REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

To CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

APRIL 1-3, 2009

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

William B. DeLauder, Team Chair
Les M. Kong, Assistant Team Chair
Lawrence B. Coleman
Eileen Heveron
Christopher D. Lu
Teresa M. Shaw
Renee Barnett Terry
Jo Volkert
Teri Cannon, WASC Staff Liaison

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional Capacity 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

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) was founded in 1947 by the 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, CSULA became a part of the California State University system. 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 CSULA in 1954 and subsequently re-accredited it in 1960, 1965, 1970, 1980, 1985, 1990, and 1999. 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, one joint doctorate, and one planned 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.

Admission is open to the upper 33 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 student population is notable in its diverse ethnic composition. In Fall 2007, the ethnic composition of the undergraduate student population was 45% Hispanic/Latino; 20% Asian/Pacific Islander; 10% White, Non-Hispanic; 8% Black, Non-Hispanic; and 0.4% American Indian/Alaskan Native. This ethnic mix reflects the population of the predominant CSULA service area. The gender mix of the student population is as follows: 62 per cent female, and 38 per cent male.

The hospitality extended to the team by CSULA was outstanding. The team met with a broad cross-section of the campus community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students. 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 Capacity and Preparatory Report

In keeping with WASC policy on comprehensive reviews of accredited institutions, CSULA chose to prepare a self-study report that consisted of an abbreviated compliance report and five thematic essays: **A Culture of Evidence: Using Student Data as Indicators of Student Success; Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals; The Roles of Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity in Supporting Students' Academic Goals; Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability;** and

Planning, Alignment, and Commitment to Learning and Improvement. While the Team reviewed each accreditation standard to insure compliance, the five thematic areas identified by the CSULA were the focus of the visit. The Team noted and also found useful the CSULA WASC Web site, the Appendices, as well as the active links to further data (available on an accompanying CD).

The Capacity and Preparatory Report was written with clarity and rigor, and provided the institution with the opportunity to gain further understanding and improvement of its capacity to support student success. The CPR Report was aligned with the University's proposal that provided the focus of the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. The Team was particularly impressed with the analytical summary sections at the end of each thematic essay, as these each addressed progress in areas, as well as issues raised in the previous WASC Commission letters.

By posting the CPR Report on the CSULA web site, the report was readily available to all campus constituents. It appeared to the Team that the CPR Review process was inclusive and involved many faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

C. Response to Previous Commission Issues

The CPR Report did respond to recommendations included in the Commission's action letter and the visiting team report of 1999. These are summarized below:

1. WASC recommended that CSULA complete plans intended to assess learning outcomes acquired through each academic major, the general education program, the co-curricula

programs, and technology. The University was also urged to further develop ways for those on campus to share ideas and practices and to develop a common language in regard to assessment, to examine how the University is organized to support student learning, and to engage the campus in dialogue to achieve greater understanding of student learning needs at CSULA.

CSULA responded to this recommendation in its Essay 1 in the CPR Report. The Team report, pages 8 to 12, analyzes the University's response to this recommendation and the Team's recommendation 1 urges that additional action is needed.

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

The University responded to this issue in its Essay 3 and the Team analyzed this response on pages 20 to 28 in this report. The Team commended the University for its efforts in developing an excellent technology infrastructure.

3. WASC recommended that the University give attention to student support issues articulated in the visiting team's report and to improving student satisfaction.

The University responds to this recommendation in its Essay 2A in the CPR Report. In this report, the Team analyzes the CSULA response on pages 13 to 16. The Team's recommendations 3 and 4 address ongoing issues that relate to student services and student satisfaction that require additional attention.

4. WASC recommended that the University give attention to several issues related to improving the library.

The University responded to this recommendation on pages 19 to 20 in Essay 3 of the CPR Report. The Team analyzed these responses on pages 22, 23 and 27 of this report. The Team commended the Library for its continued development of its information literacy instruction program.

5. The Commission urged the University to reflect on the interconnections between the University Strategy and the Priority Strategic Initiatives. Further, the Commission noted that given limited resources, clarification of goals and priorities is essential to the University moving into the next stage of its initiatives.

The University's response to this recommendation is given in Essay 4. The Team analyzed the University's response on pages 28 to 32 of this report. The Team commended CSULA for its efforts to identify strategic initiatives with budget allocations. However, the University must complete its efforts to identify performance measures so that progress in achieving the strategic planning goals can be assessed.

D. Format of this Report

This report begins with an overview and analysis of CSULA's assessment initiatives and outcomes; support services for students; roles of research, scholarship and creative activity in supporting students' academic goals; the development and application of resources and

organizational structures for ensured sustainability; and strategic planning efforts. Following each section, suggestions are listed. 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 34.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE
STANDARDS

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

The faculty and staff of CSULA have made significant progress in recent years in building the structures, resources, and processes to support and sustain ongoing assessment of student learning and success. This includes the identification of course- and program-level student learning objectives in almost all academic programs, the development of full assessment plans in most programs, the implementation of standard annual assessment reports and surveys, a revised program review procedure that fully integrates evidence of student learning and cumulative assessment reporting into the review process, and campus-level assessment resources and support. The Team reviewed several pieces of evidence for these processes. For example, it was noted from the data that 98% of academic programs have established student learning outcomes, and 91% of programs have made changes and improvements based on their assessment results -- an increase from 50% in 2005-2006 (CFRs 1.2, 1.7, 2.3, 4.4, and 4.7). The syllabus policy requires that student learning outcomes are to be included on all syllabi, and a syllabus audit process is in place. It was noted in Exhibit 7.1 that some programs have not yet published outcomes in the catalog or on the Web site (CFR 2.4), and that full assessment plans are still in development in several departments, but the Team is confident that, with the current momentum

and level of commitment to these processes on campus, these will be in place before the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER).

The Team **commends** the University for giving significant attention to assessment and for what appears to be general acceptance and support for assessment across the campus.

