REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To
California State University, Los Angeles

October 6-8, 2010

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

William B.DeLauder, Team Chair
Les Kong, Assistant Team Chair
Renee Barnett Terry
Lawrence Coleman
Teresa Shaw
Elaine Sundberg
Keith Bell, WASC staff liaison

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page number

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit 3
B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: 5
Alignment with the Proposal
Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report
C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review 6
D. Format of this Report 8

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

Essay A: "Strategic Thinking and Planning for Enrollment and Resource Management" 9
Essay B: "Becoming a Teaching and Learning Community" 12
Essay C: "Supporting Student Learning" 17
Essay D: "Promoting Students in Reaching Their Goals" 25

SECTION III. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW 32

APPENDICES 35

Reports on off-campus and distance education programs

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) was founded in 1947 (known then as Los Angeles State College) by the California State Legislature to provide upper division and post baccalaureate degree programs. When the California Master Plan for Higher Education was passed by the Legislature in 1960, Los Angeles State College was renamed California State College at Los Angeles, and became a part of the California State College system. The California State College system then became The California State University and Colleges, and eventually, The California State University. California State College at Los Angeles received University status and henceforth is now known officially as California State University, Los Angeles. A modification of the master plan included research and public service as part of the mission for the California State University system in 1987. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) first accredited the institution in 1954 and subsequently re-accredited it in 1960, 1965, 1970, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1999. The WASC Commission endorsed the findings, commendations, and recommendations of the Capacity and Preparatory Review visiting team in 2009. The University is located on nearly 200 hilltop acres on the eastern edge of Los Angeles, adjacent to the western San Gabriel Valley cities of Alhambra and Monterey Park.

CSULA is a comprehensive university with six colleges (Arts and Letters; Business and Economics; Education; Engineering, Computer Science, and Technology; Health and Human Services; and Natural and Social Sciences). The University offers programs in more than fifty academic and professional fields, and degrees include bachelors, masters, joint doctorate, and doctorate, plus a variety of certificates and teaching, service, and specialist credentials. The academic calendar operates year-round and is organized into a quarter system. The institution

offers no full degree programs online. One degree program, the BA in Fire Protection, is considered a distance education program and reported as such to WASC. Members of the team met with the coordinator of this program, as well as the Chair of the Department of Technology. There are also three off campus locations for programs – one in Educational Administration (at the Pasadena Unified School District headquarters), and two in Nursing (at Cedars-Sinai Hospital, in Los Angeles and at the USC Hospital). No classes were offered at the USC Hospital site during the fall quarter. Members of the team visited the off campus program in Educational Administration in Pasadena. The report of that visit and the Distance Education Summary (for the fire protection program) are included in the appendices.

Admission is open to the upper thirty-three per cent of high school graduates. Ninety-six per cent of CSULA's 20,000+ students live in Los Angeles County with enrollment declining in direct proportion to the distance from the campus. The campus population is notable in its diverse ethnic composition. The majority of students are Latino (54.6%), followed by Asian (22.1%), White non-Latino (14.8%), African American (8.4%) and American Indian (0.1%). This reflects the population of the predominant CSULA service area. The gender mix of the student population is as follows: sixty-one per cent female, and thirty-nine per cent male.

The hospitality extended to the team by CSULA was most gracious and appreciated. The Team met with a broad cross-section of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students. The Team also held a telephone conference call with the Chancellor of the California State University System. The Team appreciated the candor, as well as the open and forthright manner in which comments were made in all of its interactions. The campus provided convenient and comfortable meeting rooms, as well as technical support to assist with the team's technology needs. The Team's requests for additional information during the visit were met with

alacrity. The President hosted a welcoming reception for the visiting team and the campus leadership on the first day of the visit.

B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report

In keeping with WASC policy on comprehensive reviews of accredited institutions, CSULA chose to prepare a self-study report that consisted of four thematic essays: **Strategic Thinking and Planning for Enrollment and Resource Management; Becoming a Teaching and Learning Community; Promoting Student Learning;** and **Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals** (the last essay consisted of four sections – **Measures of Student Success and Educational Effectiveness at CSULA; Effectiveness of Advisement in Helping Students Meet Their Goals; Effectiveness of Campus Support Services in Helping Students Meet Their Goals;** and **Faculty and Student Engagement in Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities).** While the Team reviewed each accreditation standard to insure compliance, the four thematic areas identified by CSULA were the focus of this visit. The Team noted and also found very useful the CSULA WASC Web site, the Appendices, as well as the active links to further data (available on an accompanying CD).

The Educational Effectiveness Report was written with clarity and rigor, and provided the institution with the opportunity to gain further understanding of its progress toward achieving its educational objectives through the alignment of its mission and strategic initiatives with institutional resources. The EER report was aligned with CSULA's proposal that provided the focus of the Educational Effectiveness Review. By posting the EER Report on the CSULA Web site, the report was readily available to the entire campus community. It was apparent to the

Team that the EER Review process was inclusive and involved many faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

The EER Report did respond to recommendations included in the Commission's action letter and the visiting team report of 2009. These are summarized below:

1. In order both to prepare for a successful EE Review, and for the long-term sustainability of institutional learning at CSULA, the Team recommends that the University prioritize assessment projects and work to better coordinate all of the various activities related to student success and learning on campus and develop a comprehensive approach to the dissemination of and response to data and reports. CSULA must also identify institutional learning objectives.

The University responded to this issue in its Essays A and B and the Team analyzed this response on pages 9 to 12 and pages 15 to 16 in this report.

2. The Team recommends that CSULA faculty and staff coordinate closely current efforts on academic assessment, retention, and enrollment management. These are all efforts directed towards student success. Especially as the enrollment management plan is finalized and measurable outcomes are established for it, and in preparation for the EER, the Team recommends that the CSULA community *link* academic assessment, retention, and enrollment management programs, as all are related to student success.

The University responded to this issue in Essays A and B, and the Team analyzed these responses on pages 9 to 12, and on pages 12 to 17, in this report.

3. Student support services, i.e., financial aid, admissions and records, appear to be ongoing challenges. The Team acknowledges that student support services were cited in CSULA's CPR Report as a priority for improvement. The Team recommends that CSULA continue efforts to review, evaluate, and improve student support services so that they can more effectively contribute to student satisfaction and success.

The University responded to this issue in its Essay C, and the Team analyzed this response on pages 17 to 24 in this report.

4. It was noted in the CPR Report and is acknowledged by campus constituents, especially students and faculty, that advisement continues to be a problem area. The Team recommends that CSULA develop and implement an effective comprehensive advisement system that is transparent, user-friendly, well coordinated and organized, accessible and timely, and consistent across all departments and colleges. Based on the feedback from students and meetings with various staff in academic advising areas, a comprehensive advising system with clear goals to achieve measurable outcomes with the highest quality of service to students is essential and necessary at CSULA.

The University responded to this issue in Essays B and C, and the Team analyzed these responses on pages 12 to 17, and on page 17 to 24 in this report.

5. CSULA has identified research, scholarship, and creative activity as essential activities that support students in the achievement of their academic goals, and has addressed this in Essay 2B of the CPR Report. It was apparent to the Team that there was strong faculty and administrative support for this as an important function, but it was also clear the University does not have procedures in place to measure and assess the impact of RSCA on student success. This will be necessary for the EE Review. The Team therefore recommends that CSULA develop and implement procedures that will enable it to assess the impact of RSCA on student learning and success.

The University responded to this issue in Essay D, and the Team analyzed this response on pages 32 to 34 in this report.

D. Format of this Report

This report begins with an overview and analysis of CSULA's four thematic essays. Following each section, suggestions are listed where appropriate. Following this section is an analysis of each of the four standards again followed by suggestions. Major recommendations for all sections conclude the body of the report and begin on page 35.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

Essay A: Strategic Thinking and Planning for Enrollment and Resource Management

In the time period between the Capacity and Preparatory Review and this current visit for the Educational Effectiveness Review, the financial situation for public higher education in California has continued to worsen. CSULA has been challenged to move ahead in an environment of declining state support, as well as growing demands from its students for educational resources and support. Two additional factors have impacted CSULA—the Provost and two academic deans have left since the CPR visit, and the California State University system began several initiatives that apply additional demands on the campus. In response to these challenges and the suggestions and recommendations in the CPR Report, the campus has increased its efforts in planning and resource management. In the first part of the Educational Effectiveness Report the University addresses the first two of the aforementioned major recommendations of the CPR Review.

In carrying out its review of the University's efforts in strategic thinking the review team met with a large number of campus leaders and groups. In addition to the President and his executive leadership team, the Team met with a number of faculty and administration committees and groups. Focusing on planning, these groups included the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the Graduation Initiative Team, the Academic Affairs Management Group (AAMG), the Educational Effectiveness Council and the Enrollment Management Steering Committee. In responding to the fiscal crisis, the President elected to rely on the work of the Executive Leadership Group and the Enrollment Management Steering Committee and its subgroups – The

Enrollment Management Planning Group (EMPG) and the Immediate Solutions Subcommittee rather than the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee (SPCC). Thus the SPCC has been inactive since November 2009. The President, however, indicated that he plans to reactivate the SPCC with the new Provost as the chair CFRs 1.3, 4.2, and 4.3). Additional planning is being carried out by a Graduation Initiative Team with a focus on responding to the challenge from the CSU Chancellor's Office to enhance the graduation rates of all CSULA students with a particular focus on underrepresented minority students. It should be pointed out that Enrollment Management at CSULA is not merely managing the number of student FTE's and headcount. Strategic Enrollment Management is seen as planning for student success as well as the academic program growth and the required resources (CFRs 1.2 and 1.3). According to leaders in this new discipline –

"Strategic enrollment management is a broader, more dynamic task that begins with an understanding of the world around us, anticipates changes, probes institutional mission and goals, modifying them if necessary, and coordinates campus-wide efforts in such areas as marketing, student recruitment and retention, tuition pricing, financial aid, academic and career counseling, and curriculum reform." (CFRs 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3)

With the severe budget issues that the campus has faced in the past two years, effective enrollment and resource management have become critical. The EER Report details these issues and the many actions that the campus has taken to respond. To its credit, CSULA has made great efforts to protect the academic core and to follow through with its commitment to increase assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness (CFRs 1.2, 1.3, and 2.6). For example, the Enrollment Management Steering Committee (EMSC) made the needed policy

recommendations regarding enrollment targets and maintenance of the student body profile. It then oversaw the implementation of decisions such as elimination of rolling admission, elimination of the state funded summer quarter, the implementation of campus impaction, and increased use of impaction at the academic program level (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3). The EMSC provided guidelines to the College Deans on such issues as: a) giving high priority to needed remedial courses, along with other courses for first year students (the required Introduction to Higher Education (IHE) course and first year courses in general education and the major); b) achieving appropriate balancing of courses in the major with courses in general education and graduate courses; c) increasing course enrollment caps; and d) eliminating courses with enrollments of less than 10 students.

The Enrollment Management group has served as a key point of contact and team building. Collaboration between the major leadership divisions at both the executive level and the line staff levels has been strong and many examples were presented of successful collaborations between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Student Affairs and Information Technology. Collaboration between Academic and Student Affairs and offices of Administration and Finance and Institutional Advancement have also been crucial in meeting the challenges facing CSULA. Academic Senate leadership pointed to the enrollment management group as an example of effective collaboration at CSULA (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3).

The Immediate Solutions Workgroup's purpose is "to seek immediate solutions to problems that impede student success and detract from the student experience. When issues are identified for which no immediate solutions are available, the workgroup makes recommendations for review of the issue or future solutions to the Steering Committee." Many of this group's successes

required minimal additional resources, while saving not only money but the time of faculty, staff, and students.

Another example of successful collaboration is the improvement to *GET* (*Golden Eagle Territory*), CSULA's online course enrollment management system. Through this system, students can manage their course enrollment. The creation of the Immediate Solutions Subcommittee to work on issues that could be addressed with a minimum of additional resources lead to many process improvements that not only saved resources, but reduced the stresses and strains on the students. Examples include phased registration and an online waiting list that allowed the campus to maximize the opportunity for students to get the classes they needed.

Another example of increased collaboration and "reduction of silos" was the planning for and execution of the self supported summer sessions. This was necessitated by the mandated decrease in state supported student FTE. It was reported to the visiting team that this transition was carried out with little complication and was fairly transparent to the students.

Essay B: Becoming a Teaching and Learning Community

In the evidence reviewed and in conversations with members of the campus community, the Team was impressed by the extent to which CSULA is becoming a teaching and learning community. The University has made particularly striking progress in the last eighteen months on student learning outcomes assessment and institutional improvement. The Team notes that there is widespread interest in and acceptance of the role and value of an institutional focus on educational effectiveness. The faculty and staff members the Team interviewed affirmed that people on campus are "looking for evidence" and considering the needs of CSULA students in

decision making and planning. Students reported that they are aware of the importance of learning objectives and cited examples of their role in course work, evaluation, and instruction (CFR 2.5). Overall, the Team sensed no cynicism around the goal of becoming a teaching and learning community. On the contrary, the Team observed much excitement about what has been accomplished and about using assessment to support long-standing commitments to *this* institution's improvement and *these* students' success.

The Team examined completed program reviews, annual assessment reports and responses, examples of program and course-level assessments, department materials and Web sites, poster presentations, and the University's assessment plans. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) have been identified for each program and are required for course syllabi (CFR 2.3). In addition, student support services and other offices including financial services and information technology are focused on quality improvement (CFR 2.11). In particular, CSULA has done much to regularize and facilitate the collection, dissemination and response to learning outcomes data. The structures, people, and processes are in place and functioning consistently (CFRs 2.3 and 2.10). The Team found that the University's revised program review guidelines, with the careful integration of outcomes assessment and use of annual reports, promises to serve as a firm foundation and ensure sustainable focus and improvement. The Team learned that there is consideration of integrating the updates on program review goals, which are currently required following completed reviews but not consistently submitted, into the annual assessment report. This would further concentrate efforts and facilitate regular consideration of evidence and improvement (CFR 2.7).

The Team notes that the revised program review process is fairly new, and that annual reports were collected across campus for the first time in 2010. The reports themselves, and the responses to the annual reports, make clear that while some programs are "developed or "highly developed" in their identification of learning outcomes, their methods for collecting data and assessing student *performance*, and their response to results, most programs are still "emerging" in at least one of these areas. In addition, the Team also notes that the assessment of graduate degree programs is unevenly integrated into the program review process. It appears that the resources for and interests regarding data collection and analysis vary greatly by college and program, and some faculty members reported that they feel a lack of training and competence in the kind of data analysis and study design that are necessary for high-level assessment. The Director of Program Review and the Assessment Coordinator offer support to faculty and organize opportunities to learn about assessment through brown bag lunches, presentations, and workshops, and the established committee structures ensure continuity. Nevertheless the Team suggests that the University consider additional strategies for advancing faculty skills in the assessment process, including faculty development, incentives for faculty leadership on assessment, and staff support. In addition, the University should continue to monitor carefully the progress, results, and impact of program review as well as the annual assessment reports, and respond accordingly (CFR 2.7).

The Institutional Research (IR) Office is viewed as a partner and resource at the broad institutional level as well as the program level. IR staff members serve on key committees and are at the table in decision-making. They also understand the impact of data and the importance of "turning data into information." The Team confirmed from several department chairs and deans that the IR office is responsive and also proactive. For example, new reporting tools have

been developed and made available, including *Data Mart*, which allows faculty members to run immediate reports on student enrollment and retention right from the IR Web site. The IR office serves in program review by supplying required reports with efficiency, consistency, and clarity. In addition, IR staff members contribute significantly to broader institutional learning and inquiry. For example, IR staff prepared a study, which the Team reviewed at the poster presentation, demonstrating the variables that relate to attrition and allowing a forecast of retention rates and an identification of factors (such as early participation in the *IHE* course) that improve retention and graduation. The Team suggests that the staffing levels of the IR office should be considered, in particular because its work will be critical to the success of the Graduation Initiative at CSULA and to the University's increasing emphasis on decision support (CFR 4.5).

The Graduation Initiative will challenge all of the University's energies and resources, and both academic programs and student support services. At the same time, many people on campus view the Initiative as an opportunity to pursue the fundamental goals of the University and to focus the University's assessment and quality improvement efforts appropriately on student success. One dean observed that the Graduation Initiative is *"the most important thing we are doing on the CSULA campus"*. The Team suggests that the University must focus its efforts—including its assessment tools, its resources, and its quality improvement programs—around retention and graduation for all students, including underrepresented students of color. With a current six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen at 33.1%, the task is significant. Transfer student retention is also a concern.

Over the past eighteen months, members of the CSULA community developed a set of institutional learning outcomes:

- Knowledge: Mastery of content and process of inquiry
- Proficiency: Intellectual skills
- Place and Community: Urban and global mission
- Transformation: Integrative learning

These outcomes seem to resonate broadly across campus, and could serve as an organizing framework, along with the Graduation Initiative, for prioritizing and coordinating assessment activities and disseminating data. Indeed, the CSULA Assessment Plan for 2010-2011, which is endorsed by the Educational Effectiveness Council, and which the Team reviewed, includes the goal of beginning to assess the outcome 3, "Place and Community: Urban and global mission," and to disseminate this information to the campus (CFR 2.3).

In addition, there are ongoing commitments to quality improvement based on inquiry and results in non-academic areas. This was discussed in Essay B of the EER Report, and the Team reviewed a summary of these efforts and met with representatives from several of these departments during the visit.

The Team **commends** CSULA for its efforts in the collection and dissemination of student outcomes data, to the aims of assessing and improving student success and graduation rates. CSULA, indeed, is to be commended for the progress it has made in the last couple of years regarding student learning and institutional improvement – and has made great strides in becoming a teaching and learning community. Based upon the Team's discussions with faculty

and students, it is clear that the faculty have demonstrated a deep and strong commitment to the students of CSULA (CFR 2.3 and 2.4).

Suggestion:

The team observes that there are already successful programs in place that can be applied more broadly (see pages 25 -26 of this report) and that the University has the tools at hand to identify additional strategies inside and outside the classroom to improve retention. While the University understands the numbers of students who leave as well as some of the factors that influence and predict persistence to degree (as noted above), it will be essential to focus further inquiry into student *achievement* and *performance*, in addition to other factors in student preparation and success (CFRs 2.7 and 2.10).

Essay C: Supporting Student Learning

CSULA has made substantial progress in establishing a culture of evidence in the following areas:

- The adoption of institutional, program, general education, and co-curricular student learning outcomes (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3);
- The implementation of plans and processes—including program review—to provide for assessment of student learning at all levels in both academic and co-curricular programs (CFRs 2.4, 2.5, and 2.7); and
- The dissemination of assessment data and use of evidence of student learning for program improvement (CFR 4.7).

During the visit, the Team met with a variety of constituents to discuss the progress of the university in meeting these laudable goals. Additionally, Team members reviewed information provided in the report, in appendices, and in materials supplied for review in the Team room.

Institutional Level Outcomes (ILOs)

One of the major recommendations from WASC following the CPR visit to CSULA was that the University move to create institutional learning outcomes (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 2.4). The EER Report describes the process by which these ILOs were developed, provides an overview of the ILOs, and describes the specific, measurable objectives for each outcome, as well as the tools to be utilized in assessing student attainment. In conversations with faculty and administrators there was universal approval of the process by which these ILOs were created, as well as a great deal of optimism regarding how the ILOs will provide a framework for institutional effectiveness. In several meetings with campus constituents, several individuals spoke about the potential transformative value of the ILOs in providing the CSULA community with a shared sense of its values and its unique sense of place and purpose.

However, since the ILOs were only recently developed and approved, much work remains in the following important areas:

- Communicating the ILOs to the entire campus community, including students, faculty, staff and the external community.
- Assessing the ILOs through the use of identified measures, including the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), capstone courses, and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

- Evaluating the data, providing feedback to campus constituencies, and making needed improvement to enhance educational effectiveness.
- Mapping of the ILOs to college, program and general education SLOs. Further discussion regarding the value of alignment of ILOs to SLOs needs to be undertaken.

Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes

Clearly, CSULA has made great strides in the development of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for all academic programs (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4). Through perusal of the University's Web sites, through analysis of Table 7.1, and through discussions with faculty and administrators, there is ample evidence that academic programs/departments have all developed SLOs for their major programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. CSULA has developed an in-house rubric to evaluate departments regarding assessment, and virtually 100% rank in the "fully developed stage" with regard to having outcomes that are defined, specific, and assessable.

The University has recently revised and modified their Program Review policy CFR 2.7). This policy now requires programs to create and publish SLOs, have a continuous and sustainable assessment plan, gather evidence that the SLOs are being achieved, and make curricular changes based on that evidence. Clearly, CSULA has done important work in developing a robust program review plan and is providing programs with materials and guidance in developing their self-studies. The Program Review Subcommittee is charged with providing a report on each program at the end of each programs' review cycle. In interviews with faculty members, there was strong support of the new process. However, few departments have engaged yet in this process since the new guidelines were only approved in AY 2008-2009. There is still little

evidence that programs have “closed the loop” described above: assessment, analysis, feedback, and change (CFR 4.7).

To ensure that assessment remains continuous and dynamic, CSULA has also recently implemented an annual assessment report as a part of Program Review. Programs began submitting annual reports in Fall 2009. Those programs that responded (approximately 85%) provided information about which SLOs had been assessed, through what measures, and what results were achieved. The report also provides information on how these results were disseminated to faculty for discussion and whether changes were implemented as a result of the assessment, thereby “closing the loop” on educational effectiveness. While the EER Report indicates high percentages of programs using direct assessment (89% overall means), percentages drop in the categories of reporting results (78%) and making changes to programs (77%). Also, a review of the actual assessment reports and the follow-up review of these reports by the office of the faculty assessment coordinator, reveals unevenness in the rigor of the assessments, in the level of engagement of faculty with the results, and in actual change resulting from deep engagement with the issues by faculty. Eighteen programs failed to submit reports, and a perusal of reports revealed that some lacked sufficient information to determine whether assessments were conducted or whether the results were analyzed, discussed, or lead to program improvement. For each report, the University’s faculty assessment coordinator provided detailed feedback to all departments and specific recommendations on how to improve assessment efforts. This kind of feedback provides invaluable support and bodes well for quality improvement of the assessment processes at the program level. This detailed analysis, while time consuming, should be continued to help foster a deeper understanding of assessment and its value in program improvement and student learning (CFRs 2.4, and 4.7). With only one year of

annual assessment report data available, it is difficult to determine how programs are closing the loop on student learning and educational effectiveness, although there are some examples that the team discovered.

Members of the Team met with selected departments to discuss program review and assessment of student learning. Department representatives were asked if they could provide a specific example of an assessment tool that has been implemented and to discuss how the results were disseminated and used to make some change in the program. It was heartening to note that each department was able to respond to this request. Examples included:

- The Department of Computer Science administered a standardized post-test to students and discovered that students had very low scores on one of the program learning outcomes. Faculty members discussed this finding, determined what needed to be modified in the course, and made those changes through the curriculum course change process. After implementing this curricular change, students made substantial gains (20 points on a 100 point scale) in achieving mastery of the learning outcome.
- The Department of English performed an analysis of remedial English students' success rates in freshman composition. Results revealed that students who completed remedial English courses had a higher success rate in the freshman composition course than students who went directly into freshman composition. As a result of this analysis, the English Department has developed a pilot "stretch program," in English composition, which is being implemented in Fall 2010. Further assessment of this model will provide the department with data to determine whether to revise the remedial English program and to implement "stretch" for all first year remedial students.

These are powerful examples of the value of assessment to provide faculty with data to support curricular changes that affect student learning and educational effectiveness.

Faculty members at various meetings with the Team expressed the needs for additional "technical" assistance, that is, individuals (including the University Assessment Coordinator) who can provide needed expertise in how to develop rigorous, appropriate assessment instruments, how to analyze information and data gathered, and then how to turn these results into effective educational strategies for improvement of student learning. Other faculty commented on the need for additional technology support (e-portfolio systems, assessment management tools) for assessment efforts. Finally, the Team noted the need for additional faculty development in on-going workshops on developing assessment tools, such as rubrics, to assist in the development of robust, direct assessment techniques.

The Team concurs with the EER Report's conclusion on assessment: *"While the types of data and the regularity with which the data are collected, analyzed, and used to inform instruction are not uniform, substantial progress has been made in recent years to institutionalize a culture of assessment."* The team saw ample evidence of a commitment to a culture of assessment, but also saw irregular and uneven implementation of direct assessment strategies. Many programs continue to rely on self-report survey data and on grades and pass rates. Programs need to deepen their commitment to direct assessment and improve their expertise in this area in order to support improvement in student learning CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.9).

General Education Student Learning Outcomes

As the EER Report indicates, CSULA has defined eight General Education Learning Goals and mapped these outcomes to the current GE program blocks (CFR 2.3). The report also states that "discussions about revising General Education at CSULA have been ongoing now over the past few years." These discussions were prompted in part by the 2007 program review of GE and by the CSU system's adoption of the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Liberal Education for America's Promise (LEAP) project learning outcomes, which provide an overarching set of interdisciplinary outcomes of a liberal arts education. Additionally, an assessment plan for GE was developed in 2001, which the EER Report describes as both an "overly ambitious and comprehensive multi-year assessment plan." In 2006, CSULA conducted a review of Block B courses, utilizing indirect and direct assessment. Prior to that, five studies, including two pilot assessments were also conducted between 2000 and 2003. Two recent pilot assessments (one on baseline data on writing skills in the Upper Division Thematic Block, and the other a survey of student perceptions of progress in achieving learning outcomes in the lower division blocks) have also been undertaken.

Team members met with representatives of the GE Steering Committee, charged with the work of revising General Education and implementing assessment. According to GE representatives, the President has asked the revision of GE be delayed, in part because of a change in academic leadership with the recent hiring of a new Provost. Additionally, the potential conversion from quarter to semester structure has been delayed, which would have a substantial impact on any new GE program. However, the GE Steering Committee has held several "conversations" with faculty regarding the potential revision of GE. According to the faculty members interviewed, there is near unanimous agreement that GE needs to be fully reformed. Instead of a kind of

"cafeteria menu" model, most faculty favor a more integrative model, utilizing the LEAP outcomes as a basis for reform.

While GE reform efforts appear to be "on hold," it is important for the University to continue the work of cohesive, systematic and comprehensive assessment of general education. The data collected through this assessment will prove invaluable in supporting the reform effort and providing guidance on the structure of a new GE program that will meet the ILOs of the University (CFRs 2.7, and 4.7).

CSULA has clearly embraced a culture of evidence and seeks to become a fully engaged teaching and learning community. The establishment of ILOs and SLOs at both the program and GE level has been accomplished. Assessment plans have been promulgated, and assessment activities are being conducted. However, evidence of utilization of assessment results, both in the annual assessment reports and in the early stages of the program review process, remains uneven and needs to be deepened throughout the university. Because of this, the University has yet to demonstrate sustained and ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning although commitment to these goals remains high (CFR 4.7).

The Team **commends** CSULA on the process by which it has engaged the entire campus community to develop Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), which are reflective of the unique mission of the University. Moreover, the process by which CSULA established ILOs was inclusive, comprehensive, and transparent.

ESSAY D: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals

Section 1: Measures of Student Success and Educational Effectiveness at CSULA

CSULA has responded to the CPR Report recommendations on educational effectiveness through its evidence of student success and its effectiveness in helping students to reach their academic goals. CSULA has identified and tracked indicators to improve educational effectiveness and student success using a comparison of its freshman and transfer retention and graduation rates to peer institutions, measurable variables which impact CSULA students, and campus interventions and initiatives which have been implemented with a record of positive impact on student success (CFR 2.10). Graduation rates at CSULA, however, remain relatively low for freshmen and underrepresented minorities (URM). Although CSULA's six-year graduation rate for first time freshmen improved slightly from 1997 (27.6%) to 2007 (31%), the average graduation rate for freshmen in 2007 has not changed significantly compared to its peer institutions (33%), the national average (53%), and its CSU system average (49%), respectively. Furthermore, the four-year graduation rate for transfer students at CSULA (55.7%) is lower than their counterparts at peer institutions. Transfer students represent 50% of new students entering CSULA and the qualitative student experience of transfer students at CSULA is reported as significantly lower than the freshmen experience.

The Office of Institutional Research presented a poster session on a well-developed retention model for freshmen that can be used to significantly improve student success and graduation rates given the background, demographics and characteristics of CSULA freshmen. CSULA can apply similar efforts to its work with transfer students in achieving improved student experiences and educational outcomes for its transfer student population. Additionally, the Graduation Initiative mandated by the CSU system has provided the framework for the campus to improve

its graduation rates and reach its targeted goal of 44% (freshmen) and 57% (transfer students) by 2016, coupled with a new Student Success Council (a subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Steering Committee) which has been created to work across units in achieving student success and educational effectiveness.

Successful programs and interventions at CSULA that have demonstrated success in student retention include the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and its Summer Bridge program which serves underrepresented, first-generation, and low income students; the Learning Communities Program, particularly established for high-risk students; the Transition to CSULA higher education course; and the University Writing and Tutorial Centers.

Suggestion:

CSULA should consider expanding programs such as Summer Bridge and EOP efforts, Learning Communities, and the Writing and Tutorial programs, as well as mandating the *IHE* course for all new students and strengthening course content and quality of the course across colleges, to further support student success and learning outside of the classroom, particularly for underrepresented student populations and both freshmen and transfer student populations. CSULA should consider mapping the student experience for both freshmen and transfer students to effective educational outcomes to ensure student attainment of educational goals. Such efforts should yield significant improvements in retention, graduation, student success and educational effectiveness at CSULA (CFRs 2.2, 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14).

Section 2A: Effectiveness of Advisement in Helping Students Meet Their Goals

CSULA has taken significant steps in improving the effectiveness of academic advising on the campus and such improvements have been noted by both first year students and seniors in surveys (NSSE 2009) (CFR 2.12). Major changes guided by the *Report of the ad hoc Task Force to Address Critical Issues Related to Academic Advising* (2005) include: the establishment of a central University Academic Advisement Center (UAAC), responsible for advising in General Education requirements and advising of students with undeclared majors; policies and processes on academic University requirements and academic progress; workshops for students; and training for faculty and staff. Student learning in advising is a focus of the UAAC, and the center has adopted an advisement syllabus, which is recommended by the National Association of College Academic Advising. The Academic Advisement Subcommittee (of the Academic Senate) has made progress in addressing academic processes, and advising at the University level contributing to improved educational effectiveness. Surveys of students using the UAAC reflect positive satisfaction and effectiveness with academic advising through the UAAC, and corroborated by students attending the Open Forum during the EER visit. Further assessment using CAS standards have been initiated by the UAAC to inform improvements and its plans to increase educational effectiveness in advising at CSULA.

College and program based advisement remains an issue for many departments across colleges and advising at these levels has not risen to the same level of success and satisfaction as that provided by the UAAC. Although the College of Natural and Social Sciences has undertaken measures to improve its advising system through the use of new models of delivery and assessment, and the adoption of UAAC best practices, and the College of Health and Human Services has addressed issues related to impaction in their largest majors; the coordination and

quality of consistency in advising at the College and program levels remain deficient and improvement warranted.

The Academic Affairs Management Group (AAMG) and its workgroup/subcommittee has proposed a new model for the delivery of academic advising at CSULA -- *CSULA Integrated Academic Advisement: A Proposal and Strategic Plan* – which will significantly improve educational effectiveness and attainment of goals in advising established by CSULA and contribute to both student satisfaction and retention.

The Team **commends** CSULA for its comprehensive study and in-depth review of academic advising. The proposed model has the potential for transforming the culture of advisement on the campus and yield significant improvements to student success and student satisfaction for all students.

Section 2B: Effectiveness of Campus Support Services in Helping Students Meet Their Goals

CSULA has made improvements to student support service areas, primarily in the Financial Aid, Records, and Registrar units, and Student Affairs initiated a customer service program for its division to address quality improvements to key student support services areas (CFR 2.13, and 2.14). Through the use of focus groups, participation in a WASC Assessment Workshop, and plans to improve processes using new software programs and technology; CSULA will use new assessment measures linking student learning to administrative process improvements with the goal of two-thirds of CSULA students reporting satisfaction with administrative services on the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS). During the Open Forum for students, several individuals voiced complaints and dissatisfaction with Financial Aid, Records, and the Registrar's Office regarding poor customer service, disorganization (lost paperwork,

bureaucracy), inconsistent practices, and lack of individual student care and attention by staff in the key student support service areas. As part of the CSU Graduation Initiative, CSULA plans to address its goals of significant improvement and satisfaction of student services.

Section 3: Faculty and Student Engagement in Research, Scholarly and Creative Activities

In its CPR Self Study Report, CSULA chose faculty and student engagement in research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA) as a major theme. This important component of a university is also highlighted in the campus Strategic Plan and during the CPR visit the Team found that "RSCA is clearly articulated in the campus mission statement and is well integrated into the campus ethos and culture (CFR 1.1). The campus appears committed to the value of RSCA to both the graduate and undergraduate learning outcomes." While the CPR Team found a strong commitment to RSCA, there was a significant lack of any quantitative data on the participation of students in RSCA. In addition there was a lack of assessment or assessment tools to measure the impact of RSCA on student success and learning. Several recommendations were made to the campus in the CPR Report that called for the creation of a robust system of data gathering and assessment of RCSA and its impacts on student retention, learning and success.

Team members reviewed the EER self study report (in particular Essay D, section 3), and additional campus documents, (in particular a white paper, as well as a poster presentation entitled *"Assessing College Student Participation and Learning in High Impact Research Experiences"* authored by an education professor and graduate researcher).

The Team met with a campus group that included the Dean of Extended Education and Research, the Director of the Office of Research and Development, and a number of faculty who are exemplars in engaging students in RSCA. This group included faculty from the humanities and social sciences, as well as the sciences and engineering. The examples of student scholarship presented at that meeting and highlighted in campus documents were truly impressive.

The level of faculty enthusiasm and commitment to engaging students in RSCA remains high. There is a firm belief that participating in scholarship leads to significant student learning, and that through involvement in RSCA and faculty mentorship, student retention, learning and success are all enhanced. Much anecdotal data and examples have been collected. A number of academic programs and majors include RSCA as a requirement for the degree and many departments make significant efforts to highlight student RSCA both on campus and within their disciplines at a state or national level.

However, the University has not established the type of data collection that would allow for the assessment of the impacts of student RSCA on retention, learning or graduation rates. With all of the complex factors that contribute to student learning in a faculty mentored RSCA experience such quantitative correlations of RSCA on student retention, learning, and success would be difficult to establish. However, the campus needs to agree on what RSCA is, and to build assessment tools to provide for institutional learning on what works and what does not (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, and 4.5).

The CPR Visiting Team Report contained a number of suggestions to the University to enhance the ability to make student engagement in RSCA a key component of student learning and

success -- unfortunately in the 18 months between the Capacity Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review, the campus was unable to follow up on these suggestions.

SECTION III. MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

Following consideration of all elements related to this Educational Effectiveness Review, the Visiting Team makes the following recommendations:

1. That CSULA use the mechanisms that it has put into place, and the collaborative structures and efforts between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to continue to work on improving retention rates of all students, particularly of underrepresented minorities (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3).

2. That CSULA move forward with a comprehensive plan to improve the retention and graduation rates of the entire student body with particular attention to underrepresented minority students (CFRs 3.8, 4.1, and 4.3). The challenge of the Graduation Initiative appears to be an appropriate impetus and vehicle to address this.

3. That the Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee be reactivated to provide leadership and oversee the implementation of the University's Strategic Plan (CFRs 1.3 and 3.8).

4. That the coordination and prioritization of the assessment of institutional learning is a necessity, and that perhaps an organization, such as the Educational Effectiveness Council should be considered to take the lead role in doing this. The team further recommends that CSULA implement the assessment plan for the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs), analyze the data, and use the results to improve institutional effectiveness (CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7).

5. That allocation of the necessary resources to implement effective assessment efforts in all curricular programs at CSULA should be given high priority by Academic Affairs (CFRs 4.2, 4.5, and 4.6).

6. That CSULA more broadly implement the initiatives and interventions that positively impact the success of students (already identified in its EER Report as effective in supporting student success), for all new freshmen and transfer students (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14).

7. That CSULA consider adopting and institutionalizing the proposal by the Academic Affairs Management Group—Working Group on Academic Advisement in the Major, *CSULA Integrated Academic Advisement: A Proposal and Strategic Plan*, as a new model for academic advisement at CSULA (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, and 2.14).

8. That CSULA continue to make significant progress in improving and enhancing student support service areas, such as Financial Aid, Records, the Registrar's Office, Cashiers, and other student service offices; using informed measures and user-specific feedback to minimize bureaucracy, streamline administrative processes and procedures, and provide exemplary customer service to students with the goal of improvement in student satisfaction with campus support services (CFRs 1.7, 1.8, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, and 2.14).

9. That CSULA work to create a common understanding of what constitutes Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities (RSCA) across the disciplines, gather data on RSCA activities across the campus, develop tools to analyze that data and assess the impacts of

RSCA on student success, and use those analyses to increase the value of RSCA in student success, retention and graduation rates (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 2.8, 2.9, 4.3, and 4.5).

APPENDICES

OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

1. INSTITUTION:

   California State University, Los Angeles

2. SITE LOCATION (include physical address):

   Pasadena Unified School District
   Administrative Office
   351 S. Hudson Avenue
   Pasadena, CA 91101

3. TEAM MEMBER(S)/REVIEWER(S):

   William DeLauder, President Emeritus, Delaware State University
   Elaine Sundberg, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Programs, Sonoma State University

4. CONTEXT (for example, number of programs offered at site, degree levels offered at site, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition)

   The off-campus site visit was to the Pasadena Unified School District Administrative Offices where a cohort of 15-20 students are enrolled in the Tier 1 Administrative Credential/MA in Educational Administration program. The program is a single cohort model with 5 quarters of instruction. At the end of the program students receive both the Tier 1 Administrative Credential and the MA in Educational Administration from CSULA. All participants are teachers in either the Pasadena Unified School District or the LA Unified School District. Generally, students take two courses per quarter with faculty from the CSULA main campus. In the current quarters, students are taking a course on-site and one on the main campus of CSULA.

5. DATE VISITED and LENGTH OF VISIT:

   October 7, 2010 -- The visit was approximately one hour.

6. VISITED IN CONJUNCTION WITH (check all that apply):

   Educational Effectiveness Review Visit to CSULA

7. DESCRIPTION OF ON SITE INTERACTIONS (with whom did reviewers speak, in what contexts?):

   The reviewers met with Dr. Lori Kim, Professor of Education, Dr. Andrea Maxie, Associate Dean of the Charter College of Education and the cohort of 12 students. The students were in the second week of instruction in a new cohort of Tier 1 MA in Educational Administration students.

8. OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED (prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit): N/A

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	**Observations and Findings**	**Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.**
Quality of the Learning Site. Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)	Yes. The CSULA Program has a dedicated classroom at the Administrative Offices of the Pasadena Unified School District. The School District provides technology services (computers, printers, etc.) and covers the cost of infrastructure needs. The classroom is set up for seminar style discussion.	
Student Support Services. What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)	Students were very positive about access to advisement and counseling both in person and via email. Students expressed that they were very well advised as to course work and the registration processes. In fact, students commented that the faculty were extremely helpful in the application and admissions process. Students have full access to computing services, library collections, and other student services at the CSULA campus.	
Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution. How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)	Students currently take one course at the campus. However, as working professionals there primary interest is in accessing the curriculum of the university at the convenient off-campus site. Students expressed the opinion that if the program were only offered on campus, they would probably not have been able to enroll. The accessibility of the off-campus site was a primary factor in encouraging students to pursue the MA.	
	Students were aware of the accreditation process, indicated that clear outcomes and assessment were embedded into the curriculum and confirmed the educational effectiveness of the program. One student commented that his interest in the program was a result of two colleagues who had successfully earned the MA through the same cohort program.	

Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to off-campus activities. In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to activities at this site? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)		
Context of this site in the broader institution. How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)	The program is consistent with the mission of CSULA and the Charter College of Education to serve the regional needs of the greater San Gabriel Valley and in providing professional degree programs to educators.	
Educational Effectiveness Preparedness. How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)	The Charter College of Education has a highly developed assessment and educational effectiveness process embedded into all of their degree programs. The off-site program is subject to the same assessment and review as the on-campus programs.	

Additional Findings, Observations or Comments. Please provide any other information that you believe it is pertinent to note. Also, if any of the boxes above are checked, elaborate here. Finally, please include any recommendations you might have for subsequent team members/reviewers concerning this site.

The reviewers were impressed with the enthusiasm and thoughtful comments made by the students at the off-site program. Students particularly praised the responsiveness of the Charter College of Education to their concerns and issues and particularly noted that Dr. Kim was extremely responsive and accessible to the students. The current program is smaller than previous cohorts (i.e., 15 students), while past cohorts have numbered between 20-25. In conversation with Dr. Andrea Maxie, she indicated that attrition in each cohort has averaged approximately 3-5 students. There is some concern that the small size of the cohort could affect the future viability of offering the offsite program. The reviewers saw no specific issues regarding the site, accessibility, or the curricular offerings.

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

Institution: California State University, Los Angeles

Team Member(s)/Reviewer(s): Les Kong, Coordinator of Library Media Services, California State University, San Bernardino; and Lawrence Coleman, Professor of Physics, University of California, Davis

Dates distance education materials were viewed: October 5-7, 2010

Viewed in conjunction with (check all that apply):

- ❑ CPR
- X EER
- ❑ Special Visit
- ❑ Substantive Change review
- ❑ Other (please explain): _____

Context—For example, number of programs offered via distance education, degree levels offered via distance education, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition; average class size: **There are no full degree programs offered online. One program, the B.S. Degree in Fire Protection Administration and Technology, is considered a distance education program, and reported as such to WASC. Information for FTE enrollment or average class size was not obtained. The total number of students in the Fire Protection program is 123. In this program, only three courses are fully online.**

Description of distance education interactions—What was viewed, description of formats, other details to help describe nature and context of the review: **Listing of courses in the curriculum for the B.S. Degree in Fire Protection Administration and Technology; course syllabi; student workbooks; sample student learning outcomes assessment report; Students Learning Outcome and Assessment Plan; course assessment tools; rubrics for grading short essay questions; and sample assignments and quizzes.**

Other materials reviewed or persons interviewed concerning distance education—Prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit: **The President, the Director of eLearning Programs and Support, a professor of Technology, a professor of Education, the Director of Faculty Development, the professor and Coordinator of the Fire Protection Administration program, and the professor and Chair of the Department of Technology.**

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	**Observations and Findings**	**Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.**
Quality of the Learning Infrastructure. Is the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)	**The institution has been participating in a CSU system initiative to transition from the Blackboard learning management system (LMS) to an open source platform, such as Moodle. Apparently, a decision point to do so will occur sometime in the year 2012, due to licensing and major fee increases occurring at that time. The LMS, Blackboard, is viewed by some as being relatively inflexible in its practices and procedures – this combined with its high costs to the campus, have caused the University to consider other less expensive, and more user-friendly alternatives.**	
Student Support Services. What is the institution's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other student services appropriate to the modalities of delivery? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)	**The coordinator of the program indicated that most of the enrolled students are in the 18-20 year age range, and are, for the most part technologically adept. The institution does provide Help Desk services, however, the program's students do not avail themselves of these services. Library resources are available through its Web site, as students, once authenticated, can remotely access all electronic resources, as well as obtain journal articles and books not held by the John F. Kennedy Library. Faculty also have the capability to provide links to electronic library resources through Blackboard.**	
Connection of Faculty to the Institution. In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)	**No distinction is made between distance education and traditional, on-ground faculty. The institution, through its eLearning Programs and Support unit, "supports faculty in the application of appropriate pedagogical and computer-based educational technologies, including tools for both classroom and distance learning." The institution's Faculty Development Center also provides workshops, presentations, brown bag lunch sessions, and other resources to assist faculty in pedagogical support.**	

Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to distance learning activities. In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to distance learning activities? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)	**As discussed in the previous section, CSULA continues to enhance educational effectiveness with its ongoing development of the eLearning Programs and Support unit. Additionally, its Faculty Development Center provides pedagogical support to faculty updating them with the latest technological resources so as to enhance teaching effectiveness.**	
Context of distance learning to the broader institution. How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)	**The institution appears to be in the early stages of development as it concerns its distance learning programs. It has taken a measured and cautious approach towards distance learning in light of resource issues, strategic priorities, and its mission. The BS in Fire Protection Administration program was one of the first degrees delivering courses using the then fledgling Instructional Television Fixed Satellite (ITFS) technology in the 1970s. Enrollment in this program is heavily concentrated geographically in Southern California, with numerous remote sites (typically situated in firehouses or fire station facilities). The nature of the program, combined with the demographics and geographic dispersion of the student population, are a good fit for the distance learning modality. Most of the courses are delivered using the WebCT platform, and are hybrid in nature. Currently, three of the courses are fully online.**	
Educational Effectiveness Preparedness. How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness for distance learners? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning in distance learning courses and programs? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)	**Two syllabi with student workbooks (and accompanying CDs), sample quizzes, sample assignments, and sample SLOs, were examined relative to the Fire Protection program. Educational effectiveness is primarily measured in this program by assessing students' performance on quizzes and assignments. With distance learning in its early stages here, CSULA has yet to develop rigorous analysis systems to measure students' learning and teaching effectiveness. The institution is encouraged to consider developing these systems as it grows its distance learning programs.**	
Verification of Student Identity. What procedures does the institution have in place to ensure that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit? Does the institution make clear in writing that these processes protect student privacy and notify students at the time of registration or enrollment of any projected additional costs associated with the verification procedures? (CFRs 1.7, 1.8)	**The institution has identified a network of individuals (both in Northern and Southern California) who serve as proctors at local firehouses and fire stations to ensure and verify student identities in the taking of examinations, and other course participation in the program.**	

Additional Findings, Observations or Comments. Please provide any other information that you believe is pertinent to note. Also, if any of the boxes above are checked, elaborate here. Finally, please include any recommendations you might have for subsequent team members/reviewers concerning distance education courses and programs.