

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM  
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

To California State University East Bay

16 – 19 October 2007  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Chair

Mary Kay Tetreault, Provost Emerita  
Portland State University

Assistant Chair

Beverlee B. Anderson, Professor of Business  
California State University San Marcos

Team Members

Lisa M. Beardsley, Associate Director, Dept. of Education  
Adventist Accrediting Association  
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Peter J. Gray, Director of Academic Assessment  
U. S. Naval Academy

Kathi A. Ketcheson, Director Institutional Research and Planning  
Portland State University

Xavier Eduardo Romano, Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students  
Knox College

Jerome B. Walker, Associate Provost  
University of Southern California

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Section I – Overview and Context</b>                                                                        |           |
| <b>1A - Description of Institution and Visit</b>                                                               | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>1B – Quality of Educational Effectiveness Presentation</b>                                                  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>1C - Preparatory Review Update</b>                                                                          | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Section II – Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness</b>                                                    |           |
| <b>IIA – Evaluation of Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry</b>                                     | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>IIA (1) – Academic Quality – Program Review</b>                                                             | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>IIA (2) – Academic Quality – General Education</b>                                                          | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IIA (3) – Academic Quality – Multiculturalism</b>                                                           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>IIA (4) – Student Success – Advising &amp; Retention</b>                                                    | <b>23</b> |
| <b>IIA (5) – Campus Climate</b>                                                                                | <b>26</b> |
| <b>IIA (6) – Strategic Planning for New Era</b>                                                                | <b>27</b> |
| <b>IIA (7) – Faculty Issues</b>                                                                                | <b>31</b> |
| <b>IIB – Evaluation of the Institution’s Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Results</b> | <b>36</b> |
| <b>Section III – Summary of Conclusions and Major Recommendations</b>                                          | <b>37</b> |

## SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

### IA – Description of Institution and Visit

California State University East Bay (CSUEB) is a comprehensive Category II Master's institution that awards mostly baccalaureate degrees. Hayward, located above San Francisco Bay is the location of the main campus. CSUEB's Concord Campus in central Contra Costa County offers upper division and graduate instruction to more than 1,500 students. Professional development and certificate programs are also offered at its leased CSUEB Oakland Professional Development and Conference Center. The institution, under its current and prior names, has been accredited by WASC since 1961.

The University has experienced a recent change in leadership. Shortly after his arrival, President Mohammad Qayoumi initiated a series of town hall meetings, which resulted in the articulation of a *Framework for the Future*, mandates that guide the implementation of the university's mission, vision and values. The University has curtailed its international programs (offered under Systems Review approval), which now include only a Moscow international MBA program. This program was reviewed by a WASC team in 2005.

The current FTE enrollment of CSUEB is approximately 10,500, which includes headcounts of 10,303 undergraduate students and slightly fewer than 2,400 graduate students. Females comprise approximately two thirds of the student headcount and males approximately one-third. The students are ethnically diverse but with substantial differences between the undergraduate and graduate enrollments. The largest proportion

(slightly less than 29%) of undergraduates is identified as Asian/Pacific Islanders, followed by white (non-Hispanic) at 25%. Hispanics are approximately 14%, Black, non-Hispanic approximately 13% and non-resident aliens, slightly less than 6%. In contrast, the largest number of graduate enrollments, slightly less than 30%, are White followed by Asian/Pacific Islanders (~21%), non-resident aliens (~15%), Blacks (~10%) and Hispanics (~9%). The undergraduate and graduate programs are attracting slightly different populations.

The university is fortunate to have a dedicated and diverse faculty who are committed to teaching a diverse student body, conducting scholarly research, participating in service to the university, and engaging in community service, all while carrying the high teaching load of 12 WTUs per quarter. In Fall 06, there were 306 tenured or tenured track faculty. Faculty hired on the tenure track are required to have the appropriate terminal degree in hand. For about 95% of the faculty this means a doctoral degree. Faculty in the arts have MFAs or other approved master's degrees.

The seven-member WASC team visited California State University East Bay from October 16 – 19, 2007, for the purpose of conducting the Educational Effectiveness Review, which constitutes the third phase of the three-part WASC accreditation review process. Two members of the team were responsible for the visit to the Concord campus on October 16 and all seven members were engaged in the visit to the Hayward Hills campus (October 17-19). There were no visits to the international location.

California State University East Bay conducted a complete and extensive self-study that was responsive to recommendations from the previous visiting team and WASC Commission. The entire campus was engaged in the process through

participation in town hall meetings, answering surveys, planning, and myriad associated activities.

### **IB – Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Presentation and Alignment with the Proposal**

Based on the 2005 visiting team and commission recommendations, CSUEB revised and reduced the number of themes from those presented in the 2003 proposal. The EE presentation, entitled “The Next 50 Years: New Standards for a New Era: WASC Educational Effectiveness Report,” aligned three Educational Effectiveness Themes (Academic Quality, Campus Climate and Student Success) with the seven strategic planning mandates voiced in the President’s *Framework for the Future*. The presentation was based on five research studies conducted by the University to demonstrate it is accomplishing “its purposes and achieving its educational objective” (CR 4.1, 4.7, 4.8). The report was well written and gave extensive reference to the activities undertaken since the last review. The conclusion of the EE Report focused on institutional capacity to sustain “a new era.” Each of the five chapters introduced research questions, methods, results, reflection and discussion of results and actions both taken and planned. The sections on results contained data obtained through survey and direct measures of student learning and in several cases, disaggregated data by demographic variables. All required tables and data were supplied to the team prior to the visit and the team was provided with many additional updated supporting documents while on campus.