The Team was especially impressed with the revised program review process, which includes specific attention to assessment of student learning, assessment planning, program improvement, and program strategic planning. The program review process is aligned as much as possible with annual assessment reports that programs prepare for the University and for their specialized accreditation bodies, and also features clearer reporting lines and follow-through on review recommendations (CFRs 2.1, 2.7, 4.3, and 4.4). Such alignment and coordination will make both the review process and the broader assessment cycles more effective, valuable, and sustainable. It also assures that analysis of results from course-level and program-level assessment are regularly considered by CSULA faculty and administrators, as well as external reviewers, and not haphazardly collected and ignored. This is a firm foundation for institutional learning. The new process has been implemented this year, so that by the time of the EER, all seven of the programs currently preparing self-studies will have final reports and recommendations.

In addition, several other promising efforts involving significant assessment of student learning have been initiated. Some of these are directly related to student retention and the success of under-prepared students, which the data on graduation rates and remediation support. For example, the required course for new first-year and transfer students, "Introduction to Higher Education (IHE)" has been expanded to four units for first-year students. There is a common

syllabus and set of learning objectives for the course. A pre- and post-test assessment measuring skills, activities, attitude, and confidence has already been implemented, and tools are being developed for measuring the impact of the course on retention, course load, and graduation rates. Nine "learning communities" for students who place lowest for math and English preparation are active this year. The Team heard that initial data indicates a higher pass rate for students who complete the learning community experience.

General Education was not a central focus of the CPR and may not be a central focus of the EER, but the Team notes that faculty, staff, and students have been engaged in a "campus conversation" on the GE program, which may result in substantial changes. This is in part a result of the regular external review of the program, completed in 2007. The reviewers' report included several dozen recommendations, including a fundamental recommendation to "revise the mission, goals, and learning outcomes of General Education." In addition, the General Education Committee recognizes the need to revise the assessment plan, which is more than eight years old and does not reflect current efforts such as IHE and the learning communities. Administrative staff has worked with the Office of Institutional Research to identify the "gateway courses" that are the most challenging for students, and are beginning the process of approaching department faculty to develop tools for student success in these courses. The Team expects that the General Education revitalization will be a multi-year process, and encourages the faculty to be especially intentional in linking GE assessment to larger institutional learning goals (for example, student research, globalization, and information literacy), student retention, and preparation for success in the major (CFRs 2.2, 4.6, and 4.7).

In addition to the initiatives described above, the campus regularly participates in national assessments and surveys such as NSSE, SNAPS, and CLA, and reports on a variety of indicators to the CSU system. Overall, then, the team recognized a heightened awareness of, commitment to, and buy-in on a "culture" of evidence, assessment, and accountability on campus, especially as it relates to understanding the needs of students and assuring that all students have the resources to succeed at CSULA. At the same time, in reviewing materials and in *multiple* conversations over the course of our campus visit, the entire team perceived a general need for coordination, prioritizing areas of inquiry and goals, and consistent dissemination of information. The Team notes that responsibility for assessment efforts and initiatives is spread across campus, in programs and schools, student support services such as the Office of the Registrar, Academic Affairs, Office of Institutional Research, the Campus Assessment Coordinator, business and finance, etc.

This is to be expected on a large campus, but the Team learned through a number of interviews that there is a lack of clarity on campus about how to get information, who is responsible not only for collecting certain data but also for analyzing data and reporting to the community, who should get certain types of reports and how often, and who is accountable for follow-through. For example, members of the ASI (Associated Students Incorporated) indicated to the Team that they do not receive information on results of student satisfaction surveys. The Team also learned from deans and associate deans that they have in the past not regularly seen data on at-risk students, such as students who have not registered, or who are on probation. This limits the ability of faculty to intervene directly with students at critical moments. (The Team was pleased to hear that the deans are currently working on a list of regular report distribution that will involve both the Offices of the Registrar and Institutional Research). The Team also learned that

in general there is not a good mechanism for nor an expectation of regular dissemination of data in a way that encourages response and accountability (CFRs 4.1, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.6).

Suggestions:

1. The University should consider a comprehensive system for the management of projects, data, and materials related to assessment and "decision support."(CFR 4.4-4.7)

2. The Team also noted that the University has not yet established measurable outcomes for learning at the *institutional* level, something that is required under the WASC standards (CFRs 1.2 and 2.3). It will be essential that these be in place by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, and the Team suggests that the University look at the institutional-level objectives that are already articulated in scattered venues (for example, the goals associated with the Mission of CSULA, the learning objectives identified in the current Strategic Plan, and the objectives related to General Education, research, information literacy, etc.) for possible alignment and consolidation (CFRs 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.8, and 4.6).

3. The Office of Undergraduate Studies will be piloting the learning communities for higher achieving students during the 2009-10 academic year. This is part of a general effort at retention and persistence, and recognizes that *some* students may leave CSULA if they do not feel supported and/or challenged academically. These programs show initial promise, and the Team encourages the faculty and staff to implement the kinds of assessment tools that will produce meaningful data that can measure student success and achievement (with identified levels of

expectation) over time, cumulatively, and with disaggregated results. The Team further suggests that these results be included in the EER (CFRs 1.5, 2.6, and 2.10).

ESSAY 2A: Supporting Students to Reach Their Academic Goals

CSULA has responded positively to the recommendations by WASC to better understand and address student learning, student satisfaction, and student success, and to improve the effectiveness of student services that support students in achieving their educational goals (CFRs 2.10 – 2.14). Institutional efforts to better understand student needs were addressed through the use of student surveys (SNAPS and NSSE), focus groups with students, town hall forums with the campus community, and newly created committees with broad representation across divisions of the University (e.g., *Delivering Results: Steps/Plans to Enhance Enrollment Management at Cal State L.A.,*" Quality Improvement Program/Council) resulting in new initiatives by CSULA to improve student retention and student success (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, and 2.13).   One of the areas that the institution has taken steps to improve is that of academic advising, which has been expanded with the creation of the University Academic Advisement Center (UAAC) for centralized GE advising by staff advisors, and advisement in academic departments led by faculty in the departments and colleges (CFRs 2.12 and 2.14). Additionally, improvements to the first-year college experience have been instituted. These include: a redesigned orientation program; outreach to and support of high-risk new students through academic interventions such as the "Students Learning In Communities Support" Program (SLICS); and further enhancements to the Golden Eagles Territory (GET) portal (CFR 2.12) -- a positive step towards improving student retention and student learning for these populations.

