Final 10/2006

California State University, Los Angeles
WASC Institutional Proposal

Institutional Context

California State University, Los Angeles is a comprehensive university that offers a broad range of liberal arts and professional programs. An urban campus which was founded in 1947, California State University (CSULA) is located at the juncture of two freeways and within sight of downtown Los Angeles. The university is arranged into six colleges housing 50 academic departments and divisions, offering bachelor's degrees in 52 subjects, master's degrees in 47, certificates in 24 specialized program areas, and a joint doctorate program with UCLA. This count includes distance and on-line programs.

CSULA serves a diverse, urban population of students as reflected in the mission summarized in the university's strategic plan.

The mission of California State University, Los Angeles 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. Students will leave this community ready to contribute productively and responsibly to the global society.

CSULA serves one of the most ethnically, linguistically, and socio-economically diverse populations in the nation. One-third of the 2005 entering freshmen have parents who lack a high school diploma (37%), and more than half the entering freshmen (59%) are first-generation college students. The current enrollment of 20,034 students is composed of approximately 51% Latino students, 25% Asian/Pacific Islander students, 9% African-American students, less than 1% American Indian students and 15% white, non-Latino students. The average undergraduate age is 25, and the average graduate student age is 33. Females make up 62% of the student population. The university educates a large number of students for whom English is a second language. More than half (52%) of the 2005 entering freshmen learned English as a second language. The majority of students attending CSULA have graduated from large, urban high schools in the Los Angeles area. Many students enter the University with relatively low English and math skills, prompting the campus to have one of the system's lowest percentages of students who are proficient in math and English at entrance. In addition, CSULA's six-year freshman graduation rate is 34%_, one of the lowest in the CSU system. From 1997 to 2003, CSULA increased its 6 year graduation rate by 6.3%.

In fall 2005, 76% of CSULA's freshmen were not proficient in English and 65% were not proficient in math. The university's students come from families that struggle financially. Seventy-four percent of student households have average incomes less than $36,000, compared with 41% system-wide. In 2005, almost three-fourths of the full-time entering freshmen (71%) received need-based financial aid.

There continue to be changes to the campus, with new buildings under construction and with the utility and technology infrastructure being strengthened and upgraded. Access to campus has been enhanced by remodeled transit and welcome centers located near the entries to campus. The Music and the Engineering and Technology buildings underwent significant remodeling. Three buildings are currently under construction. Scheduled for completion in spring 2007, the Los Angeles Regional Crime Laboratory is a partnership of the State of California, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, the Los Angeles Police Department, and the university: it is a model of public-public partnerships. Wing "A" of the new Integrated Science Complex will house the laboratories of a number of science-focused majors, with an additional wing planned for construction in the near future. The Student Union was demolished to make way for a seismically sound new structure that is now under construction. Among the major projects constructed since the last WASC visit are the Golden Eagle building, which houses campus food services, meeting facilities, the bookstore, Extended Education, Grants and Contracts, and other offices the Hydrogen Refueling Facility, the Intimate Theater of the Luckman Fine Arts

Complex, the Parking and Transportation Services structure, and a new Tennis Complex.

Faculty, staff, and administration continue to support the university's goals of excellence and access for students. Administrative leadership is sustained by Dr. James M. Rosser, who has just completed his 27th year as University President. A number of other leadership positions have changed including two vice presidents, seven deans and the University Librarian. Faculty members are nationally recognized for excellence in research, scholarly and creative activities, mentoring, and teaching. The university scores highly among CSU campuses in the amount of extramural grants and contracts funding raised annually per full-time faculty member, with more than $30 million in grants and contracts generated in 2005-06. CSULA professors have been acknowledged at the system, state, and national levels as outstanding professors, including the 2005 CASE/Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching "Outstanding Masters' University and College Professor." Of the 581 full-time faculty, 56% are male; the ethnic makeup is 22% Latino, 6% African-American, 22% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 43% white. The corresponding figures for temporary faculty (part-time) are 53% male and 14% Latino, 6% African-American, 14% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 59% white. Excellence in teaching and learning is a primary focus of the university, with teaching being the most important of the three criteria for faculty retention, promotion and tenure.