## **IC – Preparatory Review Update**

### **IC (1) - Implementation of University-wide Strategic Plans**

Both the Commission and the previous WASC teams expressed concern about the various planning efforts by CSUEB (CR 4.4, 4.6, 4.7) that lacked follow-through. The University has engaged in a variety of planning efforts, the latest being the Seven Strategic Planning Mandates. The EE report (p. 3) states that these mandates will “drive all future university efforts including resource allocation and accountability.” Evidence that resource allocation and priority decisions are guided by these seven mandates will demonstrate that CSUEB is implementing its plans and is meeting the requirements of WASC Standard 4.

#### **Commitment to the Implementation of University Plans**

##### **a. Lines of Communication and coordination**

The new leadership team appears to be committed to transparent lines of communication among the various campus constituencies. The President’s Inaugural Message was widely disseminated and the EE Report describes several efforts by the university to improve and coordinate communication (EE Report, pp. 39-40) on campus and with stakeholders (CFR 4.1).

##### **b. Institution-wide Data Collection and Analysis**

Since the last WASC visit, the institution has developed and implemented five research studies (EE Report p. 3). There is evidence of some preliminary analyses of a variety of data involving student learning outcomes and the University recognizes that work remains to “integrate and coordinate evidence and use it to inform program decisions” (EE Report p. 11) (CR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7).

## **IC (2) – Multiculturalism**

In its mission statement, CSUEB commits to a “multicultural learning experience” and “multicultural competence.” However, the 2005 WASC team found that the university had not demonstrated multiculturalism “as a key value or cornerstone of the educational experience of CSUEB” (Commission Action Letter 2005, p. 6). The EE Report (pp. 23-24) addresses the work CSUEB has undertaken with regard to multiculturalism. The results indicate that there are differing views of multiculturalism. Undergraduate programs are reported to promise “substantially more multicultural content . . . than graduate [programs]” (EE Report p.22). Almost twice as many courses have an international content compared to multicultural U.S. – and even fewer courses address gender or sexual orientation (p. 22). While the EE Report states that there will be continued discussions and workshops on competencies, assessments and integration (p. 24), there is no evidence of a consensus definition of what multiculturalism means at CSU East Bay. The team acknowledges the challenges of reaching consensus but until it is clearly defined, it will difficult to develop goals or assess evidence of student learning beyond student self report that they feel prepared “to live and work in a diverse society” (p. 20).

## **IC (3) – Workload Issues**

The previous WASC team and Commission were concerned about the decline in the number of faculty (CR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3), which resulted in increased workload for the remaining faculty. Increased class sizes, governance responsibilities and scholarly expectations (CFR 2.8) were reported to place heavy burden faculty (CR 3.3). The EE Report notes that there has been a net increase of 20 full-time faculty from fall 2004 to

Fall 2006 and that 27 tenure-track searches were completed during the 2006-2007 academic year. The report notes that the Provost has also authorized 43 more tenure-track searches during 2007-2008. These are clearly important steps in reducing the workload for faculty and increase capacity to meet the demands of a growing enrollment. The report also states that the University is currently studying how workload is distributed and efforts are underway to clarify expectations regarding promotion and tenure. The staff workload has also eased with the addition of 75 additional positions since fall 2004 (EE Report p. 42).

#### **IC (4) - Concord Campus**

The Concord Campus was seen as a valuable but underutilized resource by the 2005 visiting team. The EE Report states that the Concord Strategic Plan, which was completed in March 2006, is being reviewed and that consultants have calculated the constraints that will impact the 386 acres (EE Report p. 44). The Report also indicates that the new President has taken initial steps to improve communication between the Concord and Hayward campuses.



## **SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

### **IIA – Evaluation of the Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry**

The team considered evidence of Educational Effectiveness according to the priorities identified by CSUEB in its Self Study, i.e., program review, general education, multiculturalism, advising/retention, campus climate and strategic planning. The team met with a broad spectrum of the CSUEB community. In addition to the materials provided to the team prior to the visit, the team also reviewed updated documents and attended a poster session that captured the entire assessment process. The posters, which were previously used by the institution at Fall Convocation to educate the campus community to the assessment process, outlined the processes used and gave illustrations of program assessment and actions taken or planned based on the assessment results.

CSUEB approached the Effectiveness Review focused on student learning and how the institution could improve through the assessment process. The team frequently heard that activities undertaken were done for themselves, not for WASC. There was great enthusiasm about how much they had accomplished in the past two and one-half years. The fast-paced changes involved the entire community and were supported by the leadership of the institution. Those involved in the processes were proud of their work and were enthusiastic in sharing their activities, frustrations, and successes with the WASC team.

#### **IIA (1) Academic Quality – Program Review**

Chapter 1 of the CSUEB WASC Educational Effectiveness Report is intended to answer the question “In what ways is the new Program Review Process effective in

evaluating academic quality and student learning?” Conversations with a wide variety of faculty members and administrators provided the WASC review team with insights that allowed us to verify the results, to identify areas where new information has become available since the report was finalized, and to draw conclusions and recommendation for the future.

CSU East Bay is to be commended for the comprehensive revision of the program review process, which is embedded in the “CAPR 9” guidelines. The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) serves as a policy arm of the Academic Senate by establishing guidelines that require examination of expectations for student learning, data on student learning outcomes (SLOs), implementation of program improvements made in response to the assessment process, and examination of how program currency and effectiveness is maintained. In addition to Section 2.7 of the WASC standards (Program review), the Revised Five Year Program Review Process (CAPR 9) is described as meeting the following standards’ sections: CFR 2.1 Degree program content, CFR 2.2 Student achievement, CFR 2.4 Shared expectations for student learning, CFR 2.5 Students involved in learning, CFR 2.6 Student learning outcomes, CFR3.4 Faculty development, CFR 4.4 Quality assurance, CFR 4.6 Improvement based on assessment, and CFR 4.7 Improvement of teaching and learning. (It should be noted that Appendix II of the Capacity-preparatory Report briefly responds to the CFRs that CSUEB was not able to cover, or cover adequately, in its self-study process.)