With initiatives and efforts such as SLICS, which includes a complement of remedial Math and English academic courses, and the "Introduction to Higher Education (IHE)" course, CSULA is able to respond to the critical issues affecting students at risk and positively contribute to student success and transition to the campus.

The new delivery models of academic advisement (centrally/colleges and departments) are positive steps toward developing improved student academic support and keeping students on track towards graduation, and new interventions such as the early warning system, learning communities, and a more centralized and focused delivery of advisement -- all contribute to an improvement in one of the most critical areas for student retention and student advancement towards educational goals. However, significant work is needed in further delineating the advisement system across the University and clearly establishing benchmarks, using CAS and other standards, to refine the roles and responsibilities of all advisors, including the faculty in colleges and departments. There is a greater need for coordinating the processes with all academic units involved in the advisement process for increased consistency in advising and timely service to students who need face-to-face contact across advising areas. Technology can be used to improve the delivery of advisement services and systems (road maps, online degree audit) and tracking systems with clear assessment measures to determine effectiveness and student satisfaction.

Student feedback during the visit and survey results in the CPR Report consistently underscores the need to address deficiencies in student support services, particularly in the areas of admissions, financial aid, registration, and records. Coordinated efforts and communication within and across units (specifically, Student Affairs and Academic Affairs) will contribute

significantly to improved services and greater quality in serving the diverse needs of students at CSULA. Staff commented on the lack of information/data from student surveys conducted by the campus and relevant to student satisfaction. Reports should be generated on student use and satisfaction within each of the major student support services areas. Clearly defined unit goals and the establishment of working groups across areas with a focus on measurable outcomes will allow for greater coordination of services, streamlined processes, and minimized bureaucracy. Annual reports and updates on improvements and enhancements of services should be shared broadly with students, faculty, and staff to inform the University community on overall efforts by student support services and to improve communication across the campus.

Areas such as financial aid, orientation, admissions and records, and registration have made considerable gains in improving student support services and responding to the needs of students, despite many challenges (as identified in student surveys and concerns expressed by students). In meeting with student services administrators, it is evident that there is a clear institutional commitment and genuine willingness to provide quality services and support to students. The Team also noted a strong desire on the part of all to work collaboratively and in partnership with other University units to provide effective, timely, and quality support services to students.

Suggestions:

1. Although the campus has made gains in responding to student needs and concerns, as well as in addressing student retention, and the successful attainment of students' educational goals, CSULA still faces many challenges in improving student support and satisfaction, addressing student advisement needs, and coordinating and disseminating its research and data gathering

efforts across both Academic and Student Affairs areas in relation to the effectiveness of student services support.(CFRs 2.3, 2.6, 2.10,.2.11, and 2.12)

2. There is a need for greater communication, coordination, and dissemination of information, campus data, and research through the Office of Institutional Research to student support services and the student community on the campus. The University has a wealth of information gathered from student surveys and focus groups, as well as current and historical enrollment (e.g., graduation rates, remediation statistics, etc.) data. This synthesized data would be invaluable for informing decisions and strategic planning throughout the campus and across vice president-areas, with mutual benefit to those responsible for serving students, including the Associated Students Incorporated (ASI). Remedial and advisement efforts, in particular, would be more informed and guided with convenient access to information (such as disaggregated retention and cohort data coupled with student feedback from satisfaction and other surveys) provided through the Office of Institutional Research to enrollment management and advisement staff. (CFRs 2.10 and 4.5)

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

Overview

The campus has made a commitment to including students (undergraduate and graduate) in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity (RSCA). Essay 2B highlights this, as those members of the campus community (administrators, faculty and students) with whom the Team spoke confirmed this commitment. The merit and promotion system values faculty efforts in undergraduate research. The campus Strategic Plan has as a stated goal –

> *Goal 3.6.* Promote programs that provide professional mentoring
> through research, creative activity and other forms of scholarship
> for students preparing for careers that require post-baccalaureate
> study.

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. However the campus needs to put into

place a solid data collection process to measure the amount of student engagement in RSCA and

its impact on student learning. The campus Strategic Plan goal 3.6 could be expanded to include

all students, not just those planning further graduate or professional education, as a statement of

the value of RSCA to the education of all students (CFRs 2.2a/b and 2.5).

The campus has several major efforts in the sciences and engineering, externally funded, that

provide a high level of undergraduate research support and mentoring from dedicated faculty.

The recently published "Report on Graduate Studies at CSULA" paints a compelling picture of

the graduate education programs at CSULA, as well as the full engagement of graduate students

in RSCA.

The campus is to be **commended** for its broad based commitment to engaging students in

RSCA.

However, the campus does not have in place a robust and broad system for capturing quantitative

information on student research. The existing data are mostly anecdotal and does not lend

themselves to critical assessment. As a result, there is no assessment of the impact of research

on student success and learning, nor are there the data on which to design improvements, uncover impediments, explore expansion of programs or discover where on campus it is working well and where it is not. In particular, the lack of data on student participation in RSCA affects the campus' ability to assure that all students have the opportunity to make RSCA a central part of their CSULA education (CFR 2.11). RSCA is actively promoted at all levels. Faculty members are recognized for their own accomplishments in RSCA and are encouraged to disseminate their scholarship and creative activities in the appropriate venues. In many cases, because of the large student FTE to ladder faculty FTE ratio, faculty take on student RSCA activities above and beyond their normal workload (CFRs 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4). The Team noted many examples of students being encouraged to present their RSCA locally and at professional meetings. Without broad based data, assessment of these efforts, and the impacts of student engagement in RSCA on retention and learning outcomes is not yet available for much of the campus (CFRs 2.8 and 2.9).