Responses to the Last WASC Re-accreditation

The WASC Commission's letter reaffirming accreditation, following the 1999 comprehensive review, noted issues in four areas: Educational Effectiveness, Technology in the Instructional Environment, Student Satisfaction, and Strategic Planning. The University continues to move towards greater effectiveness in the areas that were identified.

Educational Effectiveness

WASC recommended that the campus complete its plans to assess learning outcomes acquired through each academic major, the general education program, co-curriculum, and technology. The campus continues to learn more about the assessment of student learning outcomes, with many assessment activities taking place since 1999. CSULA made substantial improvements in developing common assessment language and is becoming more systematic in the application of assessment measures. The campus reports annually to the CSU on advances made in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and on the progress of programmatic assessment made by the major degree programs going through program review each year. Two faculty coordinators are appointed annually to guide and assist in the assessment of learning outcomes, one for major degree programs and the other for general education. Efforts continue to refine assessment measures that accurately reflect educational success in a student population that is quite different from the traditional college student population (with significant work-related and personal commitments), and to assist students in achieving the educational goals set by the students and the university.

The campus disseminates information about assessment through student learning outcomes assessment websites for academic programs and general education. Assessment activities are stimulated through annual assessment mini-grant competitions for programs, 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 degrees. The campus continues to explore the best committee structures and systems for supporting teaching and learning, including assessment of student learning outcomes. A reorganization of academic senate committees redirected the responsibilities for student learning outcomes assessment to the Education Policy Committee (EPC). After the campus identified a need for greater discussion and dialogue, a new faculty forum has been created. The new Educational Effectiveness Council (EEC) will focus on the development of a higher level of engagement and expertise in the assessment of learning outcomes and in the achievement of educational excellence.

The last WASC visit suggested examination of the general education program, as it forms the

foundation for all majors. Specific general education assessment activities began immediately after the WASC review. A General Education Assessment Plan was developed by a special faculty task force over a two-year period, and academic governance committees approved the plan in 2001. Within this plan, goals and objectives for the general education program were developed, assessment measures identified, and a timeline for implementation set forth. Assessment showed that students who had completed the GE critical thinking course improved their scores on the California Critical Thinking Skills Test when their scores were compared to those of a control group. A portfolio review of student papers from a required English composition course confirmed the course's general effectiveness, but also revealed a need for a greater emphasis on sentence-level and editing skills. An embedded assessment in a lower division GE biology class disclosed that over the course of the term students became more proficient in hypothesis testing. WASC suggested particular examination of the three upper division courses that are thematically linked, as these courses are required for both native and transfer students. To assess the upper division GE theme courses, faculty graded reflective essays to measure how well students could integrate knowledge from different courses. Students showed greater ability to synthesize interdisciplinary knowledge as they progressed in completing the three course upper division GE sequence.

Major degree programs provide evidence of the assessment of student learning outcomes and how the information is used to improve the program. Each program is reviewed on a 5-6 year cycle, and external evaluators and a peer committee examine the progress being made. Academic units have used capstone experiences, embedded assessments, standardized tests, and other measures to learn what their students know and can do, and have made changes to their programs and processes in an effort to become more effective.

The campus is making significant strides towards more systematic assessment with the development of an annual reporting template for all degree programs. This annual reporting focuses on student outcomes assessment and its results at the department and program level, with the goal of providing trend data at the program level. Evidence of student achievement and campus-wide indicators are being considered through the campus' participation in the CSU program of "Campus Actions to Facilitate Graduation," one of which is the consideration of appropriate "dashboard indicators" of crucial campus data. One of the most gratifying changes is that faculty have generally improved in their knowledge and attitudes about assessment since the last WASC visit.