As described in the Effectiveness Report, after a thorough review of the previous CAPR process, the revised process (CAPR 9) now serves as “a deliberate set of quality assurance processes for program evaluation, a clear policy, procedures and set of

practices for gathering and analyzing evidence of the commitment of the leadership to make improvements based on the results of the processes.” This resulted in six significant changes (1) required student learning results, (2) student learning outcomes rubric, (3) coordinated external review, (4) 5-year program plan including projected tenure track needs, (5) two accountability processes (Memorandum of Understanding and annual reports), and (6) recommendations. The Educational Effectiveness self-study related to the new program review process was guided by four questions and the answers to these questions are embedded in the results section of the report.

The Committee also serves a strong advisory role in reviewing every program review before referring it to the full Academic Senate for concurrence and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost. CAPR met weekly during the 2005-2006 academic year and reviewed reports from 22 programs. In 2006-2007, CAPR met biweekly and reviewed 10 programs. This is an extremely heavy use of faculty time in a good cause, and the long-term burden on the faculty, especially the CAPR chair needs to be considered. The chair needs more time for very important meetings with deans and department chairs who are embarking on self-studies and with chairs, deans, and the provost regarding the development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).

The CAPR 9 guidelines instituted post-review Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 2006-2007. Six MOUs have been completed that entail a signed understanding between the Provost, the dean of the school, and the program chair. The potential link between program review and long-term budget planning is very promising, and the requirement for an annual report of progress in implementing changes is to be commended. A very strong incentive for future cooperation in writing annual reports is

that the reports are a pre-condition for requesting additional budget allocations, especially for additional tenure-track faculty position. MOUs need to be reviewed several years from now to determine whether they are effective in forming a bridge between 5-year reviews.

Several concerns related to the future implementation of the program review process arose in WASC visiting team discussions with CSU East Bay faculty. The first is the need to involve College Deans more deeply in the process. Prior to CAPR 9 deans were generally not actively engaged in CAPR's discussions of their programs. This pattern is changing dramatically as a result of the requirement for post-review MOUs, but one example was provided of a dean who felt concern at the conclusion of a review, because he/she was negotiating future resources for one program somewhat in isolation of the needs of several other programs in the school. It is suggested that CAPR 9 guidelines be modified to explicitly encourage deans to meet with department chairs before the self-study begins in order to identify special issues that need attention in the program's self-study.

The direct involvement of the provost in the discussions of proposed MOUs also communicates their importance and provides a strong link between program review (i.e., assessment), strategic planning, and budgeting. In addition, the new cabinet level position for Planning and Enrollment Management, as well as the new University Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Committee (UPABC) provide the organization structures needed to facilitate the use of assessment results in the decision making process.

A second concern that has been expressed to the Visiting Team by CSU East Bay faculty and deans is the need for CAPR to consider using more than one external

reviewer for a program review. Insights into changes in disciplines, judgments on the effectiveness of the curriculum in covering important topics, and assessment of the scholarly productivity of peers in sub-disciplines are not as likely to be effectively assessed by a single person as they could be assessed by at least two, and preferably three external reviewers.

The new rubrics for external program review and student learning outcomes assessment are very well constructed. They provide clear and specific guidance for these important processes. In addition to their use in the program review process, they can serve other useful functions, that is, they provide a rich local resource of best practices in both the general and specific aspects of program reviews as well as examples of methods for gathering direct evidence of student learning.

In addition, the implementation of the student learning outcomes assessment rubrics will result in the availability of direct evidence of student learning that could facilitate the horizontal and vertical integration of outcomes. Such integration would make possible the use of direct evidence of student learning in planning and budgeting at the departmental, school/college, and institutional level. And having an integrated, articulated set of learning outcomes would provide the basis for a consistent message on the attributes and capabilities of graduate that can be shared with all of the CSUEB stakeholders including faculty and staff, prospective and current students and the parents, potential employers, and the broader community.

The third concern is that the focus on student learning outcomes was not a major emphasis of program review prior to CAPR 9, and it is a challenge to help program faculty and staff learn how to conduct effective and efficient assessments. At present,

there is considerable variability in the quality of student learning outcome statements and, subsequently, in the use of direct evidence of student learning (either qualitative or quantitative) to inform judgments about the accomplishment of outcomes. It was noted that CSUEB has been through one cycle of student learning outcomes assessment and it is now time to reflect on the lessons learned from that experience and to move to the next level of implementation.

It is encouraging to see that CAPR along with other offices such as Faculty Development and Institutional Research and Assessment are set to provide workshops and consultation to help faculty members and staff in support offices develop clear and concise statements of desired knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Holding such events such as poster sessions and faculty colloquia and posting examples of best assessment practices on the CAPR web site are excellent ways to assist colleagues across disciplines and create a vibrant culture of learning.

In conclusion, CSUEB has developed and begun to implement an exemplary process of program review in CAPR 9. This process can form the basis for sustaining the continued improvement of the academic programs and can provide invaluable information for local and institutional planning and resource allocation.

**Recommendations:**

1. Review the adequacy of administrative support provided by the Academic Senate for CAPR chair.
2. Review MOUs several years from now to determine whether they are effective in forming a bridge between 5-year reviews.