Suggestions:

From interviews with campus constituents and analyses of the provided documents and data, the Team makes the following suggestions for further campus reflection.

1. There is widespread belief that RSCA provides a significant positive impact on student success and learning outcomes. However, the campus does not have the mechanisms in place to assess this impact, and to provide the kinds of information necessary for identifying areas where student RSCA is not occurring or could be improved. By way of example, the Team learned that 80% of students in a particular department in the natural sciences did have real research experience as part of their education. The lack of participation of the other 20% had been

examined and was understood (factors include older students, family responsibilities and the need to be working) -- such data and analysis appear to be the exception. (CFRs 4.5 and 4.7)

2. CSULA has a student population that presents challenges for widespread implementation of student engagement in RSCA. There is a real opportunity to study how student RSCA can be a significant factor in retention, advancing student learning, and encouraging students to continue their education beyond the baccalaureate degree. Another important question to consider is how to engage commuter, part time, older, and other non-traditional students in RSCA. Understanding of these and similar issues is not only important in its own right, but would lead to a much improved participation by CSULA students, and could have a significant impact on student success. (CFRs 1.2 and 2.10)

3. The CPR Essay 2B notes that CSULA's position as an urban campus with a student body both living in and committed to reaching out to the local communities is a strength that should be built on. Increased community-based research and service learning by both faculty and students should be advanced. Again, data needs to be collected both to assess these programs and to demonstrate to community leaders and government officials the contributions of the campus to its communities. (CFR 4.5)

4. It is not clear who has responsibility to foster student RSCA at the campus level. While the academic departments and programs are well suited to be the focus of student RSCA, consideration could be given to a coordinated campus-wide effort -- focused on lower division students, and specifically aimed at enhancing retention and recruitment. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, and 3.8)

5. The campus may wish to consider making the fostering of student RSCA an explicit

responsibility of the deans and chairs. (CFRs 1.3 and 3.8)

6. The campus should consider additional ways of highlighting RSCA as part of the Honors

program, and as a recruitment tool for high achieving students. (CFR 1.2)

ESSAY 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

CSULA generally has well developed organizational structures and decision-making processes

to deal with challenges regarding information technology, enrollment management, and resource

development. Although the CSU system and the State of California are facing significant

difficulties in light of the economic downturn and subsequent budget shortfalls, the campus

possesses many good management practices and communication pathways to ensure viability of

the campus.

The campus has in place a solid senior leadership team that possesses a good deal of expertise in

each of their respective areas and has both a mutual respect and a collaborative approach to

making campus-wide decisions (CFR 3.10). CSULA has also created numerous ad hoc groups

to deal with various aspects of enrollment management and other resource challenges (CFR 3.8).

A University Strategic Planning and Coordination Committee has been set up to prioritize how

resources are allocated. It also uses the Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC) to

assist the President by reviewing the Resource Allocation Plan developed by the vice presidents

and makes recommendations to guide implementation of the campus budget given by the CSU Chancellor's Office.

Because of reduced state funding now, and for the foreseeable future, it is crucial that the campus work to develop alternative sources of funding beyond the state general fund. Although the campus is relatively new to the pursuit of institutional advancement, it has begun to create a culture that understands the need to raise additional dollars beyond the declining funding from the state (CFR 3.5).

In terms of physical resources, the campus has made several highly visible improvements. The new transit centers located near the campus entrances enhance the campus's welcoming image to students and visitors. Several new buildings have been added to the campus plant, including a Forensic Science Center developed using a Joint Powers Agreement between CSULA, the LA County Sheriff's Department, and the LA Police Department, as well as the Golden Eagle Building (housing food services, the University Bookstore, the College of Extended Learning, grants and contracts support, and meeting space). Several new classroom facilities have either been recently completed or are in various planning stages. According to the Vice President for Administration and Finance, the campus is also exploring options to expand the campus footprint and develop new student housing as well. These additions contribute to the perception of a dynamic campus that is working to improve its facilities and image both within the campus population and in the larger community where it is located.

The campus has undertaken several initiatives to strengthen its enrollment management efforts. It has hired an experienced Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment

Management (CFR 3.1). As mentioned earlier, it has convened a new Enrollment Management Steering Committee, with representation from key personnel in both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to oversee the enrollment and student services functions. In another initiative, staff in the Office of Outreach and Recruitment has recently begun using a communication software system (Hobsons Enrollment Management Technology) to follow-up by email with prospective students and applicants to support them as they move down the path toward a decision to attend CSULA. All these efforts and others have served the purpose of focusing campus attention on the importance of being deliberate about many individual decisions that make up a comprehensive enrollment management strategy.

Customer satisfaction related to services provided by student services units has been raised as a concern in past WASC reviews. Several past student surveys have cited students' dissatisfaction with procedures that seem overly bureaucratic and not customer friendly. Since the last review, staff positions have been added in the Office of University Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, and the Center for Student Financial Aid, to help alleviate these concerns. According to Student Affairs leadership, customer service complaints have declined, lines of students waiting for service have decreased, and student satisfaction has increased. The University, however, understands that customer service is a continuing challenge that needs to be addressed. (CFR 2.10)

The University Library continues to support the curricular programs of the campus, despite a budget in 2007-08 that was less than that of previous years. From interviews with the Library staff, the Team learned that with dwindling resources, the Library has had to focus heavily on the provision of expensive but essential electronic resources, often to the detriment of the

development of the traditional print collection. Electronic database packages from aggregators provide full text journal content across many of the core disciplines that CSULA includes in its curriculum. The Team also noted that staffing levels at the Library have remained stable for years, despite growth in student FTE and curricular programs. The University Library budget was increased by 11.5 percent from 2007-08 to 2008-09. The Team **commends** the Library for its continued development of its information literacy instruction program, which emphasizes critical thinking and outcomes-oriented instruction (CFR 3.6).

