week of each quarter to invite students to stop and ask questions of representatives from enrollment management offices (admissions, records, financial aid) and Academic Affairs (advisors, registration, etc). (CFR 3.6)

The University has also begun to implement several academic programs to improve the retention rates of our students such as supplemental instruction adopted for physics and mathematics. Similar models are currently being discussed for the gateway chemistry and biology courses that have traditionally been difficult for our students.

CSULA has many challenges in enrollment management as we look forward. For example, in 2006, the CSU Mentor application system, in which students pay one fee to apply to several CSU campuses, was instituted, and has increased the numbers of applicants to CSULA. CSULA is not often the first choice of our students and many of our students apply using CSU Application Fee Waivers, thereby lowering revenue generated by application fees. Students who attend CSULA still contend with an overabundance of "red tape" and bureaucracy. Customer service, particularly from the admissions, records, and financial aid offices, is one of the biggest complaints expressed by current and past students (SNAPS Survey). The limitations of the institution's Integrated Information System contribute to these problems, but a major problem appears to be a lack of effective staffing to meet the needs of the increasing number of applicants and students at the University. For example, from 2002-2003 to 2006-2007, the number of applications to

the University increased by 52% (from 28,281 to 43,023). Since 2002-2003, the number of first time freshmen enrolling has gone up 13.2% and the number of new undergraduate transfers has gone up 12.9%. To address this demand, 12.25 new staff positions in admissions and records and in financial aid have been added since 1999.

Essay 3 Summary. In summary, the University has made strides in coordinating technology initiatives with major strategic planning efforts, upgraded the library, created the eLearning Services Program and augmented the library's role in supporting technology initiatives. Major areas that remain to be addressed in the future include finding new ways to increase the University's fiscal resources above state funding, and hiring of additional staff in student services support areas to meet the needs of the current and increasing number of applicants and students. (CFR 4.4)

ESSAY 4: Planning, Alignment, and Commitment to Learning and Improvement; Major Theme: Being a Teaching and Learning Community (WASC Standard 4)

In the last re-accreditation, WASC recommended that the campus continue to reflect on the interconnections between the University's strategy in terms of assessment activity, the overall budget process, and the Priority Strategic Initiatives. WASC also recommended clarifying goals and priorities and developing a communication strategy to broaden campus understanding of the Strategic Plan and its initiatives.

This essay describes planning processes at CSULA, data sources available and how data are used for planning, how planning processes and strategic initiatives are aligned, and how the Strategic Plan is communicated to the campus. In addition, evidence of the University's commitment to learning and improvement is provided.

Planning Processes at CSULA

CSULA is now beginning the implementation stage of its third cycle (2008-2013) of five-year strategic plans. (CFR 4.1) The strategic planning process at CSULA has sought to be inclusive, bringing together administrators from different divisions and faculty from each of the colleges, as well as seeking input from staff and students. To begin each strategic planning process, the Strategic Planning Coordination Committee (SPCC) holds meetings at various intervals over a period of one to two years for plan development. Mission and values statements are then created, reviewed, and (if warranted) revised during each five-year cycle. For each round of planning, data on internal and external trends is collected and presented, and internal capabilities are evaluated (CFR 4.5) Broad goals and strategic initiatives are seriously debated and crafted with care. Extensive input was then sought on the 2002-07 and 2008-2013 plans, primarily channeled through the Academic Senate.

After the main substance of the plan (including strategic goals and initiatives) has been agreed upon, the president and vice presidents meet to allocate resources to the divisions responsible for implementation of the initiatives. (CFR 4.2) The initiatives are then broken down into specific action items that eventually become integrated into administrative work plans and routine faculty activities such as program review. Determinations of final resource allocations for initiatives and/or plan outcomes are provided to the University community as a whole, and adjusted on an ad hoc basis during the course of the plan. Colleges develop goals that are consistent with those of the University. College strategic plans are linked to the University Plans. College strategy development retains the flexibility to respond to program-specific accreditation schedules and demands, to needs articulated by external stakeholders relevant to particular college programs, and to program-specific assessment outcomes (CFR 4.3)

However, for the most part, faculty and staff carry out activities consistent with the plan without being consciously aware that these are plan initiatives. Implementation is made easier in part due to widespread involvement in the initial crafting of the plan and in part due to the University culture, which is characterized by strong commitment among tenured faculty to the mission and goals of the institution. Nevertheless, improvements in the University information system could enhance alignment among University units by providing more timely and detailed reports on progress toward achievement of targeted outcomes.

Data Sources Used in Planning

There are several sources of data used in planning. These data sources are used by Deans and Vice Presidents to plan future course offerings, faculty hires, enrollment projections, and resource allocation. The data are also used by Associate Deans and faculty to plan curricular revisions and offerings.

The CSU system-wide Division of Analytic Studies is responsible for compiling student data from the 23 campuses of the California State University and for disseminating statistical information about applications received, new enrollments, continuing enrollments, and degrees conferred (Analytic Studies website). Many of the statistical tables posted on this site fulfill California or federal reporting requirements. Other tables provide feedback regarding academic policies enacted by the CSU Board of Trustees. A small number of tables provide information related to budget allocations and fee revenues. Basic information for any college or year can be found in the Statistical Reports series, and each edition of the division's Statistical Abstract lists historical tables derived from the individual Statistical Reports. The unit also provides information on special themes such as academic performance reports among new undergraduates during their first year of study, math and English proficiency for new freshmen at entry, teaching credentials awarded, and student responses to periodic surveys. (CFR 4.4)

The Institutional Research (IR) website provides a wide range of quantitative information pertaining to the campus, on areas such as enrollment, retention, and graduation. In addition, IR provides college Deans at CSULA with daily access to enrollment counts and full-time student equivalents (FTES) as well. IR has collected information from students on a regular basis. Since 1999 (the last WASC review), CSULA has collected data from the UCLA Freshman Survey each year, the SNAPS satisfaction survey in 1999 and in 2006, and the NSSE survey (see link for a report on NSSE results) in 2000, 2002, 2003 and in 2007. In terms of student learning, the campus began participating in the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) for freshmen and seniors in 2006-07 and will continue to participate (see assessment website for a report on CLA results). Results of SNAPS and NSSE surveys have been tracked over time, and CSULA results have been compared to those of comparable colleges (CFR 4.3, 4.4, 4.5)