3. Modify the CAPR 9 guidelines to explicitly encourage deans to meet with department chairs before the self-study begins in order to identify special issues that need attention in the program's self-study.
4. Consider using more than one external reviewer for a program review, since programs are not as likely to be effectively assessed by a single person as by at least two, and preferably three, external reviewers.
5. Provide a vertically and horizontally integrated and articulated set of learning outcomes as the basis for a consistent message on the attributes and capabilities of graduates that can be shared with all of the CSUEB stakeholders including faculty and staff, prospective and current students and the parents, potential employers, and the broader community.
6. Reflect on the lessons learned from the first cycle of student learning outcomes assessment and move to the next level of implementation.

#### **IIA (2) Academic Quality – General Education**

General education, particularly at the freshman level, is well-developed and includes a well-thought out process for assessing student learning. Evidence from materials provided by the institution and interviews with students during the campus visit have confirmed that freshman clusters create a positive learning experience for students and support the university's efforts in recruiting and retaining growing numbers of freshmen. Interviews with faculty members who teach in general education demonstrated the energy and commitment they have devoted to creating this experience for students. Faculty members involved in the general education curriculum should be commended for their hard work and commitment to student learning.

While most aspects of the curriculum seem to be working well, there was some indication that integration of general education into an overall approach to undergraduate learning was still an issue for the campus. A quotation from one faculty member supports this impression: "...I am not convinced that G.E. is fully integrated into the business, ethos, and daily work of being a CSUEB professor. There is a sense of G.E. as an "alien" presence, and G.E. prerogatives remain largely misunderstood across the university." Research conducted by the general education learning community suggests that there is a lack of clarity in the course approval process, so that many faculty members may be unaware that a course counts for general education as well as for major requirements. This has implications for student learning and assessment in these courses. Both faculty and students would benefit from a clearer identification of courses having a general education component.

WASC CFR 2.4, suggests that "...faculty take collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment" of expectations for learning. In order to articulate learning outcomes for general education and develop direct measures of their assessment, the faculty formed a learning community in which ideas could be debated and shared. This effort should be commended for its success in articulating clear and measurable student learning outcomes for general education. Along with this, evidence was provided to the visiting team that the major disciplines or departments have well-developed assessment efforts underway. But, it should be noted that the team was not able to identify a link between the learning that occurs in general education with other parts of the curriculum. While this is not unusual, the university should take the opportunity to begin conversations that would lead to a clearer and more



consistent articulation of the expectations for learning and measures of success for undergraduate students across the curriculum.

Although the university has not articulated a specific set of institutional learning goals, interviews with faculty senate members suggested the general education goals serve this purpose, and that the responsibility for assessment of these goals resides with the general education faculty. This suggests, again, that general education is not fully integrated with the other parts of the curriculum and that the collective responsibility suggested by WASC has not been fully embraced. Generally, assessment appears to be more focused on faculty and course as the units of analysis, and less on directly on students and student learning.

The campus has made laudable progress toward identifying learning outcomes in general education and the disciplines, and is poised to begin conversations around the articulation and demonstration of expectations for learning across the curriculum. In view of the extensive documentation displayed in the assessment posters prepared by each academic unit, the team feels that substantial evidence exists to begin an analysis of both the general education and disciplinary outcomes that could result in the identification of a common set of expectations for all undergraduates. During the campus interviews, the team was unable to find agreement on what a CSUEB student or graduate is expected to know or be able to do as a result of his or her education. In the team's view, these common expectations would allow undergraduate to see the different parts of the curriculum—general education, majors, electives—as forming a whole, and to develop an understanding of what it means to be a CSUEB student. These expectations should be communicated in language that could be understood by students, so that they can easily

recognize where expectations occur in their undergraduate studies and how and where they will be assessed.

The high percentage of transfer students among undergraduates poses particular issues for general education and assessment at CSUEB. CFR 2.14 addresses the need for transfer students to have clear and consistent information about policies and requirements. In interviews with a variety of groups, the team heard a consistent message that the 12 required credits of general education at the upper-division are viewed as providing adequate assessment of student learning for transfer students. This again seems to reinforce the separation of general education from the rest of the curriculum, and may result in students regarding these courses simply as a hurdle on the way to the degree, rather than part of an integrated CSUEB education. Consideration should be given to provision of more directed general education offerings in the sophomore year, as part of the effort to improve student retention and degree completion. In addition, consideration should be given to developing a particular curricular focus on the needs of transfer students in their junior or senior year. Another issue concerns the involvement of faculty in teaching general education. Many general education courses are taught by adjunct rather than tenure-track faculty, although some of these adjuncts have become tenure-track faculty over time. As numbers of tenure related faculty increase, academic units must consider how to deploy these faculty members to teaching general education courses.

### **Recommendations:**

1. Develop a method for clearer identification of courses that count as both major and general education credits.
2. Initiate campus conversations about how general education can be integrated into the broader undergraduate curriculum, and how the assessment of learning goals can be more consistent across the curriculum.
3. Increase focus on transfer students; development of general education clusters at the sophomore level and a curricular focus on the needs of transfer juniors and seniors.
4. Develop strategies to increase the involvement of tenure-related faculty in teaching general education courses.

### **IIA (3) Academic Quality – Multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism continues to be an important aspect of the mission of CSU East Bay and a focus of campus discussions and efforts (CFR 1.2, 1.5). Many individuals, offices and committees are involved in studying and implementing “multiculturalism,” from integration in the curriculum to student life activities that provide a forum for engagement, dialogue, and reflection with culturally different others. The EE Report states that CSUEB has defined “multiculturalism in terms of people and course offerings.” (p. 19) Student *learning outcomes* and *campus climate* are more recent components of multiculturalism at CSUEB. The *people* in this statement include students, faculty and staff; the term, *offerings*, has been expanded to include both curricular and co-curricular activities. Both *people* and *offerings* are addressed in the CSUEB Diversity Plan: A Blueprint for Action. Recruiting and retaining a diverse

workforce is one element of the diversity plan. An Academic Senate committee, Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC), is focused on the *people* aspect of multiculturalism (CFR 3.11). This committee studies, reports and makes recommendations on “issues relevant to increasing faculty diversity.”