Since the last WASC visit, CSULA has made progress in both the organizational structure of the Division of Information Technology Services (ITS) and in the level and extent of services that it provides. Prior to 2003, the University had a division entitled Information Resources Management which was headed by a Vice President reporting directly to the President. This division housed Institutional Research and both academic and administrative computing. In 2003, the position of Vice President for ITS/Chief Technology Officer was created in recognition of the importance of information technology as support to the educational mission of the institution. Under the new organization, Institutional Research and academic computing were moved to Academic Affairs. Information Technology is now managed centrally under Vice President for ITS. Following creation of the University's strategic plan, ITS created its new strategic plan (2008-2013), which is linked to the CSU's System-wide Integrated Technology Strategy, and which establishes initiatives to build a culture of quality technology service based on collegiality.

From a capacity point of view, the campus technology infrastructure is **commendable** (CFR 3.7). Wireless coverage has been fully extended across campus and CSULA is the only CSU

campus to employ the N- and WPHU wireless security standards. The network and systems infrastructure is reliable and available at above industry standards. In addition, ITS supports the educational mission by providing free baseline technology training for all students. Courses include all applications within the Microsoft Office suite, as well as additional applications most used by students such as Adobe Dreamweaver and Flash. Over 75% of all classrooms currently have AV suites installed and the campus has funding in place to complete the "smart classroom" project with 100% of all classrooms targeted to have such technology by the end of the calendar year. CSULA boasts one of the highest averages in terms of number of faculty and staff computers of the CSUs and has a three-year replacement cycle for these computers, supporting the system-wide goal of ensuring that faculty and staff have the tools in place to be productive.

ITS is a willing participant in CSU System-wide technology initiatives as well. These include projects such as replacing the current Learning Management System with a more flexible, reliable product than is currently used, and linking the new system to the ERP system. As one of the first implementers of the CMS (Common Management System) -- the system-wide PeopleSoft ERP system, CSULA was one of the first campuses in the CSU to implement student self-service applications that allow such services as online registration, degree audit, and financial transaction processing. ITS is now working on developing a robust student portal to serve students in a more user-friendly manner. The next CMS project CSULA will be participating in is the creation of a system-wide data warehouse.

Despite these successes, ITS nonetheless faces a number of challenges. The obvious challenge of ensuring ongoing funding to support technology is coupled with human resource constraints, including six unfilled positions (CFR 3.5). In addition, the unit is constrained by compliance

issues forced through unfunded mandates, such as the Accessible Technology Initiative (ATI) and long-term security priorities. While a CSU System-wide security training project will assist in the ITS' pursuit of ensuring information and system security, the campus needed to reorganize its staff to accommodate security requirements because no funding was provided to assist in meeting mandated goals.

Of greater concern as the institution moves towards increased use of data in preparation for its EER, is a need for improving data and information services for its customers (CFRs 3.6 and 3.7). While some describe the CSULA CMS data warehouse as being adequate and useful, many individuals across the campus interviewed during the visit would disagree with this assessment. As an example, many administrators and deans reported they are not able to obtain the data they need, when they need it. This lack of readily available data could affect student success, as an example, because basic information pertaining to high-risk students, which could then be used to engage in timely student intervention, is not easily extracted from the CMS system. Further, CMS reports generated by the Office of the Registrar, and provided to the Schools reportedly arrives too late in the quarter to be helpful. Without adequate training coupled with the creation of easy-to-run queries, operational staff members feel that they do not have the tools to be effective. (CFRs 2.10 and 4.5)

Suggestions:

1. The campus has also convened a new Enrollment Management Steering Committee whose charge is to review all procedures and policies that influence the campus's ability to achieve enrollment targets while maintaining students' access to the classes they need to graduate. These

and other committees and task forces have been created relatively recently and have not yet developed measurable targets they can use to assess their effectiveness. The campus should be careful that the multiple groups created to deal with resource allocation and enrollment management issues operate within a comprehensive planning framework that includes full engagement of leaders from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The visiting team encourages the campus to focus selectively on the most salient efforts and establish benchmarks or goals for these groups soon so that results can be analyzed carefully by the time of the EER in October 2010. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, 2.14, and 4.3)

2. CSULA has also developed significant partnerships with public and private entities that have helped them build joint use buildings that benefit the campus and maintain campus vitality as a side benefit. For the EER, the campus should plan to provide evidence showing how the new buildings and joint projects have benefited the campus and students' educational success. (CFRs 1.2 and 3.5)

3. In the course of meetings with various students and other campus groups, the Team learned of concerns about the current state of maintenance of older campus buildings. To maintain a high level of campus morale, the campus is encouraged to address the perception that inadequate attention is being paid to custodial upkeep of restrooms and other common areas, as well as general maintenance of older buildings. (CFR 3.5)

4. The campus should be sure that efforts at improving enrollment management are consolidated in a campus-wide, comprehensive strategy that engages leaders in all vice presidential areas. (CFR 1.2, 2.10, and 4.1)

5. Although students interviewed by the visiting team expressed appreciation for the quality of the instruction and the support they receive from the faculty in their programs, some described on-going issues with various services, such as a difficulty rectifying discrepancies between scholarship awards and actual disbursements. The Team strongly encourages the campus to conduct new surveys and/or focus groups to produce evidence that the campus has addressed the concerns about student services and determine if the situation has improved. (CFR 2.10)

6. The Team strongly suggests that the campus reexamine funding levels for the University Library, as it appears to be somewhat under funded, particularly in light of campus growth in student FTE and curricular programs. With the pending approval of the EdD program, the Library has received a short-term commitment of funds to support this program; however, the campus is encouraged to identify resources to add to the baseline budget for long-term stable support for this new and expensive program. (CFR 2.2b and 3.6)