Technology in the Instructional Environment

Major changes have taken place in the use and support of technology for teaching and learning and in the university's administrative processes. In a 2002 reorganization, the separate units of Information Technology Services (ITS) and Educational Support Services (ESS) were formed, and Institutional Research (IR) was moved to the Division of Academic Affairs.

Information Technology Services (ITS) supports the university's ever-increasing use of new and various technologies, from e-mail and telephone service to the latest software applications. The implementation of the "Baseline Plan for Technology" provides a basic information competence program, campus-wide training programs, help desk functions, a set of foundation support services, local area networking and remote access, campus-wide email systems, and 24-hour access to the university's information technology network.

ITS is responsible for supporting the mission of the CSU Common Management Systems (CMS) to provide efficient, effective, high quality service to students, faculty, and staff. A campus-specific, web-based student administration system called Golden Eagle Territory (GET) has been implemented, with such features as registration over the www, submitting and obtaining grades electronically, and the new "advisor report" system to enable faculty to make appropriate course substitutions and to "clear" a student for the graduation office.

ITS contributes to the installation, upgrades, application development, and technical support

for Financials Systems (general ledger, asset management, grants, etc.), HR Systems (employee records), Contributor Relations, Student Financials, Financial Aid, and Student Administration (including Admissions, Student Records, and Academic Advisement).

Educational Support Services (ESS), a new unit in the Division of Academic Affairs, provides leadership and support for promoting and maintaining CSULA's academic goals, instructional computing services (technology-mediated classroom instruction and distance learning), and commitment to effective teaching and learning. ESS's Information Technology Consultants (ITC) support the use of information technology for teaching and learning, and liaison between ESS, the faculty and functions of the six CSULA colleges, the Library, Extended Education, and Information Technology Services (ITS). In collaboration with other units and constituencies within the university, ESS plans for instructional technology, coordinates the relationship between instructional and administrative technology plans, and manages CSU academic instructional technology projects.

Institutional Research (IR) became a unit within Academic Affairs to strengthen the relationship between data collection and analysis and academic and university strategic planning. IR provides management information and analytical support to the university's decision-makers. Planning and policy decisions are based on university data such as student enrollment, academic performance, faculty workload, facilities utilization and class offerings. IR utilizes both historical and current information to analyze and interpret patterns of past and emerging trends.

Strategic Planning

In 1999, WASC recommended that the campus continue to reflect on the interconnections between the University Strategy (i.e. assessment activities, the overall budget process) and the Priority Strategic Initiatives, to clarify goals and priorities, and to develop a communication plan to broaden campus understanding of the plan and its initiatives.

CSULA has had a strategic plan for over 20 years, and strategic planning at CSULA has been and continues to be a major strength. The development of the 2002-07 strategic plan involved all university stakeholders and strengthened the collegial atmosphere of the campus. Currently, the campus is in the beginning stages of updating the new 5-year plan and will be linking the plan to the CSU's multi-year compact with the Governor. The strategic initiatives in the plan are priorities in budgeting and management. Administrators' work plans, and budget requests and allocations reflect alignment to the strategic plan and initiatives. An annual report of the allocation of resources directed to the strategic initiatives is disseminated each fall and distributed at the annual Fall Faculty Day. Regular town hall meetings focus on strategic planning and institutional alignment.

The university continues to strengthen the linkage between educational effectiveness, strategic planning, and resource allocation.

Student Satisfaction

The university has undertaken a number of efforts to increase student satisfaction since 1999. Federal funding through Titles III and V of the Higher Education Act enabled the campus to enrich the freshman experience by developing an "Introduction to Higher Education" course and creating college-based advisement centers. Plans are in progress to form learning communities for both freshmen and transfer students. Students have greater access to information about their academic progress through the Golden Eagle Territory (GET) website. The university catalog and course schedule have been expanded and are available on-line, and the current CSU Trustee's Initiatives to Facilitate Graduation calls for further expansions and more "user-friendliness." A recent examination of enrollment trends and student-support processes redirected efforts to assure timely communication with students and greater focus on providing access based on student needs and enrollment demands. The university's response produced the dynamic "Delivering Results" enrollment management document that is guiding administrative changes to facilitating quality service.