Two offices concerned with the recruiting, hiring, orientation, and development of a diverse faculty are the Provost’s Office and the Office of Faculty Development. These offices and the FDEC have developed guidelines and templates for faculty recruitment and hiring. They have also presented workshops on diversity in faculty hiring that all members of search committees are required to attend (CFR 3.3). Aggregate numbers show that the faculty of CSUEB is the third most diverse of the four-year campuses in California and in the top five CSU campuses for the percent of African-American and Asian faculty. The Hispanic faculty, at 7%, does not place it among one of the top CSUs for Hispanic faculty. This diversity, while impressive, is not evenly distributed across all disciplines and departments. There is also differing opinion about including international faculty in faculty diversity numbers. For example, African-Americans and black Africans are both classified as “Black.”

While there is no committee that deals directly with hiring a diverse staff, the Student Services division personnel communicated to the team the practice of hiring counseling and other staff to be representative of the students served (CFR 2.13). Enrollment management and other offices of student services reported their efforts to recruit a diverse population of students. These efforts have been successful based on the student demographics and comments by student leaders.

Multicultural campus “offerings” include both curricular and co-curricular activities. The Cultural Groups and Women Committee is focused on curricular issues (CFR 3.11), while those involved in student life, campus housing, and other student services focus on co-curricular activities (CFR 2.11). The University undertook a content analysis of courses and programs to assess the coverage of multiculturalism. The results, as expected, varied greatly across programs.

The meaning, goals and assessment rubrics of “multiculturalism” vary across campus. One of the major differences in meaning is between areas where the focus is *international*, which the EE Report (p. 24) states is the preferred approach, and the focus on dimensions of multiculturalism in the U.S. For example, the College of Business and Economics focuses almost entirely on global and international aspects, referring to the diversity of their faculty, its curricular focus on global competition, and an emphasis on cross-cultural understanding. This contrasts with other units which focus almost entirely on U.S. multicultural issues of under-representation, racism, discrimination, social justice and gender issues. Some see that exposure to the very diversity of the people at CSUEB in itself provides the necessary conditions for the development of multicultural competency, while other units and departments are dedicated to study of facets of multiculturalism, such as Ethnic Studies and Women’s Studies. The literature program, for example, is considering enrichment of its discipline by instituting literature courses and programs focused on the literature of a diversity of cultures.

There is also a difference in approaches to multiculturalism. For example, in the College of Business and Economics there was awareness of multicultural diversity in students, co-curricular activities and clubs, and of the value of securing a diverse faculty,

but there was not a systematic, deliberate, coordinated effort on the part of faculty or reflected in the curriculum and outcomes assessments as to evidence of multicultural competence. Likewise, the business and economics faculty indicated an awareness of and general support for the values of social responsibility and social justice, but there was a lack of consensus about what it meant, how it would be assessed as Student Learning Outcomes, and what it would mean for the curriculum in business beyond a “global business perspective.” It should be noted however, that survey data discussed in the Evidence Narrative for the BS in Business Administration revealed “little global orientation” among students and spurred creation of a new course in global economics and a new option, Global Management. These are indicators that faculty are reflecting on evidence of student learning and closing the loop by modifying the curriculum and learning experiences but there was not a systematic, deliberate, coordinated effort on the part of faculty or reflected in the curriculum and outcomes assessments as to evidence of multicultural competence. Here as elsewhere throughout the campus, a broadly shared understanding is essential for the development of university-wide multicultural goals and appropriate assessment activities.

**Recommendations:**

1. Engage the faculty and student services personnel in a systematic, deliberate, and coordinated effort to define multicultural competence.
2. Insure that multicultural goals are reflected in the curriculum (GE and the major) and co-curricular activities.

3. Demonstrate that students have achieved these multicultural competencies by assessing student learning outcomes in this area.

#### **IIA (4) Student Success – Advising and Retention**

The team found wide-spread enthusiasm for the new administration, including creation of the Office of Vice President for Planning and Enrollment Management, which has infused the campus with a new energy regarding growth through new enrollment and increased retention. Early indicators are that the campus has moved forward into taking actions in deliberate, strategic ways. Disaggregated data, for example, identified higher attrition rates for African-American and Hispanic males. The team found discussion and ideas about the reasons for the attrition, but specific plans to ameliorate it were not yet formulated or funded.

The University catalog contained information about orientation and advising, faculty office hours, and how to receive course requirement information. Survey data showed the catalog, web, and handouts to be used by nearly all students, and “over 80% reported using their department or program including the Student Information Lobby for academic advising.” Altogether, 15 separate locations on campus were identified in the Campus Climate Survey as providing student advisement (Self Study, p 26, 2006-2008 Catalog, pp. 50-51, CFR 2.12).

First-year retention has improved by means of Freshman Learning Communities that group students with shared interests and career objectives into clusters of thematically-linked courses in the Humanities, Natural Sciences or Social Sciences. The

work on the reconstitution of Sophomore Learning Communities has similar retention goals.

The increase in the number of tenure-track faculty (who are expected to maintain a minimum of 3 hours of office hours each week), increased length of academic advisement appointments from 15 to 30 minutes, enhancement of physical plant, increased collaboration across campus, and greater engagement of faculty around direct measures of student performance by means of program reviews and MOUs are indicators of an overall increase in institutional capacity to sustain campus enrollment and retention efforts.