7. The Team suggests that the Division of Information Technology Services continue its efforts in area of ensuring and enhancing information security, including ongoing training for faculty, staff and students, in order to ensure campus-wide understanding of the necessity of these important issues and forward progress in these areas. (CFRs 3.6 and 3.7)

8. It is suggested that the concerns related to the availability and accessibility of CMS data (raised by staff, faculty, students and administrators and reiterated in a recent report from the ad hoc Quality Service Committee), should be addressed to assist the campus in preparing for its Educational Effectiveness Review. The Division of Information Technology Services' strategy

to formally collaborate with Institutional Research, Academic Affairs and Student Services will assist the campus in this effort. (CFRs 4.3 and 4.5)

9. Modern ERP systems, by their very nature, are recognized to be highly complex and difficult to use. The Team suggests that simplifying a variety of systems currently in place, such as the GET SA (Student Advisement) tool, as well as adding additional training, support and assistance to all campus constituents (faculty, staff and students) would move the institution forward in its desire to improve student services, a key concern. (CFR 3.7)

10. Although the institution has put in place secure IT systems and a governance process to support them, the Division of Information Technology Services is perceived by its clientele to be slow to respond to requests for assistance. While the team recognizes that there may be many reasons for this perception, it suggests that ITS simplify the process for end users to request IT assistance and services, with a goal of decreasing the cycle time for the delivery of technology services. (CFR 3.7)

ESSAY 4: Planning, Alignment, and Commitment to Learning and Improvement: Being a Teaching and Learning Community

Strategic Planning

Prior to and during the capacity visit, the Team reviewed evidence included in the institution's Strategic Plan Web site, Strategic Plan 2008-2013, Strategic Plan 2002-2007, Strategic Plan 1997-2002, and the CSU System-wide Strategic Plan. The Team also interviewed the Strategic Planning Coordination Committee (SPCC), and held sessions with campus leaders, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the GE Coordinator and Subcommittee, and faculty and

students.   In addition, the Team reviewed evidence that appeared on the CSU System-wide "Analytic Studies" Web site regarding budget allocation, and the Office of Institutional Research (IR) Web site regarding enrollment, retention and graduation. Three instruments related to student success were also reviewed (SNAPS satisfaction survey 2006; NSSE survey 2007; and Collegiate Learning Assessment [CLA] 2007).

CSULA currently has a strategic planning process in place. The strategic planning process, led by the Strategic Planning Coordination Committee, started with the development of mission and value statements and defining the planning process. Data on internal and external trends were collected and internal capability was evaluated. Through campus-wide participation events, goals and strategic initiatives were identified and debated. Further input from the campus constituents was solicited through the Academic Senate, and the goals and initiatives were finalized. The President and Vice Presidents met to allocate resources to divisions that are responsible for implementation of initiatives, and specific action items were developed under each initiative. The University community had the opportunity to learn of final resource allocations. Consistent with the University Strategic Plan, the colleges then developed goals and their own strategic plans with flexibilities needed for specific programs. In order to align administrative units with the goals and initiatives, Institutional Alignment Town Halls Meetings were held. Furthermore, academic departments and programs are required to develop their own Five-Year Strategic Plans. (CFR 4.1-4.3)

The current Strategic Plan (2008-2013) distinguished itself from previous plans in terms of strategic initiatives and budget allocation (CFR 4.2). The University Administration seems to be committed to the funding, and subsequently, to the success of the proposed initiatives, even at a

time of financial uncertainty. The previous WASC visit team suggested that strategic initiatives should connect to assessment activity and budgeting processes. The WASC Commission also suggested a greater buy-in by the campus constituents with a greater understanding of the plan. There is evidence indicating that the University has addressed these issues. It appears that wider participation among campus constituencies has been attempted and accomplished in several, but not in all groups, despite the initial misstep that the strategic plan was drafted without a campus-wide consultation process (CFRs 4.1, and 4.7). The strategic initiatives are indeed connected to the budgeting process (CFR 4.2). The timeline for each initiative has been established.

Although CSULA includes teaching and learning in its plan and assessment is one of its strategic goals, it is less evident, that the connection between strategic initiatives and assessment activities has been established. Performance measurement for the strategic initiatives is yet to be developed (CFR 4.4). Moreover, although it is useful to assess the outcome of previous strategic plans with a follow-up report, the campus did not assess the outcomes of Strategic Plan 2002-2007.

The CSULA CPR Report states that campus planning is aligned with the CSU System-wide Strategic Plan and the Governor's Compact with the CSU. In reviewing the planning alignment with the CSU System Strategic Plan, it is less evident that there is a clear alignment with the Governor's Compact and CSU System-wide Strategic Plan (CFR 4.6). In discussions with campus constituents, it was not clear to the Team that the strategic planning process considered the CSU System Strategic Plan and the Governor's Compact as key elements integrated into the University Strategic Plan. The Campus Strategic Plan was drafted before the current CSU System Strategic Plan, and there was no indication that the previous CSU System Strategic Plan

was considered. Perhaps an exercise linking CSULA strategic initiatives and the CSU System Strategic Plan specifically with documentation on the Strategic Planning Web site would be constructive in addressing the alignment issues. (CFRs 4.1 and 4.2)

There are indications that planning activities can be strengthened at various levels of the campus. For example, equipment purchases could be better coordinated with the move into the Science Building to avoid the lapse in the full utilization of newly occupied space. . A culture of planning can enhance not only the efficient utilization of resources but also foster a more cohesive campus community. (CFR 4.8)

CSULA has a diverse student population, and to a lesser extent, a diverse faculty. Within the student population, more than 62% are female; about half are Hispanic and close to one third are Asian. As to the faculty makeup, 46% are female, 13% Hispanic, and 23% Asian. Although the campus has a progressive record in diversifying its faculty, it can serve as a role model of reflecting its student diversity by increasing female, Asian and Hispanic in the faculty ranks. (CFR 1.5, 3.1, and 3.2)

CSULA has the capacity in strategic planning; the University is **commended** for its effort to identify strategic initiatives with budget allocation.