Students at CSULA consistently rate the faculty as outstanding teachers and seem to have a solid and favorable educational experience on campus. In a 2006 "Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS) survey of undergraduates at CSULA, students gave very high ratings to all survey areas about instruction. This included quality of instruction, courses, level of intellectual stimulation, and professors' ability to communicate with students. Students in focus groups held in 2006 praised CSULA's excellent teachers and teaching and the close student-faculty interaction. Assessments of student satisfaction and perceptions show that students are generally satisfied with faculty advising, but less satisfied with general university and college advising.

Increases in the number of staff in key offices were made in 2005-06 to improve student experiences with student services and the educational environment. It has become clear that improving customer service in key student support areas depends on obtaining adequate staffing. While recent assessments show that the level of student satisfaction with key services is still not where it should be, both the services and the level of satisfaction of faculty, staff, and students are increasing.

The university continues to take other steps to increase student satisfaction, such as extending administrative office hours to be more accessible to night students. The new Golden Eagle building, which contains a food court, bookstore, and restaurant, opened in 2003. The University Student Union is now being constructed for a 2008 opening, and this will again provide a significant and expanded center for student activities.

One challenge that will be examined in the self-study during this accreditation review is whether the changes in the above four areas have been instrumental in aligning the campus systems and structures and being a learning-centered institution.

Current Strengths and Challenges: Preliminary Self Evaluation under the Standards

In order to understand its current strengths and challenges, the university used a diverse array of assessment measures. The Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a campus-wide faculty and staff survey, meetings with faculty and administrators, and surveys and focus groups with students provided the primary basis for evaluation. An examination was made of the WASC "Worksheet for Preliminary Self Review under the Standards." In preparing the proposal, the CSULA Proposal Working Group discussed their individual self-review and importance ratings and came to a consensus on each of the Criteria for Review (CFR). For each standard, the members agreed on the two or three most important issues or areas that should be addressed. The areas that were identified as strengths and challenges are discussed below, arranged by the WASC standards.

Standard One: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

According to campus-wide surveys and discussions, most members of the CSULA community strongly believe in the CSULA mission ("to advance a learning community built on the strengths of a culturally diverse urban population"). The campus supports academic freedom and has a strong commitment to diversity and to educating students who enter higher education with relatively low skill levels. A key issue for the review is how the institution is developing campus-wide indicators and evidence of student achievement consistent with its mission and goals.

Standard Two: Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

Assessment results confirm the general view that CSULA has many high quality programs that conform to disciplinary standards and hold national or regional accreditation. Classes and programs are staffed by highly qualified professors who excel in teaching, research and scholarly activities, including students in the latter activities as much as possible. CSULA has made significant progress in the assessment of general education outcomes, with a GE assessment policy and assessments of students in different areas; the

university plans to utilize the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) to assess critical thinking and written communications skills in 2006-07.

Key issues for the review in this area are as follows: a) only some degree programs define the levels of achievement expected from students for graduation and b) expectations and responsibility for student learning outcomes are not always shared among the various constituencies or communicated clearly to students. Other issues include improving retention and graduation rates, perceived to relate to the effectiveness of student services, providing timely information about student status, improving advising, and helping students complete remediation in math and English. Assessment of progress in these areas will be important in the accreditation review.