Budget data are increasingly available to the Deans from the Provost and from the Vice President for Administration and CFO. This is essential in planning resource allocation to programs and in planning delivery of instruction over the course of each academic year. The Provost uses an array of indictors (such as enrollment in FTES; number of majors; student-faculty ratio; units of assigned time for administration, advising, accreditation compliance, and Chair/Director duties; cost per FTES; external funding; and operating costs) to make decisions regarding new faculty lines, operating budget allocations, and equipment purchases. These data are also compared to other CSU campus programs and to national benchmark data when available. (CFR 4.4)

The CSULA Office of Admissions provides weekly updates of new freshmen and transfer student application summaries for future quarters, with year-to-date comparisons of last quarter's data. These application counts are used by Deans to project future course needs. For example, increases in freshman applications necessitate increases in the number of sections of Introduction to Higher Education and remedial courses as well as increases in GE offerings. Increases in transfer student applications may require additional courses within the majors. (CFR 4.3)

Alignment of Planning Processes and Strategic Initiatives

Campus strategic planning is an important part of CSULA's long-range planning, and is not independent of other planning processes. Specifically, campus planning has needed to acknowledge and respond to system-wide objectives of the CSU. This alignment between the CSU and CSULA is most readily seen in CSULA's current strategic planning process, which has been developed within the context of the Governor's compact with the CSU, the CSU's 22 Items to Help Enrolled Students Progress toward the Degree and CSU's most recent strategic plan (2007), Access to Excellence. CSULA's 2008-2013 Strategic Plan lists six goals (and 35 objectives). Five of the six goals relate directly to the goals of Access to Excellence, and the majority of CSULA's objectives are aligned with CSU objectives. In addition, several

CSULA strategic planning objectives directly support the CSU's 22 Items. CSULA's long-range planning has been informed throughout by the budget realities of the Governor's compact with the CSU.

Each division of the University proposes its own initiatives so that unit strategic plans and action items are tied to specific University objectives. Budget decisions at the division, college, and department level reflect the University's Strategic Plan. In addition, CSULA has also endeavored to coordinate more effectively the goals and objectives of its various administrative units. Since 2005, the administrative units at CSULA have been meeting regularly in "Institutional Alignment Town Halls." Under this general topic, the issues discussed ranged from alignment to information security (May 13, 2005 and November 18, 2005). Other topics included quality service (August 25, 2006 and March 2, 2007) and sustaining and assisting student success (October 26, 2007).

The University has also taken steps to ensure that the missions of departments and programs are consistent with those of the colleges and the University. Academic programs and departments, under the new program review process, are required to develop Five Year Strategic Plans that address trends observed in student data and that are also aligned with college and University strategic plans. In sum, the University has moved strongly towards a planning process that propagates a core set of goals and objectives that guide program decisions and the budget process throughout the organization. (CFR 4.2)

Communication of Strategic Plan Components throughout Campus

The single most useful place to find information about the University Strategic Plan, the planning process, and the history of strategic planning at CSULA, is the Strategic Planning website. It contains links to previous plans as well as to the new Strategic Plan, the committee membership and a link to a bulletin board that allows feedback to the 2008-2013 strategic planning effort. The evolution of plans for communication for the most recent strategic plans is described below.

SP 1997-2002: This plan had a timeline with 2 and 5 year goals for the objectives. A follow-up report produced in 2001 detailed progress on each of the objectives. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)

SP 2002-2007: This plan listed goals and objectives, funding amounts, and personnel responsible for accomplishing the objectives. To more effectively disseminate the plan, members of the Strategic Planning Coordination Committee made presentations on the proposed University Strategic Plan to the faculty, staff, and administrators of the six colleges and the library, as well as to the Academic Senate, Associated Students, Inc. (ASI), the Alumni Association, and the Boards of University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (UAS) and the CSULA Foundation. These presentations were open to the University community. The plan was also presented to the faculty at the 2004 University Retreat held at the Doubletree Inn at Pasadena, California. Updates on progress to achieving these goals were provided to faculty and staff in 2002, 2003 and 2006.

SP 2008-2013: The current plan has been adopted by the University. This draft document was presented to the Academic Senate on April 15, 2008, and additions were suggested. The Plan was fully discussed and was approved. There will be broad dissemination of the strategic goals and objectives across the University community, through the Academic Senate, ASI, and other administrative units, as well as through postings on the Strategic Planning web site. The current plan already enumerates goals and objectives; in addition, this plan improves upon previous strategic plans by specifying timelines, responsible persons/entities, and communication and evaluation plans (all in the process of being developed). This Strategic Plan has an updated website that contains links to a new electronic forum for input from the University community.

Monitoring the Achievement of Planning Goals

The 2002-2007 framework for strategic planning and decision-making resulted in identifying seven strategic University priorities: 1) student experience; 2) campus and the extended community; 3) human resources development; 4) teaching and learning and scholarship activities; 5) resources for marketing, promotion, and recruitment; 6) administration of resources; and 7) development and technology. As part of this process, resources were identified and set aside each year to fund strategic initiatives. Examples of monitoring goal achievement are provided by the priorities of student experience,

technology, human resources development, and student recruitment. Reports were made by college deans and administrators on dollars spent on these specific initiatives, including fostering an environment that provides a positive student experience ($27 million); technology enhancements ($6.7 million); faculty recruitment and development ($1.7 million); and high quality student recruitment and support services ($912,000). Plan implementation and monitoring was the shared responsibility of the entire University community. A final report is currently being compiled on the attainment of plan goals. (CFR 4.1)

The Strategic Plan has been approved, and implementation has begun. (CFR 4.1) While the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan, first published in 2007, is similar in structure to the previous plan, there are significant differences. Currently, campus administrators are crafting the strategic initiatives, as well as additional "strategic action items." Other differences from the last Strategic Plan include the fact that dollars are intended to be linked to specific goals, objectives and actions; and there is an intention to track strategic initiatives and action items, including duration of actions year-to-year and associated dollars. Progress indicators will be set in conjunction with the IR office, and periodic reports will be made on progress.