Suggestions:

1. Establish a system of performance measurement for strategic initiatives to ensure regular monitoring and reporting of progress toward meeting the strategic goals and accountability with periodical evaluation (CFR 4.4).

2. Align University Strategic goals and initiatives more closely with the CSU System Strategic Plan and the Governor's Compact with the CSU. Furthermore, provide evidence in aligning unit strategic plans with the University Strategic Plan (CFR 4.6).

3. Mandate a communication plan to update campus constituencies periodically on the progress of strategic initiatives and goals (CFR 4.1).

Commitment to Learning and Improvement

With regard to planning of and commitment to learning, the Team reviewed the Assessment Policy, Syllabus Policy, GE Web site, and the GE Assessment Plan. The Team also met with campus constituents directly involved in teaching and learning, particularly deans and associate deans, the GE Committee, tenured and tenure-track faculty, and part-time lecturers.

The University has put in place a number of measures to improve teaching and learning. Some of these measures include: mandating the listing of course objectives, and mandating of course and program objectives, or learning outcomes, as well as assessment learning outcomes in all academic programs. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, and 2.4) Other measures include: RTP policies that reward and recognize faculty for their scholarship on teaching, learning and assessment; annual assessment mini-grants; assessment workshops; forums for the discussion of survey and assessment results; and mandating the regular reporting on evidence of student learning, analysis

and improvement. It is noted that the University included "strengthening existing programs based on the learning outcomes assessment" as one of its objectives in the strategic plan. (CFRs 2.4, 2.8, 2.9, and 3.3)

As noted above, the University is in the process of redefining GE goals and learning objectives, as a result of program reviews and a response to a report from external consultants. Several campus-wide conversations led by a GE Committee have been held (CFRs 2.2, 4.1, 4.6, and 4.8). There is optimism among committee members that the University will reach a consensus on a new GE program with a new GE assessment plan. The University is **commended** for its courage, determination and optimism in revamping GE.

In the CPR Report, the University described its effort to use evidence about learning to inform and improve teaching and learning. In a meeting with deans, associate deans, directors and associate directors, the Team observed a widespread concern about the availability of necessary information to make day-to-day academic decisions and inform long term planning efforts. A culture of data sharing is not evident. This could be the root of numerous challenges in academic advising, student degree auditing, transfer evaluation, and registration. (CFRs 2.10, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 4.4, and 4.5)

The University currently relies on adjunct faculty to teach about fifty percent of all courses offered. (CFR 3.1) The number of adjunct faculty now exceeds the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty. At an open forum with adjunct faculty, the Team learned of a widespread concern on inadequacy of classrooms and restrooms, especially in King Hall and Salazar Hall. Adjunct faculty also expressed their concern on the timely preparation of instruction and academic integrity (CFRs 1.7 2.4). The adjunct faculty who attended the forum indicated that they often

were asked to teach a new course on very short notice, some on the first day of instruction, a few hours before the class was to begin. Some also expressed concerns about change-of-grade policies. Given the nature of sensitivity in job security commonly observed in adjunct faculty and the limited number of adjunct faculty who attended the forum, the Team could not determine the prevalence of these challenges on campus, but would like to alert the University to these concerns expressed by adjunct faculty.

In its CPR Report, the University highlighted the progress in academic advising, particularly the assignment of individual faculty to focus on academic advising with course release time (CFR 2.12). The Team considers this new practice to be a step in the right direction that addresses a long-standing challenge in academic advising -- that of reduced student retention and graduation rates. In its interviews with the Academic Senate Executive Committee and deans and directors, the Team learned that there appear to be inconsistencies in course release time granted for faculty who are assigned to focus on academic advising among colleges and units, and that not all faculty members embrace the focused academic advising effort (CFR 2.12 and 3.1). Faculty members do not disagree with the importance of academic advising, but seem to consider it an extra burden on their workload. It is apparent that academic advising affects retention and graduation rates, two areas that have been identified for improvement by university constituencies. To promote student success, the University should foster a culture of engagement in academic advising, either by focused faculty, or faculty in general. (CFR 2.12)

The institution's commitment to teaching and learning is pivotal for student success. The Team believes that the University is committed to teaching and learning. The Team especially

commends the University for what appears to be a strong faculty commitment to teaching and learning.

Suggestion:

The University should engage adjunct faculty in planning at all levels of academic activities, and include and enable them to play a constructive role in defining the University's future (CFRs 3.2 and Guidelines to 3.2, 4.1, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8.).

Quality Assurance and Improvement

The University recognizes the need to develop quality assurance (QA) measures for the purpose of identifying areas for improvements, given the long-standing challenges in student services and student academic success. Financial and operational audits currently are conducted at the system level. The University has internal auditors for specific areas such as financial aid, and engages independent external financial audits for certain operations within the University. The University conducts risk assessments and program reviews consisting of self-studies and external reviews. All programs are required to create strategic plans as well as assessment plans, and to submit annual reports to their respective deans. QA programs are in place for nonacademic and curricular entities. Quality Improvement (QI) Facilitators conduct customer satisfaction surveys, data analyses, support and training. (CFR 4.5)

In reviewing weaknesses identified by campus constituencies, and areas of improvement listed in the CPR Report, the Team has the impression that QA outcomes have not lead to QI, given the long-standing challenges in student services and student academic success. It is not evident that

various units within the University analyze the data collected from QA exercises and apply them

in the decision- making process that eventually lead to significant QI. (CFR 4.4 and 4.7)

Suggestion:

The Team suggests that the University renders QA and QI more systematically, and fosters a

culture of QI at all levels of campus (CFR 4.4)

SECTION III.   MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

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 Team believes that

    for the EE Review the University will be better able to answer key questions, for

    example: What results will you present? What do you want to know and understand

    on student success and learning? How can students demonstrate success? (CFRs 1.2

    and 2.6)

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. (CFRs 1.2 and 2.6)

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. (CFRs

2.10-2.14)

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. (CFRs 2.12-2.14)

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. (CFRs 2.8-2.10)

SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

CSULA's work plan and approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review was contained in the Institutional Proposal and has not changed substantially from what was proposed in 2006. The CPR Report outlines efforts now underway in preparation for the EE Review.