In the view of student representatives, the greatest need of the campus is to improve retention and success of current students through timely and accurate academic and financial counseling, mentoring by senior students, addressing the reasons for attrition (especially in the sophomore year), upgrading the learning environment and resources of the library, and enriching student life on campus. The diversity of the campus was viewed as a factor contributing to making students from diverse backgrounds feel like they belonged at CSUEB, although a need to better integrate and support international students was identified as an issue. Career development was also identified as an area lacking accountability for effectively serving students with assistance ranging from on-campus work opportunities, internships, and facilitating recruiting by “big name companies such as CISCO, Apple, Silicon Valley and not Target or local businesses.”

In some cases (e.g., the College of Business) efforts to increase and sustain capacity for providing quality education on the main campus, including advisement of majors, has meant a reduction in certain types of activities such as closure of the



Transnational Executive MBA (TEMBA) and the MBA program in Singapore and all other sites except for Moscow. The College of Business elected not to reapply for a System Approval for Off-campus international programs in conjunction with the Educational Effectiveness Review. Instead, the new dean and faculty report they are focusing efforts on preparing for the AACSB accreditation review, recruiting and mentoring more tenure-track faculty to “increase faculty bandwidth,” and strengthening the Hayward-campus undergraduate program. Future activities of the College of Business will be “more strategic” and whether that will include expanding to international sites or offering programs at the Oakland Center remain yet to be determined within the context of what it means to make a contribution to the region.

The team commends the administration, faculty and student services personnel for taking a wholistic, developmental approach to the student in counseling vs. academic advisement that is limited to what course to take to meet minimum requirements (CFR 2.11, 2.12). We also commend the administration and faculty for addressing retention by means of the Student Success Assessment Committee that fosters a team-based approach and accountability for enhanced retention of students (CFR 2.10).

**Recommendations:**

1. Make academic advisement a priority with adequate funding for staff and training of departmental faculty, especially new faculty.
2. Provide timely advisement for transfer students from student support services and the faculty.

3. Provide timely and accurate advisement at critical periods such as the freshman to sophomore year and for juniors prior to their senior year to ensure that students are retained and graduate on time.

## **IIA (5) -- Campus Climate**

Changes in the campus climate could be divided into a “Pre-Mo Era” and “Mo Era,” the latter of which is characterized by excitement, enthusiasm, and a can-do attitude that permeates all levels of the university community. The University has engaged in a thorough self-examination through *The Campus Climate Survey*, beginning in the fall of 2005 and to be repeated every three years. The results survey many aspects of the university’s environment. With participation by faculty, staff, and students, this *Campus Climate Survey* was intended to create wide-spread institutional ownership and to accurately reflect the needs, concerns, expectations, and dreams of the University “community.” The word “community” is intentionally used as it is intended to evoke a real engagement of the comprehensive community that is defined as California State University, East Bay. This instrument addresses institutional diversity (CFR 1.5) and CSUEB planning and decision-making that is informed by a body of evidence and data (CFR 4.3) and institutional research (CFR 4.5).

The excitement and danger of such an important and comprehensive university instrument is that participation levels will correlate with “action.” In other words, the ability to implement campus climate changes based on this data will result in higher expectations and therefore a higher participation rate in two years. It should be noted that an initial 17.4% response rate is commendable given the “Pre-Mo Era” in which the instrument was developed and given.

The future of Campus Climate is no doubt linked to the exciting change that is apparent on the campus. Excitement is contagious and the changes that have come to this campus, borne in part by attending to the results of the *Campus Climate Survey* have created high expectations on the part of the faculty, staff, and students. The team found a new climate characterized by strategic planning, engaged and thoughtful leadership, new levels of institutional transparency that moves all along community lines, and an understanding that communication is ultimately key in organizational change. Much responsibility rests – whether right or wrong – on the shoulders of this new administration to realize the possibilities in, as the students say, “The Mo Era!”

**Recommendations:**

1. Repeat the Campus Climate Survey every three years as planned.
2. Continue the use of data and careful planning for follow through with appropriate and visible actions.

**IIA (6) --Strategic Planning for New Era**

Implementation of strategic planning and clearer direction for the Concord campus were two of the four capacity issues cited in response to CSUEB’s Capacity and Preparatory Review in spring 2005. The campus responded to the Commission’s concern by developing and adopting a new list of University Goals and Objectives adopted in May 2006. In addition to the town hall meetings and seven mandates, President Qayoumi, because of declining enrollment and budget deficits, put improvements in services to students on the “fast track” with subsequent increases in enrollment and financial stability. Other related improvements were increases in the number of tenure

track faculty, and improvements in the physical conditions of the campus, such as new signage and renovations of every classroom.

Factors that bode well for continued success in further planning and implementation are creating a framework and structure for planning; improving data collection and analysis; developing inclusive processes of communication and participation; placing academic planning at the core; bringing planning, budgeting and assessment together; initiating divisional planning throughout the university; and instituting a transparent budget process.

Structures are in place to sustain planning that include a newly formed Division of Planning and Enrollment Management. Of critical importance in linking enrollment management and planning are the activities of Institutional Research and Assessment. The consolidation of enrollment management, student information systems, and institutional research and assessment within the new unit, has contributed to a more systematic and organized approach to data collection, verification, analysis, and reporting. Specifically, the role of assistant vice president of institutional research and assessment is focused on the analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of institutional data, rather than on routine or mandatory reporting. This marks a positive step away from the role institutional research and assessment (IRA) has played in the past, and represents a new philosophy that data are public and should be disseminated widely and regularly to campus decision makers and external constituents. IRA is poised to play an important role in planning at CSUEB and should have a presence on key committees, such as the University Planning, Budget and Assessment Committee. It is vital that IRA be at the table as a key advisor and information provider during planning discussions. T

The Provost initiated an academic planning task force primarily of faculty and administrators in Academic Affairs. An Academic Plan will be completed by December '07 and Physical Master planning is underway. There is shared responsibility on the part of the president, senior administrators, and faculty and staff committees. Each division of the university has designated responsibility for the seven mandates. The Academic Senate Executive Committee made planning a major agenda item at its retreat in July 2007. The University Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee, which includes faculty senate representation as well as all of the upper administration, is a key factor in linking planning and budgeting under the new administration. Academic planning that relates specifically to educational effectiveness includes a continuum of pedagogies and learning modes, the distribution of programs by locations; and determining the role of university-wide values and programs for all students. In sum, the visiting team consistently heard of a new spirit of cooperation, shared responsibility, and a transparent budget from faculty and administrators and staff.