Standard Three: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

According to needs analyses, campus-wide surveys, and discussions, the campus shows strong faculty academic leadership, a record of good relations between faculty and administration, and consistent institutional governance. CSULA has careful fiscal management, consistent contract and grant income, and generally consistent state funding. In the past seven years, the campus has expanded the physical plant with new buildings and has improved the information technology infrastructure. In an environment of marginal cost funding that results in limited resources, staffing levels have been an issue. Within the past year staff have been added to student support units to meet critical needs. It is apparent that examination of the needs for ongoing staff development in student learning and in supporting students to meet their educational goals will be needed.

Assessments reveal other issues, which include enrollment shifts and meeting student demand. There continues to be a need for ongoing faculty development in critical areas, e.g., advising, teaching and learning, assessment. A restructured Center for Innovation and Effectiveness in Teaching and Learning (CIETL) is now addressing many of the needs in faculty development The Capacity and Preparatory Review will allow the campus an opportunity to explore and develop solutions to these key issues.

Standard Four: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

CSULA has a long-standing tradition of campus strategic planning. Its strategic plan is reviewed annually and updated comprehensively every five years (currently undergoing a five-year review). The plan includes strategic initiatives that are linked to funding and decision-making. One thrust of the re-accreditation process will be aligning the strategic planning process with educational effectiveness and student learning.

There are recent improvements in the collection of trend data on program-level student learning. Faculty expertise in assessing learning outcomes and aligning processes to student success needs to be expanded. Issues that will be addressed in the Capacity and Preparatory Review will include the campus capacity and infrastructure for institutional research, additional policies and practices promoting a robust culture of evidence and improvement, and greater external stakeholder involvement in the assessment of effectiveness. One important goal of the re-accreditation process is to promote increased attention to and engagement in using data to improve student learning. These issues will also be key in the Educational Effectiveness review.

Campus Involvement in Development of the Proposal and Review Process.

In January 2006, the WASC Steering Committee first convened to develop the Institutional Proposal for WASC re-accreditation. Steering Committee members represented all units of the university. After attending the WASC "Workshop for Institutions with Upcoming Reviews," a smaller Proposal Working Group—composed of faculty, a representative of the college deans and administration, of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, of Institutional Research, and of degree program and general education assessment—moved forward in preparing the proposal. The Proposal Working Group consulted widely across the university to identify what the campus does well and what areas need improvement. Members of the

Proposal Working Group made presentations about accreditation and administered opinion surveys to the Academic Senate, college deans, department chairs, and Academic Affairs administrators. To involve campus employees, a web survey was sent out to all CSULA faculty and staff. Responses were received from 357 individuals; the responses were about equally divided between faculty and staff.

Several methods solicited student contributions to proposal development. A student satisfaction survey (the SNAPS survey referred to above) used by the CSU system was administered to a sample of 800 students in early 2006. Members of the Proposal Working Group surveyed students in selected classes and met with student government leadership for a focus group. Throughout this process, the Proposal Working Group consulted with campus administration.

In spring 2006, members of the Proposal Working Group filled out the worksheet for the Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards. Strong congruence was found between worksheet answers and the issues that administrators, faculty, staff and students identified during the various campus consultations. All stakeholders identified supporting students in reaching their educational goals (student services, student satisfaction) as the top issue. Another widely shared concern was student learning outcomes and success. The "special themes approach" was identified as the format for the development of the accreditation self-study, with four themes and associated research questions identified. A WASC website was established to keep the campus community informed and to solicit feedback. The draft institutional proposal was disseminated to the Academic Senate, faculty, staff, students, and administration for review prior to submission in fall 2006. The Proposal Working Group completed the draft of the Institutional Proposal in summer 2006, and distributed an executive summary to the faculty at Fall Faculty Day for their input. Faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and community leaders voiced their opinions about the draft Institutional Proposal through campus meetings, the WASC Steering Committee, the Strategic Planning Committee, and the website. The Proposal Working Group revised the Institutional Proposal for submission to WASC in October 2006.