EE research teams have been formed and are now actively engaged. The overall theme of the EE Review will be "Becoming a teaching and learning community by supporting student success and student outcomes." The CPR Report identifies four themes in support of the overall theme. Each theme also includes sample questions to be examined. The CPR Report also indentifies data, reports, etc. that will be analyzed as a part of the EE Review.

In preparation for a successful EE Review, CSULA must address the five recommendations given in Section III above.

APPENDIX

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY
[Summary form for distance education evaluators. A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Evidence based on the information collected may be integrated into the body of the team report as appropriate.]

INSTITUTION: **California State University Los Angeles**

TEAM MEMBER(S)/REVIEWER(S): **Dr. Eileen D. Heveron**

DATES THAT DISTANCE EDUCATION MATERIALS WERE VIEWED:
 April 1, 2009

VIEWED IN CONJUNCTION WITH (check all that apply): **CPR**

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). **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. Courses offered fully online generally number between 10 and 15 per quarter and approximately the same number are offered as hybrid courses, combining in class and online mediation . Information for FTE enrollment or average class size was not obtained. Approximately one third of the faculty at CSULA use the Learning Management System (LMS) to distribute their syllabi, list Library reserves, and provide other learning resources to their students, and this use of the LMS offerings encompassed 400 courses in**

Winter quarter 2009.

DESCRIPTION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION INTERACTIONS (what was viewed, description of formats, other details to help describe nature and context of the review):

One fully online course offered this term was reviewed. The format was a basic, text based online offering which included all course module units for the entire quarter. The course syllabi followed the University policy requirements and provided full contact information, course description, student conduct expectations and grading rubric. One hybrid course was reviewed and followed the same format.

OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED OR PERSONS INTERVIEWED CONCERNING DISTANCE EDUCATION (prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit):

Three faculty members who teach online were interviewed during the visit concerning distance and online education, including one from the BA in Fire Protection program. These faculty members provided detailed descriptions of the nature of their programs or courses, how they had come to use technology mediation in course delivery, and their experiences with student achievement of learning outcomes in the online vs. traditional formats. In addition, staff who support online and distance education from Information Technology and from Academic Affairs were interviewed. Finally, two websites developed for training and supporting faculty in their efforts to use technology in their courses were reviewed. The first site, Faculty Development services, includes assistance with pedagogical, social, classroom management and the like. The second, ELearning Programs, assists faculty in using technology to support their teaching.

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address		Check (X)
each of the following. Representative CFRs		**here if**
are noted in each cell below.		**follow-up**
	Observations and Findings	**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)	**From an IT infrastructure view, the current platform is stable with no extensive downtime reported. However, the learning platform (WebCT/Blackboard) is currently being evaluated at the CSU System Level, as the System institutions have found the vendor to be inflexible and not service-friendly; CSULA is participating in this initiative. Faculty have the opportunity to explore a variety of selected vendors in a "sandbox" environment at this time. The current system allows text based chat sessions, but does not allow e-chat sessions where audio and video interactions occur and is not perceived as being extensively conducive to dialogue.**	
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)	**Students are able to perform many administrative transactions online in a fairly new self-service environment. Faculty who use the LMS appear to provide all appropriate student learning resources such as library resource links and online tutoring center links in their syllabi. The institution provides a pre-assessment survey for all students considering taking an online course, as well as a number of written training materials for**	

	students to use as they attend their online courses. The fully online course that was visited during this review provided students with a good understanding of the amount of time they should expect to spend weekly in the course in order to set expectations for the work involved. Finally, the institution provides an extensive array of free hands-on technology training courses for all students.	
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)	**Distance learning faculty are not distinguished from regular tenure track or contract part time faculty. They just happen to teach online or choose to deliver their courses at this institution using technology in part or all. For example, one faculty member interviewed began teaching two courses fully online when the student enrollment in these courses dropped below sustainable levels. By offering the courses online, this full time tenure track faculty member is able to maintain a full teaching load, with an appropriate average class size in these courses, and serve the entire CSU system through these course offerings.**	
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)	**The institution describes its participation in the evaluation of new LMS systems as described above in its CPR report. The creation of the eLearning Program lab and services such as Media Sites to assist faculty in adoption and use of technology in the classroom, whether on ground or virtual, is further**	

	evidence of the institution's commitment to building capacity regarding online and distance learning.	
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 discussion concerning adoption of Distance learning and other online or technology mediated delivery at the campus appears to be more about the potential to save money as opposed to using these methods because of data derived from best practices in the teaching-learning community. The BA in Fire Administration was the initial user of distance technologies in the early 1980s, and its use was derived from data that demonstrated their students were spread far and wide, with unique work schedules in the far reaches of the state that would preclude them from coming to a campus. Additional use of technology in the Aviation program addressed the same student-based constraint issue. In other words, the institution is at the very early stages of exploring distance learning relative to its mission and structures and is currently looking to determine the exact fit that will work for its students and faculty.**	
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)	**Because the institution is at the very initial stages of exploring the use of technology in the classroom and for distance learners, it has not yet developed robust data analysis models in this area. As well, it has not yet explored techniques that are used more routinely in online education to captivate students and**	

| | encourage their learning. As it moves more toward technology adoption, the institution would be well served by including a plan for assessing educational effectiveness in this area. | |

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 distance education courses and programs.