Planning has not just been internal but has involved the larger Bay area community in a number of ways. It now appears that the institution's name change enhances its regional focus. As we heard numerous times, this regional focus includes the Hayward, the Concord and Oakland campuses, and the Naval Weapons facility.

The institutional planning process is beginning to address the Concord campus as part of the overall vision and direction of the campus. The Academic Planning Committee has prepared three scenarios for the campus that will help the university gain clarity around the role of Concord in the overall mission of CSUEB. The team learned of ongoing discussions with key constituencies such as the high schools, community colleges, the

business community, and the mayor of Oakland about offering appropriate educational programs that will enable students to reach their educational goals.

**Recommendations:**

1. Ensure that the assistant vice president for institutional research continues to be included on key committees, that IRA is directly involved in planning and decision making for the campus, and that appropriate resources support these efforts.

2. Issues related to integrating the Concord Campus in the overall institutional mission relate to the following recommendations:

- a. Articulate a clearer definition of faculty responsibilities for teaching courses on the Concord campus and consider proposals to establish a core faculty.
- b. Allow for more direct control by the dean of the Concord campus over budgets and budget decisions.
- c. Articulate a clear definition of what constitutes a “Concord student,” including specific coding on institutional data bases, so that institutional research and assessment may conduct reporting and analysis that will provide planning, enrollment management, and assessment information on Concord students, specifically, within the broader institutional framework.
- d. Develop methods for disaggregating the results of learning outcomes specifically for students enrolled primarily on the Concord campus so that the educational outcomes of courses and programs offered there can be identified, addressed, and communicated to the university and its external community.

- e. Continue to explore ways to enhance physical access to the campus, making it easier for students to commute to the campus and for faculty to commit to teaching there.
- f. Develop improved electronic processes for signatures, approvals, or other services to eliminate the need for commuting between campuses for these purposes.
- g. Careful consideration of the scenarios produced by the academic planning committee by members of the Hayward and Concord campuses.

#### **IIA (7) -Faculty Issues**

The EE Report discusses the transparent development and allocation of resources in Chapter 6, and reaffirms CSU East Bay's commitment (under "Human Resources and Workload") to provide faculty and staff with professional development opportunities and the support they need to do their jobs. The high rate of new faculty appointments, over one hundred new tenure track faculty in the past four years and 31 last year, has raised a number of issues that East Bay has begun to address. The Academic Senate and the Provost's Office have initiated a study of the use of assigned time and how workload is distributed.

The Visiting Team requested an opportunity to speak with a large group of probationary faculty members to explore workload issues from their perspective. Probationary faculty reported that developing nine new course syllabi in the first year is almost unbearable; and three junior faculty reported creating as many as 15, 18 and 30 syllabi, respectively, during their probationary period. Among the 16 junior faculty

members who participated in the discussion, the evidence suggests that the volume of new course preparations is an overwhelming experience that needs attention before the next 43 faculty are recruited during this academic year, because it could affect retention of talented new junior faculty.

When asked to state their highest priority for change, all sixteen probationary faculty members unanimously requested protected time for professional development. They firmly believe that East Bay must pay for the professional development time that the junior faculty members need to do their jobs, to enhance their scholarship, and to meet the standards for promotion. The Visiting Team interprets the junior faculty's urgent request as a plea for a significant block of time (hence, a significant assignment of the 12 quarterly workload units) to be allotted to each probationary faculty member during every quarter and every summer for professional development as a Provost-level commitment that cannot be eroded by departmental or school needs. The Provost's 1995 "Guidelines for Probationary Faculty Development" called on departments to develop written individualized plans for all probationary faculty members, which will include explicit understandings of the University's expectations and goals for junior faculty, as well as the kind of support that will be provided to help achieve these goals.

Perhaps the Senate-Provost's workload committee also needs to study whether the annual retention letter produced by the department PTR committee and the department chair, which outlines expectations for a probationary faculty member for the coming year, may be too susceptible to the exigencies of current or anticipated teaching loads and not provide sufficient long-term protection of assigned time for professional development and scholarship. Perhaps the annual assessment letter should reflect primarily on success,



progress toward professional development goals, and meeting expectations for promotion (CFR 3.4).

The second highest priority of the probationary faculty was their request that all schools and departments establish and communicate clear standards for promotion. Many junior faculty members told personal tales of confusion and continuous lack of clarity over many years in the expectations of their departments and schools for professional development and scholarship necessary for promotion. CSU East Bay is to be commended for establishing the Faculty Support Grant fund and encouraging new faculty to apply in their first year. The Director of the Office of Faculty Development raised the possibility of giving a grant to every new faculty member automatically at the time of appointment to help her/him launch professional development activities. The probationary faculty pleaded for more support to attend at least one, and preferably two, professional conferences per year to maintain their currency in their field. The reported travel allotment of \$500 is too little to pay for the combined costs of airline travel, hotels, and food and conference registration fees. The Visiting Team is sympathetic to the junior faculty's appeal for larger amounts of professional development support.