Goals and Expected Outcomes for the Accreditation Review Process

The model used in this review is the "Special Themes Approach." The overall goal is to address these themes using researchable questions and key indicators and to relate them to key outcomes.

Through an extensive process of obtaining campus-wide input on issues, CSULA has identified important themes. The following over-arching theme subsumes all four themes:

"**Becoming a teaching and learning community by supporting student success and student outcomes."**

The four themes under this overarching framework are:

CSULA WASC THEMES

Supporting Students to Reach Academic Goals:
- Improving academic support services
- Improving advisement
- Strengthening faculty and staff effectiveness in monitoring student progress

Providing Enrollment and Resource Management:
- Establishing and attaining enrollment goals
- Ensuring sufficient personnel
- Strengthening internal management practices and processes

Promoting Student Learning Outcomes and Success:
- Supporting students, faculty and academic units toward the goal of student success in GE and program-level outcomes

Being a Teaching and Learning Community:
- Demonstrating campus growth in becoming a learning-centered organization
- Showing institutional and faculty responsibility for student learning

These four areas of focus will inform the organization of the self study, help create research questions, and provide the main outcomes for the accreditation process.

There are three important outcomes of the re-accreditation process:

WASC OUTCOMES

Outcome 1:
Increased attention to using data to improve student learning

Outcome 2:
Increased student success by supporting students and strengthening academic support services

Outcome 3:
Improved alignment of campus strategic planning with educational effectiveness and student learning

Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review

CSULA will use the re-accreditation process to gain further understanding and improvement of several important processes on the campus, particularly advisement, and student support services, including Admissions, Records, and Financial Aid. A further goal is to use the self-study review to ensure that the policies and practices of the campus support the university's enrollment goals and the admissions and enrollment processes. Some of the key capacity questions that were identified are cross-cutting and link to more than one standard. Table 1 in the Appendix displays a crosswalk between the Capacity and Preparatory Review and its essays and the Educational Effectiveness review themes. The review is organized around a series of essays aligned with the WASC standards, demonstrating that the university fulfills the core commitments to institutional capacity. Research teams will explore these topics.

Standard 1, "Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives," is addressed in one essay. The essay titled, "Developing Campus-wide Indicators of Student Achievement," will address the extent to which current data enable the campus to provide campus-wide "dashboard"

indicators of effectiveness in promoting student success.

Standard 2, "Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions," is addressed in two essays. The first essay, "Facilitating Graduation and Student Success," will address issues of access, retention, student support services, and student progress to graduation. In addition, the roles of faculty and staff in promoting student success will be addressed. Among the measures currently being implemented or considered by the campus are requiring advising more frequently; making more frequent use of the newly developed degree audit system; improving the support to students who need help in clarifying GE; providing information for developing career and life goals; making career information more prominent for students; promulgating the roadmaps to the degree developed in the last two years in an official web site; aligning class schedules to the roadmaps; requiring each student to have an official degree plan at the completion of one year of coursework; more vigorously enforcing policies to discourage class drops, withdrawals and grades of incomplete; and improving the use of technology as an advising resource for both students and faculty. A second essay, "Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity," will examine the faculty's role in pursuing such activities involving undergraduate and graduate students, and the effect of these activities on student learning and achievement. A particular focus will be on the review of student work that has developed as a result of these activities.

Standard 3, "Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability," is addressed in one essay. "CSULA's Resource Allocation Plan," will address how resources are deployed to achieve the goals of the university, including enrollment management.

Standard 4, "Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement," is addressed in two essays. The first, "Using Student Data in A Culture of Evidence," will address how effective the university is in collection of student data, and in the use of data to guide improvements. In addition, it will focus on how student data, such as, 6-year graduation rate, remediation rate, and quality of capstone projects and comprehensive exams can be used to support informed decision-making based on such evidence. A second essay: "Planning and Alignment," will focus on issues related to educational effectiveness and student learning, and their links to planning and resource allocation.