Evidence of Commitment to Learning and Improvement

The institution conducts numerous evidence-based activities and discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its objectives. First, there are two policies in place that guide the campus: the campus assessment policy, and the syllabus policy. The assessment policy focuses on using information about learning outcomes to improve teaching and learning and mandates regular reporting on evidence of student learning, analysis of the evidence, and improvements made as a result of using evidence. The Academic Senate's syllabus policy mandates the listing of course objectives on each syllabus. New degree proposals, course modifications, and new course proposals are required to list program level and/or course level objectives or learning outcomes. (CFR 4.3, 4.4)

As a result of frequent campus conversations about student learning, the new Strategic Plan has two major objectives related to student learning: Objective 1.4, Assess learning outcomes in all academic programs, and Objective 1.5, Strengthen existing programs based on the ongoing assessment of learning outcomes.(Strategic Planning). In addition, revised Program Review procedures will make it easier to assess the degree to which programs are using assessment results to improve their programs. (CFR 4.7)

Ongoing dialogues about University RTP policies provide another arena of discussion of the important role of programmatic assessment of student learning. Some College RTP guidelines now emphasize and value assessment of student learning. Because of these changes, some CSULA faculty now focus on their students' learning in their research, scholarship, and publication efforts. Thus, RTP policies recognize and reward faculty for their scholarship on teaching, learning, and assessment. (CFR 4.7) The afore mentioned Faculty Development programs constantly introduce faculty to innovative teaching methods and other means of improving their efficacy as instructors.

As mentioned previously (see Essay 2b), the campus promotes evidence-based activities with its competition for annual assessment mini-grants. These grants are awarded to teams of faculty members to develop and assess SLOs at the program level. Assessment workshops are given periodically, usually at the program level, focusing on SLOs, methods of assessment, and developing assessment plans. The Academic Senate also provides a forum for faculty discussions of the results of campus-wide surveys and assessments, such as SNAPS, NSSE and CLA. The Academic Senate's Educational Policy Committee (EPC) has conducted research into the nature of these instruments and the meaning of the student results. (CFR 4.7)

Quality Assurance and Improvement

At the system-wide level, the CSU Chancellor's Office staff carries out financial and operational audits regularly. At CSULA, the Offices of Public Safety, Records, and Information Technology went through operational audits in 2008.

In addition to reviews by the Chancellor's Office, the University's internal auditors, prompted by the President, carry out ad hoc program audits targeting specific areas. For example, the CSULA Financial Aid office recently underwent an internal audit. In addition to internal audits, University auxiliary units

conduct independent external financial audits. (CFR 4.4) As part of the campus' Risk Management program, risk assessments are carried out on selected programs every 2-3 years.

The AVP for Academic Programs is responsible for program review processes, which include internal program self studies as well as external reviews. Recently, Program Review procedures have been revamped to require all programs to create a strategic plan and an assessment plan as part of program review, and to subsequently provide annual reports to their Dean and to the AVPAA on the program's progress. Many programs in the University are also reviewed by discipline-based accreditation agencies. All programs that have sought accreditation have been successful and all plan to continue accreditation in the future. (CFR 4.4)

CSULA carries out an ambitious set of quality assurance (QA) processes at different levels. The Vice President for Administration and Finance is responsible for most non-academic program audits and for the overall QA process on campus. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies is responsible for QA processes in the curriculum and in the program approval process.

A Quality Improvement (QI) program at the CSU Chancellor's Office provides support to a campus-based QI Facilitator (QIF). Support takes the form of administration of customer satisfaction surveys, data analysis, and other assistance in QI tools and software. At CSULA, the half-time QIF provides support and training to all divisions on their QI initiatives and also arranges for various on-campus workshops for staff and faculty on process mapping and other topics.

Although there are quite a few QA and QI processes that occur at CSULA at any one time, they could be more systematic. However, as part of CSULA's strategic planning efforts, the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan includes a directive to create a culture where decisions and actions are openly made. One of the goals under this directive is to implement a comprehensive and systematic QI program for services throughout the University. (CFR 4.4)

One possible outcome of this goal would be to expand current QI efforts to include all departments, institutions and units within two years. Currently the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee is working on development of strategic initiatives and actions to be carried out in service of the Strategic Plan's goal on quality improvement. Thus, in the near future, a more deliberate QI program may emerge. The QI program could use (when appropriate) comparative or benchmark data for external sources as part of the process of institutional assessment and improvement.

Essay 4 Summary. The University has improved its mechanisms for communicating the Strategic Plan and has clarified its goals and priorities. The University conducts evidence-based activities and discussions about how effectively it accomplishes its objectives, and emphasizes and reinforces a focus on learning and improving in an increasingly evidence-based culture. A primary focus for improvement is developing a system for regular monitoring and reporting of progress towards meeting the strategic goals. Another area that needs to be addressed in the future is the more comprehensive and systematic implementation of quality improvement programs in areas throughout the University. (CFR 4.4)

Conclusions and Preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The process of re-affirmation of accreditation continues to engage the campus in inquiry and improvement. This section summarizes CSULA's capacity to meet the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity as well as its readiness to conduct the Educational Effectiveness Review. Evidence from the reflective essays in this report demonstrates the progress of the campus toward its goal of becoming a teaching and learning community by supporting student success and student outcomes. The essays have identified challenges that we face and strategies for examining them further by theme in the Educational Effectiveness Review. While the report locates essays within discrete WASC standards, the inquiry process identified the inter-connectedness between support for student learning, teaching and scholarship that crosses standards.

WASC Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

A systems approach (illustrated in Appendix C) allowed us to examine the process of sharing institutional expectations and mandates for student learning, collecting student data, analyzing data and discussing it, and making changes in response to data. CSULA has fully implemented assessment of SLOs. It has expanded its use of effectiveness indicators, created websites and infused its latest Strategic Plan with objectives related to use of SLOs to improve programs.

The campus mission, a new 2008-2013 Strategic Plan with objectives about SLOs, as well as the campus assessment and syllabus policies all communicate campus expectations for achievement. Numerous ways of collecting student learning data to ensure attainment of educational objectives include GE program assessments, information literacy assessment, NSSE and SNAPS surveys, CLA test administration, program-level assessment results and the Voluntary System of Accountability. Formal offices for analyzing data as well as informal mechanisms for sparking conversations are described, including the IR office, regular assessment activities, websites, assessment committees, stakeholder surveys, and GE assessments. Examples of mechanisms for making changes in response to data include a systematic program review system, a comprehensive faculty development program, and program level improvement strategies. Several challenges remain, including updating GE assessment plans, better dissemination and greater use of GE results, and collecting student outcome data from all academic programs. In addition, the Strategic Plan initiatives need to be linked to program-level assessment and planning.

WASC Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

The University has the capacity to understand the needs of the diverse student population it serves. Evidence shows the ability to tailor a range of services and programs from serving students under-prepared by urban public schools, to providing extensive service-learning opportunities, to offering a unique educational program that is specifically designed to permit young, highly gifted students to enroll in college as full time students.

The engagement of faculty and students in the research process as well as infrastructure support have been described, as has the positive effects of RSCA on teaching and learning. Expansion of the definitions of research, and the recognition and rewards for engaging in research activities were discussed. The University's emphasis on engaging diverse first-generation students in research is demonstrated by the numbers of programs that have been identified for their notable achievements. Future efforts will concentrate on developing further the infrastructure for RSCA on the campus, developing additional opportunities for students to engage in RSCA, and better informing students of these opportunities. The campus will also strive to institutionalize the systematic, rigorous internal review of the various student support services and student satisfaction factors, and define their needs for improvement.

WASC Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

The essay for this standard describes the University's organizational structure and management practices that allow it to maximize its efficiency with the limited fiscal resources provided to it by the state. Despite limited resources, CSULA provides evidence of sustainability in the areas of qualified faculty and staff, quality of faculty development, significant improvement in the physical plant, development of a comprehensive enrollment management plan, innovative use of information technology to support its mission and updating of the library. Challenges in this area include finding new ways to increase the University's fiscal resources above state funding, and hiring additional staff in student support services.

WASC Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

California State University, Los Angeles has extensive planning processes in place. There is an on-going strategic planning cycle covering the development of the goals and objectives that are centered on learning and student success, informed by data, communicated to the campus community, implemented, and evaluated for effectiveness. The Strategic Plan reflects national trends in higher education, and is sensitive to the mission of serving a diverse student population in an urban environment. The campus displays active

engagement in assuring alignment of the mission, goals, and initiatives of the Strategic Plan to policies and practices. Processes are in place to assure attainment of student learning outcomes, through the implementation of assessment and accountability policies and practices, and the evaluation of effectiveness of educational quality through program review. A primary area for improvement is developing a system for regular monitoring and reporting of progress toward meeting strategic goals. In the future, the campus will implement a comprehensive and more systematic QI program in all areas.

To summarize, this report demonstrates that California State University, Los Angeles, satisfies the four standards of WASC for institutional capacity and preparedness. To prepare for the Educational Effectiveness Review, the campus will continue its inquiry, using the four themes of these essays as the foci for assessment of student learning. In the EER phase, the University will examine assessment results and analysis of evidence from the inquiry, and focus on educational effectiveness and the success of students in achieving their educational goals.

Preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review: October 2008

CSULA's work plan and approach for the EE Review was contained in the Institutional Proposal, page 9 – 11. It has not changed substantially since 2006. EE Research teams are beginning to meet in the fall of 2008 and will complete their findings in late fall 2009. The EE report will be edited and submitted to WASC in Summer 2010, and the EE campus visit will be held in fall 2010. Teams have developed questions for each theme. Examples of questions include the following by theme:

Overall Theme: Becoming a teaching and learning community by supporting student success and student outcomes.

Theme 1: Promoting Student Learning Outcomes and Success

- How effective is the University in communicating expectations for student learning outcomes and goals to students?
- How effective are Faculty Development programs, in supporting the central mission of the University?
- How effective are academic units in gathering direct evidence of student learning?
- How effectively does the University use data and learning outcomes information to improve its functions?
- How effective have we been in ensuring that our graduates have the skills and knowledge that employers and graduate schools expect?
- How has student learning been impacted by our efforts to assess student learning outcomes in academic programs and GE?
- Are GE assessment results widely disseminated and used for program improvement?
- Have campus-wide indicators been developed and communicated to the campus community and how are they used to improve student learning?

Theme 2: Supporting Students to Reach their Academic Goals

- How effective are University-wide, college and program advising in assisting students in reaching their goals?
- How effectively do campus support services meet the needs of students in reaching their goals?
- What data are essential and available regarding student retention rates and the time to graduation, and are data effectively used in decision making?
- How effectively does the University inform students about RSCA opportunities?
- Do faculty and staff development activities support the achievement of student learning goals?

Theme 3: Enrollment and Resource Management

- What has been the effect of setting and managing enrollment goals on student success?
- Has the University found new ways of increasing campus resources?
- Are management priorities and processes aligned with enrollment and retention goals?
- How many support staff have been added to student services offices since the last WASC review and are these sufficient?

Theme 4: Being a Teaching and Learning Community

- Is the campus successful in sharing the responsibility for student learning?
- Has the campus strengthened its engagement with the community and other stakeholders?
- Has Quality Improvement been systematically

implemented in all areas? Has student learning been impacted by QI processes?
- How effective have we been in fostering the use of data to raise retention and graduation rates for programs, colleges and student subgroups?
- Has the University developed a system for regular monitoring and reporting on progress toward meeting strategic goals?

For the EER, a data warehouse will include representative examples of student work reflective of direct and indirect assessments of programs' student learning outcomes. The WASC website will have links to the IR website, the GE website and the Assessment website. These contain assessment reports, results and analyses and reports on how programs have improved as a result of assessments.

CLA results as well as NSSE results and graduation rates are located on the IR and assessment websites. On the assessment website, SLOs by program and results of annual program assessment reports are posted. Data points from annual reports include mission statements, SLOs for each program, where SLOs are published, which SLOs were assessed by year, methods used in the assessment, identification of direct and indirect assessment measures, and summaries of assessment findings.

APPENDIX A
Crosswalk: CSULA's CPR Themes and Essays, WASC Standards, and CFRs

WASC Standards	CSULA Themes for the CPR Report			
	Theme 1: Promoting Student Learning Outcomes and Success	**Theme 2: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals**	**Theme 3: Providing Enrollment and Resource Management**	**Theme 4: Becoming a Teaching and Learning Community**
WASC Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	**Essay 1:** A Culture of Evidence: Using Student Data and Indicators of Student Success CFRs 1.1, 1.2			
WASC Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions	CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6. 2.7, 2.10, 2.12	**Essay 2a**: Supporting Students to Reach their Academic Goals CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14 **Essay 2b:** The Role of Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activity in Supporting Students' Academic Goals CFRs 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9	CFR 2.13	
WASC Standard 3 Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability		CFRs 3.2, 3.4	**Essay 3:** Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.10, 3.11	
WASC Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement	CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8		CFRs 4.1, 4.4	**Essay 4**: Planning, Alignment and Commitment to Learning and Improvement CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7

APPENDIX B
Response to Previous Team and Commission Recommendations

In the Action letter of July 6, 1999, the Senior Commission reaffirmed accreditation and made six recommendations to the campus. This is a summary of CSULA's response to these recommendations.

The Commission urges the University to reflect on the interconnections between the University Strategy and the Priority Strategic Initiatives. Given limited resources, clarification of goals and priorities is essential to the University moving into the next stage of its initiatives. Also, the Commission indicated that it seems essential that the campus community have greater understanding of the plan and recognition of how initiatives at various levels tie into it.

CSULA has been engaged in a comprehensive and coordinated strategic planning process that involves members of our faculty, staff, students, alumni, community representatives and friends of the institution. The goal of this broad process was to design a shared vision of CSULA's future and to implement that vision through the development of key strategic directions tied to specific action plans. The plan has six strategic directions and associated goals that more fully develop these directions. The six directions are integrated and co-dependent.

To meet the Strategic Plan's goals, each division has developed and prioritized specific strategic initiatives or actions required, determined associated costs, and are identifying specific sources of one-time or ongoing funding. This investment indicates the University's commitment to make change possible. The major sources of these funds will be from existing Division budgets, productivity dollars and Lottery funds. The implementation of the strategic directions and goals is the shared responsibility of the entire University community. To accomplish our objectives, support will be required from faculty, students, staff, administrators and alumni. During the Fall 08 quarter, members of the SPCC made a series of presentations on the University Strategic Plan to faculty, staff and administrators, as well as the Academic Senate, Associated Students, Inc. (ASI), the Alumni Association, and the University Auxiliary Services (UAS). The University Strategic Planning Coordination Committee will continue its work by developing annual assessment measures for each of the goals. The Committee will annually review actions and results related to each strategic direction and goal to assess how well we are achieving our objectives and, where appropriate, make recommendations. A summary of this review will be shared annually with the campus community.

The University is encouraged to further develop ways for those on campus to share ideas and practices and to develop a common language in regard to assessment.

The Commission urges the University to look beyond the provision of discrete assessment measures to analyze the more global concerns of how the University is organized to support student learning and to engage the campus in dialogue to achieve greater understanding of student learning needs at CSULA.

In the 1999 reaccreditation report, the visiting team recommended that the campus complete its plans to assess learning outcomes in academic programs, the General Education program, the co curricular programs, and in technology. In particular, WASC reviewers suggested development and implementation of General Education assessment plans, learning outcomes and assessments for upper division transfer students. In addition WASC recommended that the university expand its array of indicators of institutional effectiveness to include indicators appropriate to its mission and to develop measures that would provide information it needs to understand how to support its unique student population.

The campus has shown a significant increase in assessment activities since 1999. There are two faculty assessment coordinators - one for major degree programs and one for general education. CSULA has made substantial improvements in creating a General Education policy and in developing General Education assessment plans and assessments. A timeline for implementation of General Education assessments was

established. Assessment results have informed General Education and have been used to improve courses. General Education outcomes are assessed on a periodic basis and include both lower division and upper division General Education courses and students. The General Education Coordinator holds regular meetings with upper division General Education coordinators and conducts regular syllabi audits to ascertain conformance to General Education requirements.

In 2006 -2007, the campus conducted a program review of the General Education program. Many recommendations were made to improve functioning. In response to the recommendations, in 2008, two "Campus Conversations" were held to discuss different models of providing General Education along with implementation strategies and identification of unique characteristic of CSULA that should be incorporated into its General Education learning outcomes.

At the fall 2008 conversation, a speaker from American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) spoke about new directions for GE, and about the Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) project with its essential learning outcomes. Small groups worked to identify key areas of learning outcomes in addition to the four core areas in LEAP. Participants also ranked CSULA´s learning outcomes, added new outcomes, and brainstormed ideas for implementation. At future General Education conversations in winter and spring 2009, revisions to the current General Education program will be made and implementation strategies will be decided.

In spring of 2006, CSULA began annual program level assessment reporting using a web survey. Degree programs provide annual evidence of their student learning outcomes. They are also asked which assessments they use, which student learning outcomes are being assessed, what their findings were and how findings were used to improve their program. 2008 was the third year of annual reporting and trend data are available. Results from the annual reporting have been shared with deans and have been used to identify programs that are not complying with assessment requirements. Although the campus assessment policy (2001) requires triennial reports on assessment by programs, the Senate's Program Review Subcommittee revise the program review procedures in 2008 to mandate annual program reporting on student learning outcomes and assessments, results of assessments and use made of results.

The University conducts program reviews of its co curricular units on a regular 6-year schedule. Program reviews are generally not conducted on non-academic units such as Financial Aid and Admissions, but Quality Assurance audits are carried out on these units regularly by Administration and Finance. The university has adopted information technology outcomes and has participated in a pilot of ETS´ICT (information literacy test) in 2007. A sample of undergraduates is tested annually to ascertain levels of information literacy skills and knowledge.

CSULA has made improvements in developing common assessment language and is now more systematic in applying and using assessments. A campus assessment website was created in 2005. Each college has a college assessment coordinator, who supervises the college's work and works with the campus assessment coordinator. The campus reports annually to CSU system wide on assessment of student learning outcomes and on the progress of programs going through program review every year.

Assessment activities include annual assessment mini-grant competitions for programs since 2005, periodic workshops on program level assessment since 2004, meetings with the deans, department chair and faculty and provision of technical assistance by the Campus Assessment Coordinator to units developing self studies for program review or developing assessment plans for degree program. In 2002, the Academic Senate's Assessment subcommittee was disbanded and responsibility for it folded into the Senate's Educational Policy Committee. After the campus identified a need for greater discussion on the topic, the Educational Effectiveness Council was established in 2007. This group meets 1 – 2 times a year and focuses

at a global level on dialogue and engagement in a discussion on whether the University is organized to support student learning.