The Visiting Team was taken aback at how many untenured faculty members are serving as department chairs and chairs of major university committees, such as CAPR, CIC, and COBRA. While it is very flattering that junior colleagues are called upon for departmental and University leadership positions, these clearly are burdens far beyond their assumptions of appropriate service for junior faculty who must keep their focus on teaching, professional development and scholarship. CSU East Bay needs to have a

serious internal conversation about expectations and protective standards for probationary faculty.

The probationary faculty was concerned that the policy on family leave, especially maternity leave, is unclear and is very poorly understood by deans and department colleagues. One dean, when asked by a woman faculty member about delaying the tenure clock for a year for parenting responsibilities, had no answer. The junior faculty members who met with the Visiting Team reported that family leave is not addressed in new faculty orientation. One woman faculty member reported “shock and awe” when her pregnancy was announced to her male colleagues; one or two were told they should give birth only in the summer; a fourth woman was told that maternity leave could not be obtained in the first year of appointment; and a fifth woman was told by two colleagues that her pregnancy “was a mistake for her career.” These responses to the increasing diversity of CSU East Bay are inconsistent with the goal of a positive campus climate and could be found to be inconsistent with system-wide policies.

**Recommendations:**

1. Consider giving assigned time for curriculum development to all probationary faculty in the first quarter of their appointment, and where appropriate, consider other appropriate releases from teaching obligations in the first quarter.
2. Consider the value of establishing offer letters from the deans, as a supplement to the CSU System contract, that contain an individualized plan for each new probationary faculty member that is called for in the Provost’s *Guidelines for Probationary Faculty Development*.

3. Consider the possibility of modifying the policy on *Faculty Development Plans* (June 7, 1999) to clarify that “annual retention letters” cannot change the allocation of assigned time for professional development that may be contained in the individualized plan of expectations and goals that was established at the time of appointment.
4. Review and reaffirm the existing 1995 policy on *Guidelines for Probationary Faculty Development* by assuring that all departments develop clear *written* standards for promotion in their respective disciplines and that individualized development plans for each probationary faculty member have clear performance expectations and specify the amount of assigned time for scholarship and professional development.
5. Make larger allocations from the Faculty Support Grant funds or other resources at the time of appointment to support professional development of probationary, tenure-track faculty through conference participation.
6. Establish protective limits at the Provost’s level on service obligations of probationary faculty, and give consideration to preventing administrative appointments and service as chairs of university committees to such faculty.
7. Examine the issue of maternity and paternity leave (with input from junior women faculty) in an attempt to reconcile existing CSU System policy of 30 days paid leave (4 weeks) with the logistics of a quarter-based (6 week) academic calendar, and with a view toward creating a policy to support a diverse new faculty that contains a large number of women.

8. Inform deans, department chairs, and the entire senior faculty about maternity and paternity leave on a regular basis to overcome the apparently wide confusion about existing policy.

### **IIB - Evaluation of the Institution's Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and Learning Results**

The team concludes that CSUEB has made significant progress in having systems in place for enhancing teaching effectiveness and learning results. Evidence to support this assertion is an enhanced culture of institution-wide data collection and analysis. There is an emphasis on accountability and a focus on teaching effectiveness and learning results in the university's revised program review process. The revised guidelines, a 5-year cycle and innovative MOUs are components of the university's efforts for continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning. The team saw evidence of curricular changes and faculty hiring decisions that were the outcomes of program reviews. Other "systems" that support enhanced teaching effectiveness and learning are increases in number of tenure-track faculty; a holistic, developmental approach to student counseling and advising supported by a team-based approach for enhanced retention of students; and the improvements in the physical conditions of the campus.

### **SECTION III – SUMMARY OF TEAM CONCLUSIONS AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

The team saw evidence of CSUEB’s dedication to improvement in all phases of preparation for the accreditation presentation. The Educational Effectiveness Report, the documents on-line, and those provided to the team during the visit, all served to substantiate a positively changed climate and approach to educational effectiveness. The team saw processes and evidence of teamwork and commitment to the mission and goals that are clearly articulated and relatively well understood by all constituencies. (CFR Standard 1) The institution responded to all the issues raised in the Institutional Capacity Review and evidenced substantial progress related to each issue. CSUEB is to be commended on its progress and improvement in the many areas cited previously in this report. The new leadership has provided direction and focus and fostered a series of coordinated systems and processes designed to evaluate, implement and reassess plans (CFR Standards 2, 3 and 4). These efforts and activities are to be commended. The progress is impressive.

Because CSUEB is still a “work-in- progress,” the team has several broad recommendations about where the institutions should focus its attention. The team recommends that the campus:

1. Further the institutional goals of academic quality, an improved campus climate and student success by strengthening the program review process, insuring that it is taken seriously throughout the campus, and increasing the quality of data collected across programs.

2. Address the link between the learning that occurs in general education and other parts of the curriculum and come to agreement about what a CSUEB student should know and be able to do at completion of the baccalaureate.

3. Involve all programs on what multiculturalism means to CSUEB in terms of value statements, mandates, social responsibility and justice and student learning in order to come to a consensus for multicultural goals and rubrics for measuring multicultural competency.

4. Sustain the extensive campus wide support for planning into the implementation stage. Continue to use planning priorities to guide budget allocations and align planning for the Hayward Campus with Concord, Oakland, and if appropriate, the Naval Weapons facility.

5. Continue progress made in hiring tenure track faculty and supporting them to success.

Finally, everyone that the team met at CSUEB is dedicated to this institution. The progress that has been made since the Capacity and Preparatory Review is impressive. The institution is “on the move” and is engaged in myriad activities that will improve the student experience and the work lives of important others on the campus – faculty, staff, and administration. The team encourages CSUEB to continue to engage in activities that will sustain this forward movement.