Some key capacity questions that will be addressed include the following:

- Is information on student learning outcomes linked to institutional and strategic planning? (CFR1.3)
- How are expectations for student learning formulated, reviewed, and communicated to students and others in the campus community? (CFR 2.3, 2.12)
- Are degrees majors clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in the levels of student achievement required for graduation? (CFR 2.1)
- How are expectations and responsibility for student learning shared among various campus constituencies? (CFR 2.4, 4,8)
- How do campus support services meet the needs of students in reaching their goals? (CFR 2.13)
- How effective is student advisement, and what structure is most effective? (CFR 3.4)
- Are the academic and support units configured and staffed to support student success? (CFR 3.1)
- What are campus quality assurance processes? Do they address effectiveness of programs and units and track results over time? (CFR 4.4,4.7)
- Is the campus' research capacity and support level appropriate? Are its data resources sufficient, and how do they inform decision-making? (CFR4.5)
- What are institutional policies and practices for gathering and analyzing information that leads to a culture of evidence? (CFR 4.5, 4.6)
- How does the campus engage the community and other stakeholders in assessing the effectiveness of its programs? (CFR 4.8)

Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The Educational Effectiveness review will re-examine strengthening the process of promoting student learning outcomes and success and gaining greater buy-in to the goal of becoming a "teaching and learning community."

In the Educational Effectiveness review, research teams will work on each theme. They will review and revise research questions, conduct research, collect data, and write reports and develop conclusions drawn from these efforts. This will enable the campus to report on progress in becoming a more effective teaching and learning community.

The proposed themes are the following:
Theme 1: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals
Among the questions the university will research under this theme are the following:

- How is student progress in meeting their goals evaluated? (CFR 2.2),
- How effective is student advisement in assisting students to reach their goals? (CFR 3.4)
- How do campus support services meet the needs of students in reaching their goals? (CFR 2.13)
- What data are essential and available regarding student retention rates and the time to graduation, and how are data used in decision-making?
- How do faculty and staff development activities support the achievement of student learning and academic goals? (CFR 3.4)

Theme 2: Enrollment and Resource Management
Under this theme, one particular focus will be ensuring the attainment of overall enrollment goals and assuring resource stability. Among other questions to be researched are these:

- What is the effect of setting and managing enrollment goals for freshmen, transfer, graduate, and out-of-state (international) students?
- How are management priorities and processes aligned with enrollment and retention goals?

Theme 3: Promoting Student Learning Outcomes and Success
Questions to be researched under this theme include the following:

- How effective is the university in communicating expectations for student learning outcomes and goals to students? (CFR 2.12, 2.3)
- How effective are academic units in gathering direct evidence of student learning? (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.3)
- How effectively does the university use data and learning outcomes information to improve its functions? (CFR 2.6, 2.7)
- How effective is the linkage between information about learning outcomes to institutional planning? (CFR 1.3)
- Are campus-wide objectives and indicators developed and communicated, and how are they used to improve student learning? (CFR 1.2).

Theme 4: Being a Teaching and Learning Community.
Among the questions to be researched are these:

- How are institutional expectations and the responsibility for student learning shared in the university community? (CFR 2.4, 4.8)
- How can the campus strengthen its engagement with the community and other stakeholders? (CFR 4.8)
- How effective is the university in collecting and analyzing data? (CFR 4.5)

Final 10/2006

Workplan and Timeline

Initial Tasks

OCTOBER 15, 2006 • Submit proposal to WASC
FALL 2006 • Review feedback from WASC Proposal Review Committee • Create Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) Subcommittee • Create Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) Subcommittee