In the 1999 review, visiting team also recommended that CSULA more accurately define and describe diverse faculty roles for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP), and that it should review procedures for innovative faculty grants. The campus developed a new RTP policy in 2000 and every two year, colleges and departments review and revise their policies and procedures. In recent years, a new RTP option, the Individual Professional Plan or IPP, was made available to faculty who wish to develop and unique plan for their faculty development and career.

Additionally, RTP workshops are given annually both to new faculty and to current faculty to provide support for faculty undergoing review. CSULA also has an innovative grants program to allow new faculty to get release time, student assistant or other supports to conduct research in their field.

The Commission urges the University to develop measures that will provide the information it needs in order to understand how best to support the CSULA students in achieving the educational goals set by themselves and by the University.

Beginning in Fall 2008, students who tested into the first level of college level remedial math and English were pre-enrolled in a cohort cluster that consisted of remedial math, remedial English and an Introduction to Higher Education (IHE). All of the remedial math classes have a study group attached to them. Attendance in the study groups is mandatory counts as part of the math grade. The learning communities (faculty and students) were provided support to optimize the fact that the same students will be in the same four classes together for the entire fall quarter. This support includes workshops for the faculty to help them better understand the purpose of learning communities and to provide them with tools and strategies to enhance student learning.

The Eagles Nest Early Warning Program was established for students who are in their first terms of college and for a variety of reasons, may be in greater jeopardy than other groups of having academic difficulty. In order to provide support for these students at the earliest signs of potential academic difficulty, these groups will be included in the Eagles Nest Early Warning Program. A mid term report will be solicited from instructors who have high risk students in their classes. Students who are doing poorly will be contacted by an advisor and asked to come in for a "counseling session." Students who do not respond will have a hold placed on their next quarter's registration.

By the end of the second week of each quarter lists will be provided by the Office of Institutional Research of students who have been identified as high risk. Students will be contacted and be required to make an appointment to see an advisor. Students will be interviewed and, based on the determination of the advisor (using a predetermined rubric), may be required to complete an assessment survey to identify specific areas in which intervention might be most appropriate. Based on the assessment a *Plan to Achieve Student Success* (PASS) will be developed. Compliance with the action plan will be monitored to provide support and help ensure that the plan is fully carried out. Students will provide documentation of having achieved milestones identified in the in a predetermined and mutually agreed upon timeframe.

Data has shown that there are large numbers of students who appear to be doing well academically, but nonetheless do not return after a year. These students will be sent an email congratulating them on their success in the previous quarter, encouraging them to keep up the good work and inviting them to contact the University Academic Advisement Center if they have any questions or if they need assistance of any kind.

The University has many programs and services which help students in the transition and adjustment to Cal State L.A. and to help ensure their academic success. In an effort to provide students with a well integrated, comprehensive first and second year experience the Student Success Council has been established to facilitate regular goal oriented dialogue among units of the University that impact students most

in their impressionable first and second years. The Student Success Council discusses ways in which each of the respective areas impacts students, how services can be improved, the alignment of services and how they can more effectively be aligned, redundancy and the integration of services

During the Fall 2008 the University launched a revised Introduction to Higher Education (IHE). The IHE (freshmen) courses in the colleges of Arts and Letters, Business and Economics, Health and Human Services, Natural and Social Sciences and for Undeclared Students have been modified from a 2 unit course to a 4 unit course. The content is more substantive in nature with an emphasis on thinking critically and decision making generally, but specifically in the context of choices faced by college students. These courses were modified based on a successful two year pilot conducted by the college of NSS.

The University is urged by the Commission to proceed carefully to develop measures that will accurately reflect educational success in a student population with significant work-related and personal commitments.

The University responded to the 1999 visiting team's suggestion to expand its array of indicators of institutional effectiveness and to develop measures that provide information to help the campus understand how to support its unique student population. The campus is regularly required to report indicator outcomes to CSU system wide, including persistence rates, graduation rates and remediation rates.

Student satisfaction surveys have been given on a regular basis at CSULA over the past 10 years, including the SNAPS survey (1999 and 2006). For the third time, a national survey that measures student engagement and self reported learning (National Survey of Student Engagement or NSSE) was given in 2007 to freshmen and seniors. Findings were instructive and gave the campus many ideas on improving its programs, especially in the areas of administrative offices and staff support for transfers.

Since 2007, there has been a CSU wide participation in the Voluntary System of

Accountability (VSA) that has resulted in online report cards for each campus. Our College Portrait resides on the campus IR website. Some indicators include student characteristics, degrees and areas of study, cost per year, enrolments, persistence, 6 year graduation rates and indicators of student engagement from NSSE, and a measure of student learning (CLA).


The Commission encourages the University to look at how technology can help it achieve its goals.

The reorganization of Information Technology Services (ITS) in January 2003 was designed to strengthen and augment all aspects of the University's technological infrastructure. The organizational structure has facilitated a high level of collaboration between Academic Affairs and ITS which has enabled academic programs to leverage this infrastructure. Examples include the eLearning Program and Support Center (eLPS), which supports faculty in the application of appropriate pedagogy and computer-based education technologies; the Faculty Development Center, which works to enhance faculty development in various ways including seminars in the use of advanced instructional technologies and opportunities to preview new instructional technologies; six Open Access Labs (OALs) are available for students in all disciplines for University-related work; the Information Technology Consultant (ITC) Program which designates technology professionals to act as resources and liaisons between the Office of Academic Support and the six colleges, the Library, and Extended Education. The ITCs support faculty in a wide range of services related to the use of information and instructional technologies.

The 1999 visiting team suggested that staff should be provided with state-of-the art equipment, which could enable staff to serve in the role of ITCs within their own office environments. All full-time staff has equipment that meets or exceeds minimum Baseline standards, and the equipment is refreshed every 36 months. ITS provides ongoing training workshops to increase staff proficiency in a

variety of applications. The ITS Strategic Plan for 2008-13 outlines plans and requirements to enhance both workshop availability and application topics. The 1999 team also recommended a strong linkage between ITS and the University Library's programs. As outlined in the ITS Strategic Plan, the University Librarian is a permanent member of the ITS Advisory Committee. This committee provides input regarding ITS projects and technology initiatives.

Appendix C: Using Student Data in a Culture of Evidence



APPENDIX D
Opportunities for CSULA Students to Participate in Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Many of the programs that provide opportunities for students are in the College of Natural and Social Sciences. There are several programs housed in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry that focus on student involvement in biomedical research, under the auspices of the Minority Opportunities in Research (MORE) Program Office. For example, the aims of the Minority Access to Research Careers-Undergraduate Student Training for Academic Research (MARC-U*STAR) program are to increase the number of well-prepared students who can compete successfully for positions in graduate programs leading to the Ph.D. in one of the biomedical sciences. Students participate in an honors training program which is rich in opportunities for involvement in research and provides an academically sound science curriculum. Another example of this type of program is the Minority Biomedical Research Support-Research Initiatives for Scientific Enhancement (MBRS-RISE). The MBRS-RISE program has as one of its goals the development of the pool of underrepresented minority group members who pursue careers in the biomedical related sciences. The CSULA MBRS program is one of the largest and most successful in the country and is in its 23rd year. It involves 15 faculty and 50 students in the departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Mathematics and Psychology, working on a variety of biomedical research projects, primarily at the basic science level. Undergraduate students perform supervised research under participating faculty, devoting at least 15 hours per week during the academic year and 40 hours per week during the summer. The MBRS and the MARC-U*STAR programs are funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health. Similar programs involving students in RSCA are found in the College of Engineering, Computer Science and Technology, and College of Health and Human Services. (CFR 2.2)

Research Collaboratives with External Institutions
In addition to curriculum and organized programs, there are also a number of research collaboratives between CSULA and research and practice entities that involve students in research and creative activities. For example, the CSULA-Caltech Partnership for Research and Education in Materials (PREM) collaborative was established in April of 2004 to enhance and promote diversity in materials science research and education in the Southern California area by fostering interdisciplinary interactions between faculty and students at CSULA and Caltech that advance the discovery and understanding of new materials. The goals of the PREM are to enhance the materials science research and educational program at CSULA by expanding ongoing collaborative efforts with Caltech and Caltech Center for the Science and Engineering of Materials (CSEM) and to develop highly trained undergraduate and master's students for careers in materials research via a comprehensive program involving scientific research, workshops, and faculty mentoring. (CFR 2.5)

Faculty Funded and non-Funded Research
In addition to curricular activities in the classroom and research program collaboratives, students are also provided with opportunities to work on faculty-funded and non-funded research. In the College of Health and Human Services there are several projects that offer students involvement in research. For example, the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminalistics has a number of funded projects that actively involve students in the research process. Two professors received $350,000 in funding from the National Institute of Justice to support research entitled Investigations on the Use of SampleMatrix ™ to Stabilize Crime Scene Biological Samples for Optimized Analysis and Room Temperature Storage. The project is employing 12 Criminalistics graduate students during the one-year project period. Also, several professors received a $650,000 research grant from the National Institute of Justice to study The Role and Impact of Forensic Science in the Criminal

Justice Process. Ten Criminalistics and Criminal Justice graduate students are working with their professors on the project.

Other examples of student involvement in faculty-funded research emanating from the College of Health and Human Services are found in the Department of Child and Family Studies. Faculty in that Department in collaboration with Psychology professors, are working on a pilot study on the acquisition of Spanish and English in Latino preschoolers. Undergraduate students from Child Development and Psychology are currently involved in the project, helping with the data collection, transcription and coding. On the other end of the age spectrum, there are a number of research projects involving undergraduate and graduate students in the Applied Gerontology Institute under the College of Health and Human Services. (CFR 2.5)

APPENDIX E
Statement of Stipulated Policies

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

California State University, Los Angeles
WASC Accreditation
Institutional Stipulations

This is to confirm that California State University, Los Angeles, is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments, that it will engage in the process with seriousness and candor, that the data presented are accurate and that the Institutional Presentation will fairly present the institution.

California State University, Los Angeles, has published and made publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission. Such policies will be available for review on request throughout the period of accreditation. Special attention will be paid to the institution's policies and recordkeeping regarding complaints and appeals.

California State University, Los Angeles, will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education procedural requirements.

California State University, Los Angeles, will submit all regularly required data, and data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of Accreditation.

California State University, Los Angeles, has reviewed its off-campus programs and distance education degree programs to ensure that they have been approved as required by the WASC Substantive Change process.

Signed by

James M. Rosser, President

12-10-08
Date

5151 State University Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90032-8500 (323) 343-3030 FAX: (323) 343-3039 www.calstatela.edu

The California State University: Bakersfield, Channel Islands, Chico, Dominguez Hills, East Bay, Fresno, Fullerton, Humboldt, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Maritime Academy, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, Stanislaus

APPENDIX F
WASC/ACSCU SUMMARY DATA TABLE

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles Year Founded: 1947
President/CEO: James M. Rosser Date Form completed:11/26/08
Calendar Plan: Semester X Quarter Trimester Other _____
Approved Degree-Granting Levels: Associate X Bachelors X Masters X Research Doctorate Professional Doctorate and other

Sponsorship and Control:
Independent
Independent, with affiliation
Religiously affiliated
X California State University
University of California
University of Hawaii
X Public
Proprietary

FOR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS:

Last Reported IPEDS Data for Enrollment by Ethnicity and Gender. Use IPEDS definitions for students.
IPEDS data reported as of (date) October 15, 2007

Table 1

Enrollment by Category	Total FTE of Students*	Total Headcount of Students	Non-Resident Alien Headcount	Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount	Am Indian/ Alaskan Native Headcount	Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount	Hispanic/ Latino Headcount	White/Non-Hispanic Headcount	Ethnicity Unknown Headcount	Total Male Headcount	Total Female Headcount
Undergraduate	13,540	16,046	928	1,327	69	3,152	7,265	1,656	1,649	6,258	9,788
Non-degree											
Total	13,540	16,046	928	1,327	69	3,152	7,265	1,656	1,649	6,258	9,788

* If institution has used a formula other than FTE = FT + (PT/3), please indicate how calculated FTE. FTE = FT + (PT x 0.403543)

WASC/ACSCU SUMMARY DATA FORM

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles

IPEDS Data for 6-Year Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

Please indicate if the data provided in tables below is for: freshmen only (use Table 2)
freshmen and transfer students combined (use Tables 2 *and* 3)

Table 2

Freshman Cohort Year (Entering Fall)	Overall Graduation Percentage	Non-Resident Alien Headcount		Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount		Am Indian/ Alaskan Native Headcount		Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount		Hispanic/ Latino Headcount		White/Non-Hispanic Headcount		Ethnicity Unknown Headcount		Total Male Headcount		Total Female Headcount	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1999	31.6%	12	3.0%	22	5.6%	0	0.0%	81	20.6%	226	57.4%	25	6.3%	28	7.1%	103	26.1%	291	73.9%
2000	34.4%	17	4.0%	19	4.5%	2	0.5%	102	23.9%	229	53.8%	26	6.1%	31	7.3%	121	28.4%	305	71.6%
2001	31.2%	12	3.0%	17	4.3%	1	0.3%	102	25.5%	202	50.5%	27	6.8%	39	9.8%	114	28.5%	286	71.5%
3-Year Averages:	32.4%	13.7	3.4%	19.3	4.8%	1.0	0.2%	95.0	23.4%	219.0	53.9%	26.0	6.4%	32.7	8.0%	112.7	27.7%	294.0	72.3%

If institution tracks freshman and transfer graduation rates separately please provide last 3 years data for 6-year cohort transfer graduation rate by ethnicity and gender:

Table 3

Transfer Cohort Year (Entering Fall)	Overall Graduation Percentage	Non-Resident Alien Headcount		Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount		Am Indian/ Alaskan Native Headcount		Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount		Hispanic/ Latino Headcount		White/Non-Hispanic Headcount		Ethnicity Unknown Headcount		Total Male Headcount		Total Female Headcount	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1999	61.6%	54	6.8%	61	7.6%	4	0.5%	156	19.5%	364	45.5%	96	12.0%	65	8.1%	313	39.1%	487	60.9%
2000	60.6%	67	8.7%	48	6.3%	2	0.3%	140	18.3%	345	45.0%	89	11.6%	75	9.8%	265	34.6%	501	65.4%
2001	56.4%	68	7.8%	52	6.0%	2	0.2%	172	19.7%	386	44.3%	105	12.1%	86	9.9%	287	33.0%	584	67.0%
3-Year Averages:	59.4%	63.0	7.8%	53.7	6.6%	2.7	0.3%	156.0	19.2%	365.0	44.9%	96.7	11.9%	75.3	9.3%	288.3	35.5%	524.0	64.5%

WASC/ACSCU SUMMARY DATA FORM

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles

FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS:

Last Reported IPEDS Data for Enrollment in each program level by Ethnicity and Gender. Use IPEDS definitions for students.

IPEDS data reported as of (date) October 15, 2007

Table 4

Enrollment by Category	Total FTE of Students*	Total Headcount of Students	Non-Resident Alien Headcount	Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount	Am Indian/ Alaskan Native Headcount	Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount	Hispanic/ Latino Headcount	White/Non-Hispanic Headcount	Ethnicity Unknown Headcount	Total Male Headcount	Total Female Headcount
Masters	3,155	5,005	544	312	21	844	1,643	994	647	1,747	3,258
Research Doctorate											
Professional (Masters & Doctorate)											
Total	3,155	5,005	544	312	21	844	1,643	994	647	1,747	3,258

* If institution has used a formula other than FTE = FT + (PT/3), please indicate how calculated FTE. FTE = FT + (PT x 0.361702)

IPEDS Data for 4-Year Cohort Graduation Rate, Last 3 Years, by Ethnicity and Gender:

Table 5

Graduate Cohort Year (Entering Fall)	Overall Graduation Percentage	Non-Resident Alien Headcount		Black, Non-Hispanic Headcount		Am Indian/ Alaskan Native Headcount		Asian / Pacific Islander Headcount		Hispanic/ Latino Headcount		White/Non-Hispanic Headcount		Ethnicity Unknown Headcount		Total Male Headcount		Total Female Headcount	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2001	42.8%	42	15.4%	21	7.7%	0	0.0%	41	15.0%	88	32.2%	47	17.2%	34	12.5%	80	29.3%	193	70.7%
2002	41.6%	47	20.3%	7	3.0%	0	0.0%	40	17.2%	73	31.5%	43	18.5%	22	9.5%	70	30.2%	162	69.8%
2003	47.7%	27	13.2%	14	6.8%	0	0.0%	31	15.1%	61	29.8%	51	24.9%	21	10.2%	59	28.8%	146	71.2%
3-Year Averages:	43.7%	38.7	16.3%	14.0	5.9%	0.0	0.0%	37.3	15.8%	74.0	31.3%	47.0	19.9%	25.7	10.8%	69.7	29.4%	167.0	70.6%

Current Faculty: **Total FTE** of faculty 795 as of November 1, 2007 (date)

Full-time faculty headcount: 579 % Non-Caucasian 44.2% % Male 54.2% % Female 45.8%

Part-time faculty headcount: 647 % Non-Caucasian 46.4% % Male 54.3% % Female 45.7%

FTE Student-to-FTE Faculty Ratio: 21 to 1

WASC/ACSCU SUMMARY DATA FORM

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles

Finances:

A. Annual Tuition Rate: Undergraduate Resident Tuition: $3,332 Undergraduate Non-Resident Tuition: $3,332 + ($226 x 36 units) = $11,468

Graduate Resident Tuition: $3,974 Graduate Non-Resident Tuition: $3,974 + ($226 x 27 units) = $10,076 **B. Total Annual Operating Budget:** $200,649,064

C. Percentage from tuition and fees: 34%

D. Operating deficit(s) for past 3 years: $0 (FY2008); $0 (FY2007); $0 (FY2006)

E. Current Accumulated Deficit: $0

F. Endowment: $0

Governing Board: A. Size: 51 B. Meeting a year: 6

Off-Campus Locations: A. Number: 0 B. Total Enrollment: 0

Distance Education Programs: (50% or more of program/degree requirements are offered via any technology-mediated delivery system):

A. Number: 0 B. Total Enrollment: 0