Capacity and Preparatory Review

WINTER 2007 – FALL 2007 • CPR research teams investigate research questions for the CPR essays • One research team investigates each WASC Standard • Begin data portfolio
WINTER 2008 • Each CPR research team completes its draft findings for the CPR
SPRING 2008 • Campus holds consultations on preliminary CPR results
SUMMER 2008 • Revise essays in response to campus consultation
FALL 2008 • Complete CPR Report
DECEMBER 2008 • Submit CPR Report to WASC
WINTER 2009 • Prepare for CRP Site Visit
SPRING 2009 • Hold CPR Site Visit
SUMMER 2009 • Campus receives CPR report
FALL 2009 • Campus responds to CPR team report

Educational Effectiveness Review

WINTER 2007 – SUMMER 2009 • EER research teams investigate research questions for EER themes • Create one research team for each theme
FALL 2009 • Each EER research team completes its draft findings for the EER
WINTER 2010 • Campus holds consultations on preliminary EER results
SPRING 2010 • Revise essays in response to campus consultation • Complete EER Report
JUNE 2010 • Submit EER Report to WASC
SUMMER 2010 • Prepare for EER Site Visit
FALL 2010 • Hold EER Site Visit
WINTER 2011 • Campus receives EER report

Groups to Be Involved

The WASC Steering Committee has oversight over the re-accreditation process. Its membership is broadly representative, consisting of administration, faculty, student, staff and community leaders. A Capacity and Preparatory Review Subcommittee and its research teams will prepare the essays for the CPR Report. For each WASC standard, a research team will investigate data and the research questions, make preliminary findings and compose a draft of the essay. The Office of Institutional Research will coordinate data preparation.

In spring 2008, committees will present drafts of the essays for the CPR to the WASC Steering Committee; circulated among faculty, students, staff and administrators; and posted on the web. The Capacity and Preparatory Review Subcommittee will reflect on the responses to the draft essays and revise the essays for the final report. In a similar process of preparation and campus consultation, an Educational Effectiveness Review Subcommittee and its research teams will write the theme essays for the EER Report

Quality of Current Data Gathering Systems

Several divisions of the university will support data gathering and analysis during the re-accreditation process. The Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Student Affairs, and Information Technology Services are members of the WASC Steering Committee and will be closely involved in the process. Several units in Academic Affairs will play key roles. The Office of Institutional Research will provide data and analysis of current and historical data. Since the last WASC reaccreditation, Institutional Research (IR) at CSULA has undergone radical change. Most important has been the relocation of the IR office from the division of Information Technology Services (ITS, formerly known as Information Resources Management) to Academic Affairs. The impetus for the change in organizational structure was recognition of the need for IR to play a major role as the provider of strategic data and analytical studies in direct support of executive decision-making, campus-wide strategic planning, enrollment management, and assessment of institutional effectiveness. The implementation of Peoplesoft SA in 2004 required the creation of new approaches to data reporting, and Institutional Research continues to build capacity.

The IR office, staffed with a programmer and IR professionals, provides official reports and statistics to internal and external constituencies. It maintains and implements several important surveys related to student satisfaction, persistence, and success, including UCLA's survey of freshmen (Cooperative Institutional Research Program or CIRP), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS). It also supports other campus initiatives such as the planned Collegiate Learning Assessment.

The Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs - Planning and Resources will provide Academic Affairs with budget analysis and information on faculty workload, staffing needs, space utilization, and enrollment goals. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will supply outcomes assessment information for major undergraduate and graduate degree programs and program review information, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will provide the results of the assessments of general education.

Additional data resources are the Division of Administration and Finance, which will provide financial, and resource information, and the Division of Student Affairs, which will provide admissions and enrollment data along with information about many essential student support services.

Resources Needed and Committed to Process

The President has committed resources to support centralized efforts for the accreditation review process. The campus will identify leadership and the membership of the Capacity and Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Subcommittees. Released time will support faculty participation, and staff and administrative time will be supported as well. Resources will also be provided for allied activities that engage the campus in the

dialogue and discussions required in the self-study process. These may include workshops, meetings, retreats, and poster sessions.

A. **Appendices** (Data tables, off campus & distance programs, institutional stipulation)

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators