

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
to
California State University Long Beach

October 6-8, 2010

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Judith A. Ramaley, Chair
Irma Guzman Wagner, Assistant Chair
Jená Burges
Meredith Michaels
Marilyn E. Miller
Jacqueline M. Mimms
Barbara Wright, WASC Staff

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Numbers

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Description of Institution and Visit | 3 |
| B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report:
Alignment with the Proposal
Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report | 4 |
| C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review | 6 |

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

- | | |
|---|----|
| A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry | 7 |
| Core Commitment I: Organizing for Effectiveness
(Includes discussion of Financial Impact of the Economic
Recession and the State Budget Crisis) | |
| Core Commitment II: Staffing for Effectiveness | |
| Core Commitment III: Assessing Student Success
(Includes discussion of Institution's Systems for Enhancing
Educational Effectiveness) | |
| B. Program Review | 27 |
| C. Student Success | 30 |

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

32

APPENDICES

- Appendix A. Report on Off-Campus Program: M.A. in Education:
Option in Mathematics Education
- Appendix B. Report on Distance Education Program
- Appendix C. Report on Ed.D. in Educational Leadership

THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

I. A. Description of Institution and Visit

History and Mission. California State University Long Beach (CSULB) was established in 1949 as Los Angeles-Orange County State College and offered 25 courses to 160 students taught by 13 faculty members. Over the years, CSULB acquired a number of name changes and nicknames, including “The Beach” - an enduring and appropriate term referring to its proximity to the Pacific Ocean which is three miles away. Since its beginning, CSU Long Beach has grown to become one of the largest of the 23 campuses in the California State University (CSU) system. According to *University Facts*, the total enrollment figure for spring 2010 was 31,586 students. Seven academic colleges offer 87 baccalaureate degrees, 38 programs leading to educational credentials, 67 master’s degrees, and one independent doctoral program. Distance Education and off-campus courses are available in selected programs to undergraduate and graduate students. CSU Long Beach is a highly diverse institution representative of the communities it serves in Southern California. The institution’s July, 2010 EER Self-Study reported a student population that includes 5.1 percent African-American, 18.9 percent Asian/Asian American, 29.9 percent Caucasian, 20.4 percent Mexican American, 0.6 percent Native American/Alaskan Native, 8.2 percent Other Latino/Hispanic, 6.6 percent Pacific Islander/Filipino, and 10.3 percent Unknown/Other. CSU Long Beach has been designated by the U. S. Department of Education as a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Throughout the years, CSULB has received considerable recognition for its academic programs and service to students and has become a “Campus of Choice” where applications far outnumber available admission slots. The campus community exhibits a strong “Beach Pride” through its commitment to CSULB’s Mission Statement:

California State University Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service for the people of California and the world.

Recent Accreditation History. CSU Long Beach was first accredited in 1957. The current accreditation cycle leading to the October 2010 Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit

began in June 2002 when the WASC Commission reaffirmed accreditation and set the EER for spring 2010. In June 2005, this review was rescheduled for fall 2010. The university submitted the Institutional Proposal in October 2006 to WASC. In December 2008, CSULB completed an Institutional Report, or Self-Study, for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) stage of the reaccreditation process. The CPR site visit took place on March 4-6, 2009. The WASC Commission, in June 2009, acted to receive the CPR Team Report, continue the accreditation of CSU Long Beach, and schedule the Educational Effectiveness Review for October 6-8, 2010.

Description of Visit. The visiting team was composed of six members. With the exception of one member, the team had also participated in the spring 2009 Capacity and Preparatory Review. In preparation for the site visit, team members reviewed the institution's proposal, prior accreditation and Commission actions, recent reports including the 2008 CPR Institutional Report, the 2010 EER Institutional Report or Self-Study, many appendices, and web-based data and documentation. Additional information was obtained at the time of the EER visit through materials in the Team Room and numerous interviews with campus-wide constituencies. The team met with members of the WASC Steering Committee, related contributing committees, representatives of various offices, student, faculty, and administrative leadership groups, faculty participating in Program Review and General Education, and conducted open meetings for faculty and staff and for students. Team members also interviewed persons involved in the Distance Education and Ed.D. in Educational Leadership programs, and the off-campus M.A. in Education with an option in Mathematics Education. One of the team members visited the off-campus master's degree program at Stanford Middle School in Long Beach.

The team would like to acknowledge the hospitality and candor of the people it met with during its visit. Special appreciation is extended to all of the individuals in campus offices that provided information and materials before and throughout the EER visit. CSU Long Beach's spirit of collegiality was evident in the professional welcome and assistance extended to the visiting team.

I. B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

Alignment with the Proposal. CSU Long Beach organized its Educational Effectiveness around three themes referred to as "Core Commitments" that aligned with the 2006 Institutional

Proposal (IR) for Reaffirmation of Accreditation and the document's intended outcomes. An over-arching question for each Core Commitment was presented in the Institutional Proposal and throughout the accreditation review process. These questions were asked in various ways. The three Core Commitments and related questions are: 1) Organizing for Effectiveness. Does the campus organization for decision-making facilitate institutional effectiveness and student success? 2) Staffing for Effectiveness. Are campus personnel policies and practices effective in helping us to hire, retain, make successful the best possible faculty and staff? 3) Assessing Student Success. Are the outcomes data we collect utilized to improve student learning, retention, and timely graduation?

The WASC Self-Study Steering Committee, established in 2005 through the Academic Senate, was actively involved in the review process starting with the Institutional Proposal and continuing with preparation for both the Capacity and Effectiveness reviews. This committee appointed research teams with wide campus representation to study each of the Core Commitments and prepare final reports for the Steering Committee. Campus engagement was obtained through an Outreach Committee as well as through various offices including those of the President and Academic Senate. These processes were utilized earlier in the Capacity and Preparatory Review and more recently in the Educational Effectiveness Review. WASC Committee recommendations were assigned to corresponding Core Commitment research teams for further investigation in preparation for the EER visit.

Overall Quality of EER Report. The institution's 2010 Educational Effectiveness Review Report adhered consistently to the three Core Commitments selected for the 2006 Institutional Proposal and addressed as well in the 2008 Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. Research teams redefined questions and strategies to obtain essential information related to each of the WASC recommendations. The university's EER Report consisted of three essays with appendices for each of the Core Commitments. CSULB's WASC Steering Committee and research teams served a critical role in collecting and distributing information described in the three Core Commitment essays. These essays were presented in different formats although each directed readers to materials in the appendices and related online resources. Overall, the EER Report, which contained considerable information, served as a starting point for the visiting team to broaden its inquiries about CSULB's accomplishments during the time between the completion of the report and the time of the EER visit. One volume could not tell CSULB's whole story,

especially since it continued to develop rapidly after the report's submission - the rest of the "chapters" were filled in when the team went to the campus.

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

When the WASC Commission met in 2009, issues raised during the CPR visit and presented as recommendations in the CPR Team Report were accepted and incorporated into the recommendations made by the WASC Commission. The accrediting body, in its action letter to the institution, highlighted five areas for attention and improvement. Each of these areas was adopted by the institution within the current self-study and addressed both within the body of the Educational Effectiveness Review Report and its appendices. The WASC recommendations, along with selected subsequent institutional responses, are as follows:

Recommendation 1. Evidence of Use of Data for Decision-making: The Commission recommended that CSU Long Beach provide *evidence throughout the university of data collection, analysis, and use for decision making (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)*.

CSULB chose to study the "use of data in decision-making" through Core Commitments I and III. The self-study process served as a campus-wide opportunity to examine how data are used in planning, setting priorities, and making decisions. (A description and analysis of this and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.)

Recommendation 2. Evidence of Institution-wide Assessment of Programs: The Commission recommended that CSU Long Beach provide *evidence of institution-wide assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and institutional levels, and including general education and program review. Direct methods, analysis, and use of findings for feedback, decision making, and improvement should be demonstrated (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.6, 4.7)*.

In response, CSULB created a Statement of Institutional Level Learning Objectives and continued to complete more program reviews. Core Commitment III research teams focused on a self-study of this recommendation. (A description and analysis of this and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.)

Recommendation 3. Financial Plan to Address Economic Downturn: The Commission recommended that CSU Long Beach develop a *financial plan for dealing with budget cuts to the CSU system and other impacts of the economic downturn (CFR 3.5)*.

The University conducted a case study with "the financial crisis" as its focus to identify communication strategies, consultation and decision-making as the economic downturn issue

unfolds. Although a campus budget plan was included in Appendix F of the EER Report it is not a financial plan developed in response to the economic downturn.

Recommendation 4. Diversity Plan: The WASC Commission recommended the development of a *plan for increasing diversity among faculty and staff (CFR 1.5)*.

CSULB expanded data gathering to obtain information about diversity from a larger representation of the campus. The Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan, discussed in the Core Commitment II essay and presented in Appendix E of the EER Report was designed and completed in summer 2010. The plan was developed based on widespread involvement across the university and includes specific actions to be taken in a number of areas. (A description and analysis of these and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.)

Recommendation 5. Plan to Strengthen Communication and Outreach: The Commission recommended a *plan for strengthening communication and outreach to all members of the University community (CFRs 1.7, 3.8, 3.11)*.

CSULB's case study with "the financial crisis" as its focus, served to investigate the effectiveness of campus communication. Multiple communication strategies were used to engage the entire university community, the Academic Senate, faculty and staff, students, and department chairs. (A description and analysis of these and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

II. A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness

CSULB's responses to WASC Commission Recommendations 1, 5, and 3 and team findings are discussed in this section: Core Commitment I. Recommendation 1 is also addressed under Core Commitment III. The Institution's Response to **Financial Impacts of the Budget Crisis** is embedded throughout discussions related to Core Commitment I. Team members asked the following strategic financial planning questions: 1) Does the institution have a resource plan to invest in areas that are strategic priorities for improved educational outcomes and how will it know if it has been successful in making these investments? 2) If the institution is reducing spending, what evidence is there that reductions are being made strategically, to spare areas that are most critical to educational outcomes? These two principal questions addressed the

requirement that CSULB, as part of the CSU system, be queried about the impact of the financial recession on the institution. Information contained in this section of the report covers the two main questions noted above as well as those suggested by WASC: 1) How has the financial recession affected your institution? 2) How has your institution responded? 3) What plans are in place in case the current state of affairs becomes permanent?

WASC Recommendation 1: *Evidence throughout the university of data collection, analysis and use for decision-making (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).*

Actions. Since evidence regarding this recommendation was threaded throughout the Self-Study, each team member looked for evidence within her assigned area of emphasis. Team members kept a common set of questions in mind as they met with people who participated in the study itself, individuals who have used the findings to develop actions to be taken, and people who are participating in the implementation of the strategies or programs developed as a result of the study. In general, the team sought to discern how the campus advisory and decision-making bodies work when they are not engaged in a self-study. The team explored the extent to which the campus has moved from a “culture of data” toward a more comprehensive “culture of inquiry” or “culture of evidence” approach to defining their goals and creating strategies for achieving them. An overarching question was: To what extent is the leadership across all constituencies learning from this experience and how are they applying what they have learned as CSULB moves into its next budget and planning cycle?” Specific questions are as follows: 1) What information was collected during the self-study process and how was that information obtained? 2) How is the information being utilized? 3) Who has reviewed, interpreted, and applied the results of the self-studies to decisions related to each core commitment? 4) What process is in place to learn from the experience of implementation of any strategies developed and implemented on the basis of the findings of each study?

Findings: As part of its self-study, CSULB designed an approach to a much broader and more frequent exchange of information about the budget situation and the choices being considered for managing a \$58 M budget cut. The self-study dovetailed with the budget crisis, and while it is not possible to tease out whether the budget crisis or the WASC self-study process (most likely some combination of both) drove the changes, the changes appear to all be for the good. The change with the greatest impact has been in the areas of communication and transparency.

The responses to providing more information, more often and to more people using multiple channels of communication yielded valuable feedback and the expression of concerns about the impact of the choices being considered. In turn, this has led to some new strategies for promoting deeper understanding and the ability to use the data that have been collected and compiled to guide these discussions. For example, a new “chairs toolkit” is being designed that will configure information at a departmental level in a more usable form across the many disciplines represented at CSULB. In the past several years, there have been significant changes in how the campus community uses data and information as well as how that material is interpreted and applied.

Starting a decade ago, in recognition of the uncertainties of the state budget and the changing demographic patterns affecting enrollments and the interactions of institutions within CSU, CSULB initiated an approach to planning that was deliberately designed to be nimble and easily adaptable to new information and changing conditions. Rather than adopting a three year horizon, the plan is updated annually and changes in emphasis and priority of the initiatives undertaken in support of planning goals are adjusted based on the results obtained in the implementation of each project or initiative. This model has created a more flexible and adaptable model for building the annual budget. Over 90 percent of the goals have been addressed and significant results obtained. The budget process is integrated with this strategic planning process, which starts in the fall with a review of the prior year’s goals and continues with a vetting of priorities and putting issues on the table for discussion. The groups’ recommendations are predicated on an assessment of what is realistic, both politically and fiscally. In a typical year, the fall is dedicated towards planning; the spring towards making budget decisions, within the overall planning parameters set by the President. The planning and budget process has been adapted to respond to the current circumstances that the campus faces and the goals have shifted from ambitious forward-looking priorities to plans to maintain current capacity. The more ambitious goals are now contained in a new (beyond the three-year horizon) section of the plan supporting a meaningful convergence of enrollment planning, facilities usage, and IT environment and it guides the priorities set in the capital campaign which is currently in its silent phase. The President has placed a strong emphasis on growing the CSULB Endowment which is considered quite low for an institution of CSULB’s size and the Provost has place a high priority on supporting faculty scholarship and growing external research support. Other

efforts are underway on a system-wide basis to identify other sources of revenue and support for the mission of CSULB and its sister institutions. In sum, as one administrator said, “Planning is now a part of our culture. I couldn’t have said that fifteen years ago.” It is clear that the priorities defined by the President to “graduate students with highly valued degrees” and to ensure that CSULB students “finish what they start” have driven campus attention and focused institutional efforts and attention as well as investments in the future.

The campus was emphatic in its view that the process itself has been important. The process resulted in greater confidence that planning - especially during periods of budget uncertainty - is going on and is a reinforcement that campus priorities are shared, resulting in a renewed commitment to the mission of providing access and opportunity. The outcome has been expanded relationships and the ability to talk about controversial issues in a collegial manner. Through the process, it seems that more constituents feel they have a stake in the outcome.

WASC Recommendation 5: *A plan for strengthening communication and outreach to all members of the University Community (CFRs 1.7, 3.8, 3.11).*

Actions. In response to the report prepared by the Site Visit Team in the first phase of the reaccreditation process (Capacity and Preparatory Review), the CSULB WASC Steering Committee elected to address the second recommendation by focusing upon communication and decision-making directed at the “current financial crisis.” The case study, which was conducted through face-to-face interviews with key constituencies, explored the communication strategies, consultation processes, and decision-making as the budget situation unfolded. The study, therefore, touched partially on Recommendation 1 as well. While conclusions were drawn from the interviews that were conducted as a result of this case study, the report did not provide any suggested responses or follow-up activities or a description of any adaptations to these processes that might result from the case study and its findings.

Discussions with members of the campus community who helped design a more expanded approach to exploring the budget situation and its implications for CSULB yielded a much clearer picture of what was done, what the leadership of the campus has learned from this experience, and how those lessons have begun to influence both the approach that will be taken to building the budget and the way that the campus community is developing a set of related plans, including its approach to accessible technology and the campus sustainability and climate commitment agenda. In summarizing the findings and conclusions, the EER Report (p. 10)

concludes with a comment that “there is no doubt that there is room for improvement as this unprecedented and very threatening situation is addressed, but the balance of evidence is that the campus has managed quite effectively on the whole.”

The case study yielded the following conclusions, as articulated in the EER Self-Study document submitted to WASC in July 2010 (p. 9): 1) Faculty, staff, and students have been represented in the key committees that have dealt with the crisis. 2) The campus has engaged in a wide range of frequent communication strategies to the entire campus community and to targeted audiences... through a variety of communication vehicles (face-to-face, e-mail, web pages). These communication strategies are considered to have been effective in reaching “the vast majority of campus individuals.” 3) The campus has effectively coordinated individuals from different divisions of the university to achieve key campus goals critical to successfully handling the budget crisis. 4) Efforts to disseminate information to, and solicit input from, various groups are generally perceived as contributing to a participatory culture on the CSULB campus.

Each of these conclusions was evaluated during the site visit. A significant amount of time has elapsed since the study was completed and more information is now available regarding the economic situation in California and in the CSU system. The test applied was whether the patterns and activities reported as a consequence of the case study have continued and whether a habit of reflection and continued observation has been instilled in the repertoire of the campus as a result of the case studies during the two phases of the WASC reaccreditation process.

Findings: The conclusions presented in the case study were affirmed through conversations with senior administrators and, to a somewhat lesser extent, from observations of faculty, staff and students. A number of “take-aways” were mentioned by senior administrators. Among the lessons learned from the more expanded approach to engaging members of the campus community in understanding and responding to the budget crisis were that reaching a larger audience refined and improved the choices made in responding to budget cuts; the process has changed how the campus community gathers and uses information; there was clear affirmation of the campus values (student success in particular) and the role of a shared commitment to access and opportunity in guiding responses to the budget and to directives from the Chancellor’s Office and a growing understanding of the value of clear learning goals assessment in promoting student success and highly valued degrees.

The broader consultative process is an effective response to the realities of the current budget climate. CSULB operates in a volatile external environment characterized by last minute switches in funding levels and directives from both the Legislature and the Chancellor's Office regarding enrollment targets. The institution has worked on a more comprehensive and broad-based approach to keeping members of the campus community informed and engaged in understanding the conditions that the institution faces and the choices that are being considered for managing those conditions. During FY 2009-2010, in accordance with Core Commitment I, the consultative process was expanded to include additional opportunities for discussion and exchange. A retreat was held by the Academic Senate that yielded fifteen pages of comments about the proposed budget reduction plan. The senior leadership of CSULB then reviewed the comments, looking for clusters of related responses and indications of any points of convergence. The three areas that were identified were support for faculty, the need to increase the campus-specific student fees, and support for student success. After further discussion with governance groups, this input guided the development of the final budget package. The process of consultation is quite complex.

As an example, CSULB has historically had among the lowest campus-based student fees within CSU. Although the administration has reported the institutional consequences of this pattern over the years, this time, there was a response. The explanation for this shift was that broader participation and the active involvement of the President set the stage for people to take this issue seriously. As one administrator put it, "People really listened this time." The decision by the President regarding where to set campus-based student fees will be informed by the responses from the Academic Senate Retreat (favorable to an increase), a student referendum (did not endorse a fee increase), the Student Fee Advisory Committee (recommended a modest increase to support a "Beach Legacy" fee), input from the Deans Group (supportive of an increase) and input from the Resource Process Planning Group (supportive.)

WASC Recommendation 3. *A financial plan for dealing with budget cuts to the CSU system and other impacts of the economic downturn (CFR 3.5).*

Actions. The Self-Study included a section on the economic crisis and its impact on CSULB as well as a description of the CSULB planning and decision-making processes and the goals that have been set for the year in response to the President's call for a "managed approach that protected student success (p.7)". The team sought to determine what has been done to

protect student success and how student success was defined and monitored. Questions were asked about what data are collected, who analyzes those data, and how data are used to assess the possible impact of various budget solutions on this key parameter of institutional life. CSU Long Beach is one of 23 CSU campuses and relies heavily on State funds and fee revenues to support its operating budget. State funds (increases/decreases) flow from the State to the Office of the Chancellor and are then appropriated to each campus. System-wide mandatory fee levels are set by the Board of Trustees. Proposals to increase campus-based fees require a recommendation by the President and, then, approval of the Chancellor. As part of the CSU system, the campus is subject to central decisions regarding enrollment and other policies in managing the budget

Findings. The campus had an operating budget of \$480M in 2009-2010. Excluding financial aid and auxiliaries, over 70 percent of the remaining budget comprises State funds and fee revenues. During the two-year periods of 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, State funds were reduced by over \$30M, the impact of which was buffered to some extent by the availability of one-time Federal Stimulus Funds. In 2009-2010, the campus budget was reduced by \$58M of which \$25M was dealt with on a one-time basis primarily through the use of staff/faculty furloughs (\$20M) and President's reserves (\$5M). In the short term, the campus reduced the number of new freshmen, and reduced the number of lecturers correspondingly. However, because providing access to California students, whether as freshmen or as junior transfers, is a priority for CSU Long Beach and for the State of California, deciding how many students to enroll has a political as well as a practical dimension. Also, given the increase in fee levels approved by the CSU Board, the campus appears (in the short run) to lose more in fee revenue than the savings achieved by reducing instructors. The remainder of the "budget hit" was accommodated through a series of one-time actions that included reducing supplies and travel and implementing time-base reductions. The campus deliberately chose to maintain all academic programs on the basis that the campus felt that it would lose more in terms of trust and morale than it would gain in savings. Any future decision to modify academic programs would be made in a thoughtful and strategic way. Based on a review of the campus's financial statement, campus expenditures remain higher than operating revenue meaning the campus is relying, in the short run, on campus reserves, one-time savings, and, possibly, transfers from the Foundation. This is a reasonable short-term strategy but it should continue to be closely monitored over the long run.

Despite the apparent reprieve from the State in 2010-2011, the visiting team encourages the campus to continue its longer term planning (CFRs 3.5, 3.8).

At the time of the EER site visit, the State was actively considering a budget compromise for 2010-2011 (almost four months into the new fiscal year and two months into the academic year) that would restore \$305M to the CSU system and would provide an additional \$60M to support enrollment. Of the \$305, \$106M would be one-time Federal Stimulus Funds. In response to the increase in enrollment funding, CSULB will open enrollment for the spring semester and seek to enroll significantly more students. The campus view (shared by the team) is that the major challenge facing the campus could come in 2011-2012 when the State will continue to face significant deficits under the oversight of a new - and unknown - administration. For 2011-2012, the campus has indicated its intent to increase the number of new freshmen, thereby increasing fee revenue. At the same time, it is likely that the CSU Board of Trustees will consider an increase in systemwide fee levels and the campus may consider an increase in campus-based fees. CSULB recognizes that the focus on student success, faculty support, and instruction translates into the need to be more efficient and centralized, administratively. The campus cited several examples of intentional restructuring - purchasing of parking permits, UPASS (an agreement for students to utilize city bus service), upgrading the student administrative system to be more self-service, off-site hosting of student e-mail, engaging in strategic energy partnerships with the local utility company, and so on. At the same time, the campus continues to monitor key administrative areas to ensure sufficient personnel, as an example, with the opening of spring enrollment, student services will face an enormous workload.

The campus recognizes that it is subject to external factors, like actions by the State and the Federal government that are not within its control, and it does not believe there are alternative revenue strategies that would position it to “buy” its way out of the fiscal challenges it faces. Notwithstanding, CSULB is actively working to expand enrollments and to provide the research infrastructure to support faculty in successfully competing for extramural funds. These efforts focus more on achieving excellence, than on filling the existing budget hole. Through the strategic planning process and the events of this last year, there appears to be a clear consensus on campus-wide priorities, starting with student success and instruction, closely followed by developing an appropriate research infrastructure for faculty support. As evidence of

commitment to these priorities, student services were exempt from cuts in the current year and this year's strategic planning process has begun with a discussion about technology (CFR 3.8).

Core Commitment II: Staffing for Effectiveness

CSULB's responses to WASC Commission Recommendations 4 and team findings are discussed in this section of the report:

WASC Recommendation 4: *A plan for increasing diversity among faculty and staff (CFR 1.5).*

Actions. In the 2009 Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, CSULB identified diversity as an institutional priority for inquiry. Although the university has a very diverse student population (above the CSU systemwide average in all ethnic categories), the CPR team noted that this diversity was not reflected in the faculty, staff, and administration. Based on information provided in the CPR team report regarding diversity issues, the WASC Commission recommended that CSULB develop a robust plan of action to increase diversity among faculty and staff. Demonstrating its commitment and acknowledging its responsibility to address diversity, the institution used the EER process as an opportunity to gather additional data, establish goals, identify strategies, and develop a diversity plan. The Core Commitment II: Staffing for Effectiveness research group refined CPR questions and widened its qualitative data collection to include greater participation of diverse campus representatives. The collaborative process used in putting together a plan for diversity also addressed the Commission's recommendation that CSULB engage in decision-making that is informed by data analysis (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).

The "CSULB Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan" was completed in July 2010 and addressed four action areas: 1) Education and Training, 2) Recruitment, 3) Retention and Campus Climate, and 4) Assessment. For 2010-2011, specific actions in the area of "Recruitment," call for building diversity through: 1) an expanded faculty recruitment initiative, 2) tenure-track searches, 3) meetings with search committees, 4) support for visiting faculty, 5) faculty thematic hires and cluster hires, and 6) staff administrator recruitment. Under "Retention and Campus Climate," exit interviews for faculty, staff, and administrators and mentoring are to be given special attention. While the plan is quite specific in actions to be taken, its implementation is still under development but moving forward, as confirmed by participants in EER visit interviews. Because the diversity plan is so new its results will not be known for some

time. Consequently, the EER team could not determine whether it has accomplished its intended outcomes. Instead, the team examined the plan to see how lessons learned during its development were incorporated into planned actions and whether issues or concerns remain that might need further attention during the implementation phase.

Findings: From 2001-2009, CSULB experienced a net increase in the number of tenured and tenure track faculty of color from 189 to 276. The primary gain was among Asian and Asian Americans; the least growth was among American Indians and African Americans. Of twenty-seven African American faculty hired during that time period, several left for reasons besides retirement. Other reasons given for leaving were family concerns, a better offer, failure to achieve tenure, or department climate (Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan, p. 2). During the EER visit, a small group discussion with faculty of color and LBGT representatives generated conflicting information regarding the campus commitment to diversity; however, the institution's diversity plan acknowledges the need to focus on retention as much as on recruitment (p. 2).

CSULB has given considerable attention to the retention and graduation of different members of the student population and the results are significant, particularly, as they relate to faculty recruitment activities described in the campus diversity plan. For example, one planned action is to: "Develop a strategy that better tracks the progress of recent CSULB graduates who have pursued terminal degrees at other campuses nationally. Remain actively engaged in their recruitment thereafter" (p. 4). Another specific action is that "CSULB faculty should identify diverse graduate students in their discipline and initiate a long term exchange...and, if feasible, develop a mentoring relationship" (p. 4-5). The intended outcome, as described in the campus diversity plan, is to cultivate a long-term social network exchange with these graduates for the purpose of recruiting them to the campus sometime in the future so that the diversity of CSULB's student body becomes a pool from which to "grow one's own" diverse faculty and staff. During EER interviews, a number of staff members claimed CSULB as their alma mater, indicating that the concept of "growing one's own" already exists on the campus.

The diversity plan recognizes that the campus has a "hidden treasure" in its diverse student population but what is less apparent is how undergraduate students are guided to pursue advanced degrees. The team was pleased to see that graduate student mentoring is part of the diversity plan and encourages steps to extend "career ladder" assistance into the upper division undergraduate levels as well.

Faculty recruitment, at any campus, faces multiple challenges requiring guidance. CSULB's diversity plan articulates an intentional course of action to direct the university's approach in increasing recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty but does not describe specific goals or targets. Specific action steps mentioned earlier in this report; however, are forward-thinking but faced with significant challenges. For example, the availability of doctorates among women and people of color is limited and not likely to change in the near future. Additionally, given the lingering fiscal and budget constraints, it is unclear how successful CSULB will be in implementing proposed faculty recruitment initiatives. In conversations with numerous campus representatives, the team found a commitment to implement as much of the diversity plan as possible within available resource capability, as illustrated by offering recruitment sessions to search committees within each college to help them build diverse applicant pools. University-level sessions with college representation are already in place. Although the budgetary situation has adversely impacted recruitment efforts for new faculty and staff at CSULB, leaders are optimistic that the diversity plan will assist the campus in recruiting and hiring qualified and diverse faculty and staff applicants to the campus.

In addition to recruitment, the diversity plan notes the importance of retention. Mentoring is highlighted as a planned action to support retention and a new campus climate survey is intended to shed more light on factors that encourage or discourage new faculty to leave. The extent to which information gathered for CPR self-studies and in focus groups following the CPR visit was built into the proposed biennial campus survey is unclear but the EER team remains confident that messages heard have not been lost. The approach used in collecting information between the CPR and EER visits was collaborative. Tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and staff were invited to help design, develop, and participate in an extensive qualitative data collection effort (CFRs 1.3, 2.8.) While the approach fosters a sense of ownership and tends to accurately reflect the needs and concerns of employees, it also raises the expectations of participants that actions will result. At this point, how data collection will lead to the use of information in decision-making is a question for the future, due to the newness of the diversity plan.

In analyzing the EER Report, it was apparent that CSULB attempted to represent candidly the concerns raised by campus constituents. While some faculty members in the focus groups perceived a highly positive campus climate, there were those who disagreed. The report

acknowledged limitations inherent in focus group research and pointed out that the voluntary participation and small sample size of participants might not be representative of the total population (p. 11). CSULB employs approximately 1900 faculty and 1350 staff members (University Fact Sheet, spring 2010). Fifteen focus groups for faculty were conducted with a portion tailored for faculty of color and LGBT faculty; structured questions regarding campus climate and equity and diversity were included in the sessions. A total of forty-eight faculty participated in the focus groups (EER Report, p. 11). Although the focus group data can be viewed as a “snapshot” of a much larger population, the nature of the comments presents a serious message for the campus community. The majority of faculty of color participating in focus groups challenged the university’s level of commitment to diversity. Faculty of color reported experiencing racism, lack of fairness in the evaluation of their work, and bias on student evaluations in their retention of tenure (p. 14). These opinions corresponded with similar findings obtained in an earlier COACHE survey which revealed that faculty of color had experienced racism or ignorance in their interactions with colleagues. Some of the faculty in the more recent data collection, expressed hesitancy in recommending CSULB to other potential candidates (EER Report, p. 14).

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transsexual (LGBTB) faculty in the focus groups expressed concern about campus support for diversity regarding LGBT issues, particularly at the university level. Since both faculty of color and LGBT faculty, who took part in the EER self-study inquiries, expressed that they would hesitate to recommend CSULB as an employer, the university’s ability to attract faculty from these two groups may be impaired. It is unclear to what extent the recommendations, provided by faculty of color LGBT faculty for improving campus climate, were adopted or incorporated into the Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan. Among these recommendations were: providing incentives to departments that increase faculty diversity, increasing campus dialogue, and training faculty members regarding diversity in general and LGBT issues in particular. The team also found it reassuring that one of the planned action items in the plan is to “arrange informal meeting opportunities among campus affinity groups and incoming faculty, and consider additional steps to support the retention of faculty of color and LGBT faculty” (EER Report, p. 14). The proposed concept of “cluster” or “thematic faculty hires” can also serve to enhance campus diversity. An exit interview for faculty who leave CSULB is to be implemented by the Office of Faculty Affairs. The staff and administrators exit

interview process augments an existing program by including questions pertaining to campus climate and diversity on campus (p. 6). Given the comments voiced by faculty of color and LGBT faculty, it would appear that much information can be gained by also including the same questions in the faculty exit interviews.

With reference to staff, CSULB has seen an increase in managers of color although opportunities for advancement to management positions remain limited. The highest increase has been among Latinos/as managers. In spite of limited opportunities for advancement, there is a low turnover rate among the staff (Diversity Plan, p. 2 and EER Self-Study, p. 16).

Workload concerns are recognized by CSULB as factors affecting a number of working conditions including quality of service and retention of employees. The “2009-2012 Strategic Priorities and Goals” document identifies the following need: “Continue to examine and address faculty and staff workload and worklife conditions.” The EER Report also addresses the issue of workload and it is gratifying to see the workload issue contained in both documents, since concerns continue to plague the university. The loss of temporary faculty due to the 2009-2010 budget reductions resulted in increased workload for the remaining faculty. Mandatory furloughs, coupled with meeting the heavy demands of instruction, scholarly and creative activity, and professional service, most likely exacerbated the situation (CFRs 2.8, 3.1., 3.2, 3.3). The EER Report begins to address this issue; however, the university needs to be aggressive in developing a strategy for dealing with the workload concerns heard by the team during interviews with faculty and administrators.

The EER Self-Study essay on “Staffing for Effectiveness” included a summary of actions taken relative to recruitment, professional development, and equity and diversity. One of these was the approval of a new university Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy. Within each college’s department, faculty are outlining expectations and voting on specific delineations of reassignment, tenure, and promotion criteria. The process of revising RTP policies and procedures on any campus is an overwhelming and sometimes insurmountable task, but CSULB will have the new RTP process in place by 2014 and will have accomplished it in a spirit of cooperation and collaboration. This revision aligns with the institution’s mission which advocates “...educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service” (CFR 1.1). The team commends the actions taken regarding such an important aspect of faculty workload. CSULB has, for a number of years, given newly-hired tenure-track faculty

assigned time to reduce the expected teaching load of 12 units by three units per semester for a three-year period. The purpose is to allow more time to engage in required research and scholarship. At the present time, deans are assessing the impact of this allocation on senior faculty members who are required to teach classes ordinarily taught by new colleagues. It is an unresolved issue which could become more complicated given financial uncertainties.

Staff workload issues are a little more complex to define since tasks and responsibilities are not formula-based as they are for CSU faculty. Clearly, though, staff members have been impacted by budget cuts resulting in increased workload responsibilities. There is evidence that the campus has taken substantial actions with regard to management training, the staff development and reward system, and equity and diversity issues. The diversity plan reflects attention to this matter. A campus leader spoke about the increased work that staff will be required to do in spring 2011 to process new student applications made possible through increased enrollment funding. Although the plan notes that expanded mentoring programs will be developed to support faculty, the plan does not indicate that additional mentoring support systems will be made available to staff. Perhaps survey and focus data did not support this action, but the institution is encouraged to continue finding ways to systematically support staff as well as faculty.

The EER team found, and campus leaders acknowledged, that not all aspects of the university's diversity goals have been achieved. For example, a shortcoming of the EER Report and Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan is that concerns raised in the CPR Team Report, specifically, cost-of-living and salary disparity, are not adequately addressed. Also, each of these documents focuses on diversity issues in a narrow sense rather than in a broader concept of diversity that extends beyond race, ethnicity, gender, and other categories.

CSULB has responded to WASC's recommendation to develop a diversity plan in a thoughtful, collaborative, and constructive way. As the different actions in the plan move into practice, the team expects that the impact of new or expanded efforts on diversity issues will be monitored (CFR 4.6). As an example, the plan proposes several new or expanded activities to be integrated into the campus's existing academic framework but it is unclear what data or assessments were used, or will be used, to identify gaps in existing program or current practices leading to further enhancements. Because implementation plans are in a development stage and not fully formed, there exists an excellent opportunity to establish identifiable, measurable

outcomes to provide tangible evidence that diversity goals are being met. In order to demonstrate how data collection will move toward decision-making, implementation plans could include “information flow and feedback loops.” This would build on what has already occurred at CSULB in engaging a broader sector of the campus community in responding to data as well as identifying where decisions are made at various levels.

Various campus representatives indicated that, in order to be successful in addressing diversity issues, it might be necessary to use a distributed approach to implementation and monitoring at multiple levels, e.g. division, college, and department. The team suggests that it could be helpful to identify in the implementation process the offices or personnel accountable for carrying out the various aspects of the diversity plan. Perhaps, administrators and managers might be held responsible for appropriate diversity initiatives and activities within their units through performance reviews. To determine levels of effectiveness, some universities have created high-functioning oversight groups or committees such as the President’s Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee or the Provost’s Faculty and Diversity Council charged with the responsibility of studying reports, monitoring progress, and making recommendations on issues relevant to increasing faculty and staff diversity. CSULB has its own culture which the team recognizes as an asset in ensuring that key underlying principles described in the plan will be enhanced. These are: student success, academic freedom, respect, appreciation, inclusiveness, engagement, equity, modeling, and academic quality. How CSU Long Beach assesses and monitors the effectiveness of the Faculty and Diversity Plan will, most likely, reflect the institution’s attention to inclusive and collaborative dialogue, as shown in its responsiveness to WASC’s recommendation that a plan be developed.

Core Commitment III: Assessing Student Success

CSULB’s responses to WASC Commission Recommendations 1 and 2 are discussed in this section of the report. Related issues of **Program Review** and **Student Success** issues are discussed in the following sections, II B. and II. C.

Recommendation 1: *Evidence throughout the university of data collection, analysis and use for decision-making (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).*

Actions. The EER Report describes substantial development of systems to support the collection and use of data for decision-making related to assessment and student success since the CPR visit. The Office of Institutional Research has adopted Cognos, a more intuitive utility,

allowing users to generate reports for use in decision-making. This capacity, in turn, forms the basis of the CSULB Institutional Dashboard which allows members of the campus community to track developments in such areas as graduation trends, enrollment trends, retention, and faculty appointments. Users are able to generate reports that are disaggregated along a variety of criteria (by academic unit, student level, student economic status, etc.) in order to track the success of student groups or specific initiatives (CFR 4.5).

Data have also been made available for detailed and immediate planning purposes (CFR 4.3). The Interactive Enrollment Planning Report supports the management of classes and schedules. CS Links provides data on class enrollment patterns and room utilization for enrollment managers, as well as data on individual students for academic advisors. Standardized program-specific data reports have been designed for inclusion in the program review process.

The report outlines actions taken by the campus in response to data from various sources (CFR 4.4). National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data indicating that CSULB students scored below comparisons on measures of student-faculty interaction resulted in the initiation of a popular Provost's Summer Research Award supporting undergraduate and graduate student collaboration with faculty members on research projects. Data showing marked improvement in the success of students participating in a pilot of the Beach Learning Community (BLC), a program for students who require remediation in both English and Mathematics, resulted in plans to expand the program to all eligible students in 2010. The success rates and satisfaction levels of students in pilot Graduation Writing Assessment (GWAR) courses have resulted in improvements to the courses and portfolio assessments along with a proposed revision to the GWAR policy under discussion by the Academic Senate, which would allow students to enroll in the GWAR course without having to attempt the Graduate Writing Exam first. Data regarding the different needs of students in different majors, and on how those needs influence student success in remedial and General Education mathematics courses, led to a restructuring of the pre-baccalaureate math curriculum into two pathways, one for students whose majors require them to prepare for taking calculus and one for other students who need only to prepare for meeting General Education math requirements. Most of these changes have resulted in substantial improvements in student passing rates for the remedial courses in which they were enrolled.

A few other efforts have been less successful. For example, the use of data to identify and improve low-success courses has not resulted in lasting improvement in student success; some

departments, however, are continuing their own efforts along these lines, as the campus community considers the research suggesting appropriate next steps to take in improving student success in such courses. The team encourages the university to build on departmental momentum in using data to improve low-success courses in ways that better support student learning.

Another action connected to Recommendation 1 is the “Highly Valued Degree Initiative,” launched as part of the CSU’s Access to Excellence efforts to improve graduation rates and reduce achievement gaps for historically underrepresented students. The initiative is organized into five areas: Curriculum Pathways, Support Services, Advising, Faculty Development, and Research and Evaluation (CFR 4.6). This effort and the data used to guide and support it are described in a separate section on Student Success, below.

Findings. The description of initiatives resulting from analysis of data, both in the Educational Effectiveness Review report and in numerous meetings and conversations during the visit, suggest that the campus is using data for making decisions and monitoring progress in improving institutional support of student success. The actions described above provide evidence that CSULB can do that effectively.

It is probably not an accident that many of the successful initiatives grounded in solid data have been collaborative across different functions, units, and areas of expertise. The team heard in many venues about the cross-functional and mutually supportive collaborations that have moved these initiatives forward and made them so rewarding for participants. Beginning such efforts by looking at solid data takes a problem out of the realm of story and anecdote, which is by definition told from the perspective of an individual or particular group and can make it difficult for those with other perspectives to see the story in the same way. Beginning instead, with a set of data that participants can agree is accurate or representative can open the way for very different approaches to converge on novel and creative solutions. The team saw evidence of this effect in a number of successful campus initiatives.

Recommendation 2: *Evidence of institution-wide assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and institutional levels, and including general education and program review. Direct methods, analysis, and use of findings for feedback, decision making, and improvement should be demonstrated (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.6, 4.7).*

Actions. The EER Report outlines CSULB’s efforts to improve assessment of student learning outcomes that began to build momentum in 2005 with the adoption of a timetable and statement of assessment responsibilities (actions and findings related specifically to Program

Review are described in a separate section, below). Progress was gradual at first, but the report indicates that in the fairly brief period of time since the CPR visit, the university has built considerable capacity for learning outcomes assessment. The report describes a newly-refined rubric that has been employed to shape useful feedback to departments on their annual assessment reports, offering support and suggestions related to the assessment processes, measures, results, and plans for curricular and/or pedagogical changes.

Participation rates have also increased, with close to 100 percent of academic programs submitting annual assessment reports in 2009. Moreover, while the vast majority of reports in 2006 reported on assessments that were still in the planning stage, by 2009 fully 95 percent reported on assessment activities that they had completed. A number of programs still included indirect measures of student learning among the assessment strategies they used in 2009, but almost 80 percent of the programs used or planned direct measures (CFR 1.2). Programs are still working to clarify their understanding of assessment purposes and processes. The team found that the submission rate of graduate level assessment reports closely approximated that of undergraduate level reporting. The new Ed.D. in Educational Leadership program was studied as a separate part of the EER visit and its well-developed assessment plan could serve as a model for other graduate programs that are in the process of articulating outcomes and assessments.

General Education assessment has also been through several changes in recent years, with a major one occurring since the CPR visit. The “Student Achievement in General Education” (SAGE) approach was suspended last year in the wake of furloughs and budget cuts, presumably because it relied on a small number of trained faculty members to conduct focused assessment activities. Instead, a course-based assessment approach was adopted, and the program review and annual assessment report templates were revised to include data on the GE courses offered by the program, to encourage efficiency by including GE review and assessment in program-level review and assessment. Curriculum maps for the GE outcomes are being completed by all departments offering GE courses, indicating which of the GE skill areas are fostered by each course. This closer connection between major programs and GE outcomes will be further developed by the integrative capstone experience developed by the General Education Governing Committee to support students in synthesizing GE skills and disciplinary knowledge.

The EER Report also announced the development of institutional learning outcomes drawn from CSULB's Mission, Values, and Vision Statement. The outcomes are listed in the report and have been posted on the university website (CFR 2.3).

Findings. In exploring the institution's response to this recommendation for Core Commitment III, the team consulted the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators 2008; conducted meetings with members of the campus community, including the General Education Governing Committee, the Program Assessment and Review Committee; reviewed selected student portfolios, annual assessment reports, and the subsequent feedback provided to the programs; talked with the current Director of Program Review and Assessment; and navigated the websites for selected programs, including the hybrid online/face-to-face faculty development resources developed on the "Designs4" framework.

One of the institution's research questions asked: "How has student learning been impacted by our efforts to assess student learning outcomes in every academic program, including General Education?" The team found that the EER Report itself does not answer the question, focusing instead on the substantial improvements in capacity that have been achieved, the participation that was fostered, and a summary of the types of changes reportedly made by programs. The report states that the assessment program "demonstrates that attention to evidence of student learning can be part of a comprehensive, university-wide approach to enhancing student success through educational effectiveness." No doubt this is true - but the report does not provide examples of the evidence, nor whether the evidence of student learning indicated that students were performing at levels acceptable to a specific program or to the institution. The team expected to see information about how well CSULB students were achieving some specific outcomes, particularly in the General Education program, and evidence of reflective practice in descriptions of what the programs did in response to those particular results; instead, we saw aggregated reports of activities and of general types of "improvements in student outcomes due to assessment of learning" such as "improved knowledge/skills" (p. 34).

The team was therefore gratified when discussions on campus revealed a very different picture. Meetings with those actually engaged in assessment efforts were notable for the range of specific results that were thoughtfully and knowledgeably discussed (CFRs 2.4, 4.6). For example, we learned that students in the criminology program fell short of department expectations for writing when they wrote the 30-page ethnography required as part of their field

experience. In response, the department created a discipline-specific writing program within the department. Students who have been through the program are just now reaching their fieldwork experience, so formal assessment of the program's impact on student learning will occur soon (CFR 2.6). Examples like this one provide evidence of the institution's progress toward building a culture infused with curiosity about student learning, with evolving practices of data collection and analysis, and with the subsequent actions steps that characterize meaningful assessment. The team encourages the university to sustain the momentum of this progress.

Another dimension of the university's assessment progress relates to the way that its identification of learning outcomes has supported the coordination of multiple sections of the same course (CFR 4.7). In a number of settings, reference was made to the development of "signature assignments" common across all sections of a key course. In the case of the Liberal Studies program, for example, the five core liberal arts areas are assessed through signature assignments for each area as part of a three-unit capstone experience. Analytical rubrics are used to score the assignments in group scoring sessions, and the results are used to adjust the assignments and reading materials for subsequent offerings of the course across multiple sections.

Meetings during the visit also provided insight into why the report includes no GE assessment results yet, what progress has been made toward getting such results, and how programs are using the information that is already available. The hiatus in assessing General Education outcomes under the old model allowed the General Education Governing Committee (GEGC) to become aware of - and to consider how to incorporate - all the assessment and analysis connected to GE that was already going on in connection with other activities. Currently, each department assesses achievement of General Education student learning outcomes in the GE courses that it offers, and the assessment results for General Education courses are included in departmental assessment reports. Departments are also contributing to the development of curriculum maps, which are intended to show which departments address the same learning outcomes so that communities of practice can be formed to engage in collaborative assessment of those particular outcomes; in the meantime, however, as one member of the GEGC noted, the maps also provide major programs with a "silhouette" that shows gaps where their students may not be getting adequate attention to the development of specific skills, and awareness of those gaps can guide advising and curricular changes even before the

communities of practice are identified and convened. On the whole, the visiting team was impressed with the progress that has been made toward developing a sustainable model for assessing and improving General Education, and it encourages the university to build on this work through collecting and analyzing student learning data, convening communities of practice, and including the General Education program itself in the Program Review cycle.

In addition to the assessment work being done in academic programs, learning outcomes assessment is also being incorporated into the work of all Student Services units. Two case studies were presented in the EER Report, demonstrating the integration of Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) frameworks with learning outcomes. One of the case studies traces the efforts of the Educational Opportunity Program to improve the math and English skills of its students. The fact that results were better for math than for English provides useful information that should help the program work with Academic Affairs to strengthen the program's ability to improve students' writing skills (CFRs 2.11, 4.6).

While the team found a number of ways in which assessment progress exceeded the level represented in the EER Report, we also found that this was not the case with the institutional outcomes. The institutional outcomes that have been identified since the CPR visit have not been explicitly connected to course, program, General Education, or co-curricular experiences or outcomes. CSULB needs to map the institutional outcomes onto the other levels of outcomes that have already been established so that assessment of outcomes at other levels can also provide information about the extent to which students have achieved what is expected of a CSULB graduate through all dimensions of their university experiences.

Also, while CSULB has set benchmarks for improving graduation rates and closing the achievement gap for traditionally underrepresented groups, programs have not yet set targets or benchmarks for student learning outcomes as critical measures of student success (CFR s 2.2, 2.6). Accordingly, the university is encouraged to articulate its expectations for student learning achievement at the general education, major, and institutional levels, compare assessment results with those expectations, and use such analyses to inform decisions about institutional priorities in ways that parallel campus uses of graduation rate data.

II. B. Program Review

Recommendation 2: *Evidence of institution-wide assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and institutional levels, and including general education and program*

review. Direct methods, analysis, and use of findings for feedback, decision making, and improvement should be demonstrated (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.6, 4.7).

Actions. Managed by the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC), the program review process at CSULB was updated in 2005 and again in 2010. The inquiry-based process begins with a proposal submitted by the program or department, the purpose of which is to identify the themes on which the self-study will focus; additionally, annual university-wide themes to be addressed by all programs undergoing review that year are identified by the Vice Provost. These campus-wide themes provide a way to make progress on university priorities at the department level, because they are drawn from the university's strategic goals. The improvement of student learning has been among those themes for each of the past several cycles; requiring "a description of assessment findings and the changes that have been implemented based on those findings," this level of focus has no doubt contributed to the recent building of momentum around the assessment of student learning outcomes (CFR 2.7).

The Program Review process, which meets the goals of the WASC Program Review guidelines, takes two years. During the first year, the self-study is prepared and potential external reviewers are identified; during the second year, internal and external reviews are conducted and discussed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is developed to outline commitments made by the department and the college/university-level administrations as a result of Program Review findings and recommendations. Once the MOU has been finalized, it forms the basis for annual reports submitted by the program (these are in addition to the annual assessment reports) and for subsequent written administrative responses to those reports. The MOU also provides a connection between Program Review and allocation of resources, though no systematic role for MOU commitments in regular budget planning was described. Programs are typically reviewed every seven years, adjusted when necessary to allow externally-accredited programs to align their Program Review cycles with their accreditation self-studies when the period between reviews does not exceed ten years.

Not all academic and co-curricular programs are currently subject to program review. For example, as stated above, the General Education program is not currently part of the Program Review cycle. However, plans to enhance and broaden the scope of program review to be more inclusive have been reported by the Program Assessment and Review Committee, the Director of

Assessment and Program Review, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies, and the visiting team applauds these developments.

Findings. The visiting team examined Program Review documents prepared by the Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling, Civil Engineering, and English departments (completed in 2007, 2008, and 2009, respectively) as part of its evaluation of the program review process at CSULB. The selection of these programs allowed the team to examine how Program Review was implemented by a graduate-level program (MA ED, Education Administration option), a professional program (BS in Civil Engineering), and an undergraduate liberal arts program (BA in English). Members of the visiting team also met with faculty and administrators associated with each program, with members of the Program Assessment and Review Committee, and with the current Director of Program Review and Assessment.

The visiting team found that Program Review is assuredly used to improve program effectiveness. Faculty members in the MA ED program now devote one faculty meeting per semester to reviewing students' mastery of student learning outcomes and their progress against established benchmarks. Further, they noted that the Program Review process provides an opportunity for them to develop a priority list of resource needs (e.g., faculty, academic support services, computer laboratories, library resources, etc.) with significant emphasis on assessment, accountability and data-driven decision making, and that these needs are communicated to the Resource Planning Process Committee for consideration. The undergraduate Civil Engineering program used the Program Review process to identify student learning issues, analyze the curricular components and pedagogy involved, and make changes in course design to provide additional active learning opportunities. They subsequently tracked the results of student response to the changes and used that analysis to further adjust the program elements, leading to improved student outcomes. The institution supported these program activities with assigned time, approval of curricular proposals, and additional administrative resources for other adjustments identified by the program.

As noted above, the review process has been evolving, and, while there is not a formal process for systematically reviewing the Program Review procedure itself, CSULB has been responsive when a need for adjustment to the procedure is demonstrated. For example, in the course of preparing its self-study, the English department raised questions about the accuracy of the available data, and Institutional Research is currently developing standard departmental data

sites to provide accessible, accurate, and reliable data for program review and other purposes. The English department also struggled with the quality and relevance of its external review. The Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC) confirmed that the quality of external reviews has been uneven and, in order to address this gap in the process, PARC is working on a template for external reviewers to use in preparing reports that more consistently meet departmental and institutional needs (CFRs 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

II. C. Student Success

WASC expects that at the time of an EER visit, institutions will have deepened the analysis of its own data, and that it will have obtained comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate, and so on. The WASC-required campus response is described below.

Consistent with its mission as a “diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university,” CSU Long Beach demonstrates a strong commitment to student success. Based on the systemwide “CSU Graduation Initiative: Closing the Achievement Gap,” CSULB established the Highly Valued Degree Initiative (HVDI) building on graduation and retention data analyses and student success initiatives already in place. A letter from the President, in the spring 2010 edition of “The Beach Review,” began, “No student succeeds alone.” It ended by saying, “Students are why we are here.” This message of campus engagement in helping students succeed and attain quality degrees was heard by the EER team throughout the visit in different venues and from different members of the campus community. CSULB’s Strategic Priorities and Goals 2009-2012” lists “Student Success” among the five institutional priorities.

In reviewing presentation materials from the Office of the Provost and through campus conversations, the team learned that CSULB has set HVDI graduation rate goals with particular attention given to current minority freshman rates and those of transfer students (CFR 2.10). During the fall 2010 semester, graduation rate goals for each of the seven academic colleges are being assigned with discussions occurring with the Provost and Deans. To implement the HVDI further, five task forces consisting of faculty, staff, and students have been formed. The task forces and their charges, as noted in an April 2010 online report, “CSULB Student Success Efforts” from the Planning and Budget Office are:

- 1) Curriculum Pathways - to identify reasons why average units of graduation for CSULB students are high and identify ways to simplify requirements and reduce excess units, giving special attention to low income and underrepresented minority students.

- 2) Support Services - to identify student support needs, with special attention to needs of low income and underrepresented minority students.
- 3) Advising - has the goal of ensuring that all students, especially low income and underrepresented minority students receive needed advising.
- 4) Faculty Development - to identify the most effective instructional methods that contribute to retention and learning, especially for low income and underrepresented minority students.
- 5) Research and Evaluation - to support the other task forces with data.

Successful student success initiatives already identified by task forces include the Beach Learning Community (BLC) that focuses on entering freshmen who need assistance in mathematics and writing skills. The BLC was designed in response to analysis of low-retention rates for these students. When the CPR visited in March 2009, the BLC was found to be a source of pride; at the time of the EER visit the team found that the BLC had been broadened to serve more students in baccalaureate programs. Retention services for Latino/a and African-American students have also been expanded. The designation of CSULB as a Hispanic-Serving Institution allows for grant-funding opportunities to support graduation rates. In an EER interview, three students spoke eloquently and confidently about their opportunities to serve as mentors or interns through Student Services programs for Latinos/as. An Engineering major indicated that he probably would have left in his first year had it not been for student assistance programs. Representatives from the Office of Student Services together with other campus representatives shared other initiatives such as the expanded use of electronic reporting through which students can check on their progress toward degree completion (CFR 2.12). Graduation Green Light is the umbrella term for three data-driven graduation initiatives in the University Advising Center. These are just a few examples of student success initiatives designed and implemented in response to data-identified needs (CFR 2.13).

CSULB has deepened data analysis and conducted comparative analyses expected by WASC for this part of the accreditation process. With reference to “Campus Climate,” the team found that CSULB has designed a comprehensive survey that, at the time of the EER visit, was almost ready to be distributed with information obtained by core commitment research groups incorporated into its questions. Regarding student success data analysis, the Vice-Provost was quoted in the online CSULB News and Events, “This Week @ The Beach” – week of April 05,

2010 that, “For over a decade, CSULB has doubled graduation rates and we have seen significant recent gains for many groups.” The article, “Cal State Long Beach Graduation Rate Efforts Pay Off, Especially for Underrepresented Minority Students,” further notes a seven percent increased graduation rate for underrepresented students over the past two years; a six percent increase for Latino/a students, and a six percent increase for African-Americans. Institutional Portfolio Summary Data Tables found in the EER Self-Study (p. 92) revealed a corresponding trend of increased 6-year cohort graduation rates for underrepresented students.

CSULB compared itself on a national basis using the CRO or College Results Online that aggregates graduation data for first-time, full-time freshmen from the federal government’s Integrated Post-Secondary Education Reporting Data System(CFR 4.4). A power-point progress report on “Student Success at CSULB” highlighted increased graduation rates. For example, in comparison to 74 similar public master’s universities, CSULB’s “all students” 2007 graduation rate was in the top 25 percent; in 2009 the rate increased to the top 10 percent. Rates for Latino/a students for the same years increased from the top 40 percent to the top 10 percent; African American graduations rose from the top 20 percent in 2007 to the top 10 percent in 2009. Graduation increases were also noted on the basis of gender: female graduation rates increased from the top 25 percent in 2007 to the top 5 percent in 2009. Male graduation rates increased from the top 30 percent in 2007 to the top ten percent in 2009.

CSU Long Beach has made considerable progress in improving its graduation rates through campus-wide efforts that have supported these accomplishments. Graduation and retention rates are certainly important indicators of success and the team was impressed with the increases that have occurred. However, the team wishes to remind the institution that data regarding the quality of student learning are also significant in identifying a successful graduate and encourages CSULB to continue to broaden the definition of “student success” to encompass academic achievement among other factors of a highly valued degree.

SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW AND THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

Overall Findings. In March 2009, The Capacity and Preparatory Review Team visited California State University Long Beach to review and seek to understand actions that had been taken in response to the first phase of the accreditation process. Based on the CPR visit, the team

made a set of recommendations to the WASC Commission which became the starting point for the continued self-study that was undertaken and reported in the Educational Effectiveness Review. These recommendations have been addressed by the institution and findings are discussed in this report within Section II. Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness under the Standards.

At the exit interview on October 8, the EER Chair presented a team statement that reflects the impact of the entire review on the institution:

In our opinion, CSULB is opening up a new chapter in the practice of institutional development and the use of collaborative and reflective practice during a time of rapid and unpredictable change. Your approach to planning and the connection between your mission and the priorities you have set as well as the link between your goals and how you invest in your capacity are exciting. There is much that your colleagues in higher education can learn from you about how to move from anecdotes to data collection to effective use of data and the journey toward a culture of discovery and a habit of learning from experience. You are thinking your way into the future in an admirable way and we thank you for the privilege of getting to know you better.

Commendations

Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness

1. The planning and budget process used at CSULB is admirably suited to the difficult and rapidly changing social and economic environment in which the institution operates.
2. The introduction of a consultation model that allows for much broader and more frequent exchange of information and ideas about the budget situation and the choices being considered for managing the budget is compatible with the campus culture. The new working relationship with the Academic Senate as an effective sounding board has improved the ability of the administration to tell the budget story and to talk about critically important issues in a collegial manner. Campus leadership across all constituencies has learned to focus sharply on the critical questions of what is already known, what isn't known yet, who needs to know and what do they need to know, and what tangible results to expect from the enhanced exchanges made possible by the broader collaborative model. Lessons learned from this experience are already being used to design the next Academic Senate retreat and other ways to support planning and budgeting.

3. The Wednesday memos updating the campus community on the budget situation and the enhanced web presence for information about planning and budgeting are excellent ways to keep members of the community informed. The expanded approach to engaging the campus has helped CSULB work its way through a difficult budget crisis in a collegial manner. The campus is learning how to work through contentious and potentially divisive issues in an open and respectful manner consistent with its historic commitment to collaboration.

4. Student participation in university governance is meaningful and influential and faculty, staff, and students value the role that students play in setting priorities and in evaluating success.

5. There is clear evidence that the campus is moving effectively toward using data as a component of reflective practice and agenda-setting in an uncertain environment.

6. The practice of assessment is spreading through the campus community and the value of assessment is being embraced more fully. Efforts are underway to link responses at the unit level to broader institutional goals.

Core Commitment 2: Staffing for Effectiveness

1. CSULB has taken the issue of faculty and staff diversity very seriously and has developed a faculty and staff diversity plan. Despite limited opportunities for recruitment, the campus has developed and begun to act upon the financially feasible parts of the diversity plan with an emphasis on mentoring, faculty and staff development, and training for search committees and supervisors.

2. There is clearly a respect for and appreciation of the need to acknowledge the impact of budget constraints on faculty roles, responsibilities, and workload. This has led to an effort to compensate for this impact by adapting and streamlining the approach to Program Review to accommodate review cycles set by external accreditation.

3. In responses to concerns about faculty workload, the RTP process is being revised to allow for department-based RTP policies consistent with each department's areas of emphasis and related

teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service expectations. This new model will be fully implemented by 2014.

4. CSULB has developed a campus climate survey to follow up on the findings of the initial case study conducted for the EER review. The process of regular inquiry will guide the implementation and evaluation of plans to support faculty and staff.

Core Commitment 3: Assessing Student Success

1. CSULB has continued to acquire additional information to guide the development of strategies to promote student success.

2. CSULB has demonstrated a willingness to broaden the definition of student success from quantifiable outcomes such as graduation and time to degree to include a consideration of other elements, including the quality of the student experience, both curricular and co-curricular.

3. CSULB kept in close contact with their local community high schools and community colleges during a time of considerable confusion about how many new students would be admitted to the university.

4. CSULB has expanded the scope of consideration of quality and the definition of a “highly valued degree” to include both faculty expectations for their students and the perspectives of the external community, including employers.

5. The team notes with appreciation the strong evidence of increasing collaboration between academic and student affairs and between faculty advisors and student support staff in the design and implementation of programs that support the needs of incoming students and improve student success by increasing the involvement of students in a vibrant campus life.

6. The development of student learning outcomes and the assessment process is laudable, especially given the short time that has elapsed since the CPR visit in March 2009. The team saw

many examples of the rapid introduction and enhancement of the assessment process and its impact on the curriculum and pedagogies.

7. General Education outcomes and assessments have been integrated into the program review process for specific degree programs and into annual assessment reports.

8. CSULB has developed exemplary approaches to cross-unit collaboration and effective engagement with the external community. The team especially wishes to recognize the effective use of the Enrollment Advisory Council and the internal Advising Council.

Recommendations

1. Demonstrate that students are achieving explicit expectations for learning. Student success can be viewed through a variety of lenses. Time to degree and graduation rates are important measures and reflect the most common accountability measures being imposed upon higher education by policy-makers. However, student learning and the design and responsiveness of courses of study to changing conditions in practice are also important. In addition to whether students complete their courses of study, CSULB will want to increase its attention to how well-prepared the students are for what lies ahead. Employment patterns and salaries are related to this issue but are not sufficient surrogates for measuring how well students are prepared (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7).

2. Broaden the definition of quality. The quality of an education can be studied from both an internal and an external perspective. CSULB may benefit from adding a more qualitative element to its evaluation strategies. Although reputational ratings and hiring patterns are good external reference points for quality and degree completion does connote one aspect of student success, current efforts to define curricular outcomes and to develop ways to collect and then assess measures of those outcomes can offer another valuable perspective on quality (CFRs 2.7, 2.10).

3. Continue to prepare for the future. Despite the apparent reprieve from the State for FY 2010-2011, it will be important for the campus to continue to develop budget strategies for the long

term, including alternative approaches to revenue generation. The campus may also benefit from continuing to evaluate the effect of faculty and staff reductions on the workload and responsibilities of the remaining workforce (CFRs 3.1, 3.5).

4. Close the feedback loop. The new communication strategies that were developed in FY 2009-2010 hold great promise for engaging a broader sector of the campus community in responding to data about the performance of the institution and its progress toward accomplishing its mission. The broadening of participation in planning and budgeting has yielded promising results. The campus should build upon this experience. In future years, the administration should follow up on lessons that have been learned during the past year and close the feedback loop as the budget plan comes together by demonstrating how they have listened carefully, reflected upon what they have heard and have incorporated campus feedback into decisions being made about setting and acting upon campus priorities (CFRs 3.8, 4.3).

5. Continue to build a supportive environment for achieving CSULB's mission. CSULB has made a promising start in creating materials that allow a department to see how it is contributing to overall university goals, such as enrollment targets and time to degree. The team encourages the university to continue to develop ways to allow individual units and their members to see how their efforts contribute to the whole. For example, as the revision of RTP criteria continues to unfold, it would be appropriate to recognize more fully the contribution of faculty members to student success and to the scholarship of learning and teaching (CFRs 1.1, 2.4).

APPENDIX A

OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

Summary form for off-campus site reviewers. A completed copy of this form for each off-campus site visited 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.]

1. INSTITUTION:

California State University Long Beach

2. SITE LOCATION (include physical address):

Stanford Middle School
5871 Los Arcos, Long Beach, CA 90815

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

Jacqueline M. Mimms, Ph.D.

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

The Master of Arts Degree in Education, Option in Mathematics Education, is designed for high school mathematics teachers to enhance their content and pedagogy knowledge. It is a 30-33 unit program and does not overlap with the Master of Science in Mathematics Education, Option in Mathematics for Secondary School Teachers. There are no other CSU campuses offering a program that is identical to the Mathematics Education Program at CSULB (e.g., with an emphasis on the combination of mathematics assessment, technology integration, investigation of research-based effective teaching strategies for meeting the mathematics needs of diverse students.) Although San Diego State University offers some similar courses, the primary emphasis is on understanding children's mathematical thinking. The CSULB program utilizes a 25-student cohort model at Stanford Middle School which allows candidates to work with the same students throughout the program. Candidates have multiple opportunities to learn from colleagues and share their mathematics teaching expertise. The target audience is classroom teachers, mathematics coaches, curriculum specialists, and teacher leaders in their school districts. The program is strongly supported by local schools with more than 20 local school mathematics department heads signing their support for the program in 2006. Summer courses are offered on the main campus.

The class that was visited was the second cohort to be enrolled in the Mathematics Education Program. Eleven state-supported courses are offered at the off-campus site based on a 3-year course offering plan. Six experienced Ph.D. tenure track faculty teach in the program. All classes are taught in a face-to-face mode with an instructor present. The class in session on the day of the visit was EDME 502, Research in Mathematics Teaching and Learning taught by Dr. Shuhua An. Dr. An was responsible for drafting the original program proposal. The class meets on Wednesdays from 4:00 – 6:45 p.m. for sixteen weeks. A wide array of library resources and academic support services are available for faculty and candidates.

5. DATE VISITED and LENGTH OF VISIT:

Wednesday, October 6, 2010 -- 1 ½ hours

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

- CPR
- EER**
- Special Visit
- Substantive Change review
- Other (please explain)

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

a. Met with Kathy Cruz, Stanford Middle School Principal. Ms. Cruz stated that there are 8 mathematics instructors at her school. She has promoted the Mathematics Education Program to her math teachers. Two of her teachers have enrolled in the program. Ms. Cruz also described how beneficial the program has been to her teachers and how having the students in the program on the campus program to provide tutoring to her middle school students has been helpful to the mathematics instructors at her school.

b. Also met with two local teachers who arrived early for the class. Both teachers stated that they had learned useful strategies as a result of being in the program. Courses offered at Stanford Middle School are very convenient for working students, some who travel from long distances, and students avoid having to deal with on-campus parking.

c. Dr. Shuhua An was also interviewed. Dr. An was responsible for developing the Mathematics Education Program. She indicated that the primary benefits of the program to students include job preparation, career change, professional development, improvement of math skills, learning useful classroom mathematics techniques, and those simply interested in mathematics. Some students have been able to participate in forums in China where they had an opportunity to present their research projects.

d. Class visitation and interview with approximately 25 students – Students spoke about not only the personal and professional benefits they had obtained by participating in the program but also described how the program is currently being promoted (e.g., E-mails, CSULB webpage, fliers, word-of-mouth, through district offices, etc.). There is adequate access to computers when needed on the main campus. The students do not feel isolated from the campus but, instead, feel very connected to what is going on at the main campus. They stated that Dr. An has an extremely strong commitment to the program and is personally involved with the success of every student in the program. One student said that “she doesn’t sleep” in reference to her availability to students. It is clear that Dr. An holds a great deal of respect and is esteemed among all students in the program.

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

Master of Arts in Education: Option in Mathematics Education Informational Binder containing general Program Information; Program Proposal; Assessment Plan; Curriculum Map; Course Syllabi; Program Data; and Faculty Roster Teaching in Program

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)</p>	<p>Yes. Stanford Middle School serves as a middle school during the day hours and provides adequate space for the MAED in the evening. The classrooms seat approximately 30 students and are modestly equipped with essential tools necessary to conduct classroom teaching (e.g., blackboard, audiovisual equipment, etc.).</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)</p>	<p>Students at the off-campus site have access to the same level of advising, counseling, library and computing services as main campus students. Students interviewed stated that even though their classes meet at an off-campus site, they feel very connected to the main campus activities. They are kept informed through E-mails. In addition, the students collectively spoke about Dr. An's commitment to ensuring student success and indicated that she, and other faculty, are extremely responsive to their needs and make every effort to insure that their needs are met.</p>	
<p><i>Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)</p>	<p>Stanford Middle School is located approximately 1.5 miles from CSULB and is not visible to the main campus. However, as previously indicated, it appears that there is a strong connection between faculty and students. During the interview, students reported that faculty are accessible, approachable and very helpful. Students also have access to the academic support services they need (e.g., advising, counseling, technical support, etc.).</p>	
<p><i>Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to off-campus activities.</i> In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to activities at this site? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</p>	<p>The program is built around the core standards and concepts contained in the college Conceptual Framework as well as state guidelines and NCATE and professional standards. In addition, the home campus is committed to providing Ph.D. tenured faculty to teach in the program. Since the program was developed to meet the needs of classroom teachers, mathematics coaches, curriculum specialists and teacher leaders, they can</p>	

	<p>provide feedback on program effectiveness in relationship to their abilities to implement the standards-based mathematics curriculum, technology and assessment in their teaching practices. Based on data analysis, constructive feedback from program participants and the local community, program revisions and improvements are implemented.</p>	
<p><i>Context of this site in the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>CSULB has a history of community engagement and maintains close contact with its local community and strives to meet the needs of students within their service area. As a result, several off-campus programs have been implemented. The Mathematics Education Program evolved after substantial community participation between the mathematics education faculty and local school representatives. The same mission and vision exists for on-campus and off-campus sites. Students utilize the same application and admission processes as main campus for graduate standing candidates. Faculty hiring and evaluation meet the same standards as on-campus.</p>	
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The University has placed considerable attention to developing student learning outcomes and assessing program effectiveness. Instructors determine tools to assess competency in course related activities and assignments related to SLOs. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan focuses on 8 SLOs and students who successfully complete the Mathematics Education program are expected to be competent in all areas. The program also uses the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Principles and Standards for School Mathematics guidelines.</p>	

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

The Master of Arts Degree in Education, Option in Mathematics Education program provides a unique opportunity for students to not only gain knowledge and skills in mathematics and pedagogy, but also allows candidates to conduct research and assess the learning needs of diverse students. The research component of the program was highlighted by program participants interviewed during the EER visit. For example, at least one student participated in an opportunity, made available through the institution to present research findings alongside a CSULB faculty member to professors and colleagues in China. The program director is hopeful that this practice of having students present their research will be extended to other program candidates in the future.

California schools are in dire need of teachers with mathematics backgrounds. This program addresses the shortage and takes into consideration the benefits of using a cohort model in an off-campus delivery format which is responsive to schedules of working professionals. The College of Education at CSULB's response to community needs is laudable.

APPENDIX B

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

Institution: California State University, Long Beach

Team Member(s)/Reviewer(s): Jená Burges

Dates distance education materials were viewed: 9/27/10- 10/6/10

Viewed in conjunction with (check all that apply):

EER

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:

An externally accredited MSW program for working professionals is offered via Saturday classes at a distance through video conferencing at two sites, one in Sonoma with a cohort of 25 and one at Channel Islands with a cohort of 26. The program began in 1995 with cohorts at Humboldt and Chico, and later launched cohorts at other sites – most of which have now become independent programs run by the universities that once served as remote CSULB MSW sites; the distance MSW has now completed five full three-year cycles. In this fully-interactive model, the students are at the remote site with microphones at every desk and a video screen displaying the instructor and instructional materials, while the instructors – faculty in the on-campus Social Work program - facilitate from a campus studio. There are also two local site coordinators in the classroom, and field seminars of 8-10 students are taught by local practitioners. Students do local field placements of 16 hours a week for four semesters.

Several other programs have substantial online/distance components. The MS- Health Care Administration program is taught on a hybrid model, with about half of the instruction online. There are 81 students registered in the MS-HCA hybrid master's program in F10. Sixteen faculty have taught in the program over the last two years; six are full-time and ten are part-time. The Masters in Public Policy and the Bachelors in Occupational Studies (now being phased out) are mostly online, with only the first and last class sessions being taught face-to face on campus. There are 46 students in the Masters of Public Policy distance program. Twelve faculty have taught in the program over the last two years; six are full-time and six are part-time.

The MS in Engineering Management has been discontinued as planned; taking its place as the only fully-online program is a new online version of the Master of Science in Emergency Services Administration (EMER) program in the College of Health and Human Services. The program was first offered in Fall 2002 but was transitioned to a fully online offering in 2009, having received WASC Substantive Change Approval for online delivery in April 2005. Fifty-eight students started in the Fall 2009 cohort, and 30 students have started in the Fall,

2010 cohort. Full-time faculty contributing to the EMER program come from eight different departments on campus. The program also has a cadre of professional practitioners in emergency services administration and management serving as part-time faculty. Student enrollment (including students finishing the previous version of the program in addition to the new cohorts): 89 students in Fall 2009; 61 students in Spring 2010; and 36 students in Summer 2010 for a total of 186 students served for FY 09/10.

Description of distance education interactions—What was viewed, description of formats, other details to help describe nature and context of the review:

Guest access to “BeachBoard,” CSU-LB’s version of the BlackBoard Learning Management System that constitutes the platform for online courses, was provided beginning 9/27/2010 to allow review of an impressive range of online resources and support available to students (e.g., tutorials to help students learn to navigate the BeachBoard environment, instructions for various components, self-assessment tools, contact names and numbers, etc.). Because several individual online courses (including Elluminate sessions) were reviewed before and during the CPR visit, and no concerns were raised, it was not necessary to enter individual courses again. As noted in the CPR report, a common template used across all of the online courses facilitates students’ familiarity with these modes of instruction.

Since the time of the CPR visit, CSU-LB has designed several hybrid workshops for purposes of faculty development, and access to five of those was also provided beginning September 27. An active workshop for faculty in the Beach Learning Community (the program for freshmen needing remediation in both math and English) was surveyed, along with archived workshops for faculty developing Business courses and for new faculty. These hybrid workshops seem well-structured and effective, and, while they are not designed for students, such experiences do serve to acquaint faculty with the principles of online course design, which ultimately benefits their students.

Other materials reviewed or persons interviewed concerning distance education—Prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit:

Documents:

- A list of questions following up on questions arising from the CPR visit and the EER reports was sent to the ALO prior to the visit, and a thorough response was received.
- A brochure for the MSW program was consulted.

Persons interviewed:

- Debbie Hildreth Pisarcik, Distance Education Supervisor, College of Continuing and Professional Education
- Leslie Kennedy, Director, Instructional Technology Support Services
- Jeet Joshee, Dean, College of Continuing and Professional Education
- Ken Millar, Dean, College of Health and Human Services
- Sue Stanley, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services
- Marilyn Potts, Master of Social Work Distance Education Director
- Shireen Pavri, Associate Dean, College of Education

In addition, follow-up emails were exchanged with Dr. Stanley and Dr. Joshee.



Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Infrastructure.</i> 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)</p>	<p>The learning platform and infrastructure are efficient and intuitive, with ample resources to guide students through the structure and foster interaction among students and faculty in a variety of formats: email, discussion board, Elluminate, video conferencing.</p> <p>In light of BlackBoard's acquisition of Angel, the campus has decided to shift to Desire2Learn instead of to Angel as it had planned. Migration to Desire2Learn has begun and completion is anticipated for Summer 2011.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> 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)</p>	<p>The University Library is positioned to support online and distance students because many of its resources are digital and available through remote access via the library website. Online research guides; librarians are available for email consultation and 24 hours a day through live chat. Technical support is also available online.</p> <p>Students can perform almost all financial aid functions virtually; the only exceptions are submitting additional documents, which can be done by mail, and counseling, which is done via phone appointments for students not able to come to campus. The Financial Aid Office has a counselor designated to coordinate the special needs of distance and online programs which helps ensure the needs of these populations are met.</p> <p>Students in online courses not only receive the same level of advising support as would any other student but are also served via email and telephone communication as needed.</p>	
<p><i>Connection of Faculty to the Institution.</i> 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)</p>	<p>In many cases (e.g., courses in the MSW program), the distance courses are taught by the same faculty members who teach the courses on campus. A range of online and faculty-development support is available for faculty teaching courses online (e.g., a full array of resources for developing accessible online course materials). Faculty members work with a designated instructional designer.</p> <p>Faculty work collaboratively to identify and assess program learning outcomes. This includes articulating specific program outcomes, mapping those outcomes to the curriculum, and collecting,</p>	



	analyzing and acting on data on student performance related to those outcomes on an ongoing basis to inform program improvement activities.	
<i>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)</i>	UCES personnel participated in the CPR and EER processes, and developments in assessment of student learning and program improvement infused the distance programs and courses to the same degree as they did in the on-campus offerings.	
<i>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)</i>	As noted in the CPR report, there is no university-level planning with respect to distance education. Both student expectations and workforce demands, rather than institutional priorities, were cited as driving forces behind developing online courses and programs, though global engagement is cited as an institutional priority facilitated by online learning (e.g., in the case of the new fully-online EMER program, now making emergency management administration training available worldwide). Meeting workforce needs and helping students acquire workforce skills are important elements of the CSU-LB mission, and programs for working professionals do make an impact on the community. Those consulted on distance education issues believed that the university could be making more online/distance courses and programs available; the fact that many on-campus courses now have some online components is seen as a step toward developing more fully-online courses and programs.	X
<i>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)</i>	All online and hybrid programs submit annual assessment reports and receive feedback on those reports. They also undergo periodic program review, which will now involve the specific data reports available through Institutional Research as described in the EER report. By way of example, the transformation of the EMER into an online program resulted from a major curricular review, and the discontinuance of the BA in Occupational Studies, a result of developments in the discipline itself, also exemplifies the evaluation and subsequent adjustment of programs.	



<p><i>Verification of Student Identity.</i> What procedures does the institution have in place to ensure that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit? Does the institution make clear in writing that these processes protect student privacy and notify students at the time of registration or enrollment of any projected additional costs associated with the verification procedures? (CFRs 1.7, 1.8)</p>	<p>CSU-LB uses LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) which also is tied with TIM (TIVOLI Identity Manager) for authentication purposes for online students. These require personal information to log in to confirm is who h/she is. There are also tools that will lockdown browsers, randomize questions, restrict the test to specific IP address, and restrict the length of time one can take the test, etc. However, if an online test is not proctored, it should be considered an open book exam. Most online programs don't rely on one modality for assessment. The curriculum incorporates projects, papers, and discussion boards in order to engage the students in multiple modalities so that the instructor gets to know the students' writing styles and possibly see them via web conferencing. The goal is to incorporate and exhibit the students' analysis and critical thinking in to the learning environment as much as possible, which makes it more difficult for someone to "take" the course for another student</p>	
--	---	--

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

As CSU-LB balances its resources and needs, engaging in university-level planning for distance education will become even more critical. Lessons learned through developing and offering the multi-disciplinary EMER program – especially its use of simulations and other newly-developed online resources – could provide a foundation for planning other programs that serve institutional as well as college and community priorities.

Appendix C

Review of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership Program offered through the **College of Education, CSU Long Beach** **EER Visit, October 6-8, 2010**

Team Member/Reviewer: Irma Guzman Wagner

Background Information:

In 2005, California Senate Bill 724 was enacted granting CSU the first-time independent authority to offer doctorate degree programs. This was a significant response to long-standing requests that the State allow the CSU system to offer “stand alone” Ed D. programs. Previously, Educational Leadership doctoral programs in the CSU were designed and offered through joint agreements with doctorate-granting institutions like those in the University of California (UC) system. The 2005 legislative action represented a major achievement in the history of higher education in California reflecting the demand for highly-qualified educational leaders in P-12 schools and community colleges.

Description of CSULB’s Ed. D. Program:

CSULB became one of the first universities in the 23-campus CSU system to offer an independent doctoral program. The Ed.D. Program at CSU Long Beach has been chosen to be part of a Carnegie-based pilot study of similar programs nationally.

The Ed. D. Program has two options or strands: 1) Educational Leadership in Pre K-12 School Districts, and 2) Educational Leadership in Community College/Higher Education. Students are enrolled in a cohort model of instruction requiring 1) full-time study of 7-9 units per semester and summer study, and 2) 60 units of coursework designed for a three-year completion period. Course requirements are distributed as follows: 1) 35 units of Core Courses, 2) 13 units of Research Courses, and 3) 12 units of specialization courses in either the Pre K-12 or Community College/Higher Education strand. Admission Requirements consist of the following: 1) Master’s degree in Education or a related field, 2) minimum 3.0 cumulative GPA in upper division and graduate coursework, 3) demonstration of sufficient preparation for, experience in, and potential for educational leadership. The application process includes: 1) official transcripts for all college coursework, 2) official GRE General Test scores taken within the past five years, 3) three letters of recommendation, 4) statement of purpose, 5) current resume, and 6) writing samples.

Program Approval History:

The Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) Program in Educational Leadership Program was approved by the WASC Commission in June 2007 and, since then, has undergone reviews by the Substantive Change Committee. During the spring 2009 Capacity and Review Preparatory (CPR) site visit, the Ed. D. Program was reviewed at WASC’s request. A similar request was made for the fall

2010 Educational Effectiveness Review (EER.) A member of the visiting team was assigned to study the doctoral program. This report is a summary of what was learned about CSULB's Ed. D. program at the time of the October 6-8, 2010 accreditation review.

Enrollment Status:

In 2007, 27 students were admitted into Cohort I. In May 2010, 13 students graduated from the first cohort; 6 additional candidates defended their dissertations in summer 2010. There are currently four cohorts with 98 students at varying degrees of completion. Efforts to begin a spring 2011 cohort are currently underway. Students come, primarily, from Los Angeles and Orange County area schools and higher education institutions including CSULB. A review of ethnic distribution among admissions revealed a high percentage of underrepresented candidates within each of the four cohorts.

Program Evaluation and Candidate Assessment

In an interview with the Dean of the College of Education and the Ed.D. Program Director and through reviews of program documents, it became evident that two kinds of effectiveness information are collected through: 1) Program Evaluation and 2) Candidate Assessment.

Program Evaluation. The "Ed.D. Program Evaluation Procedure: Student Evaluation of Instructor, Program Surveys, and Focus Groups" is found in the Ed.D. Faculty Handbook. The procedures designate the individuals or groups who receive specific survey, focus, or other kinds of data. These include the college dean, Ed.D. program co-directors, and faculty. The Advisory Board, consisting of a wide representation, meets at least twice a year to advise on programs aspects, including the evaluation of program effectiveness. It was apparent at the time of the EER review, that data are being collected and used for making ongoing improvements on a regular basis. Program surveys are web-based and completed on an annual basis in September. One example of the use of data is that in the first year of operation, administrative office support to students was inconsistent; however, that concern was addressed and corrected with comparative data showing an annual increase in satisfaction. CSULB surveys of instructional performance are used on a regular basis except during the summer when the university does not generate the "Student Evaluation of Instructor" forms. Instead, the Ed. D. Program Office distributes a duplicate form allowing the students to evaluate instructors.

Another example of data collection and program improvement is the review of the first set of dissertations from Cohort I. Teams of two faculty members were assigned to read and evaluate each dissertation using established rubrics. This review was done to determine which elements in writing dissertations needed faculty attention. It was not designed as a "grade" for the dissertations per se or of individual doctoral candidates. The quality of each dissertation chapter and scholarly writing proficiency was judged with aggregated findings charted for discussion by faculty to follow up on needed program improvement. The EER visiting team member had an

opportunity to review dissertation samples from both program strands and, if she had used the dissertation rubric, would have given high ratings in all criteria, including scholarly writing. Rubrics are also available for examining the quality of the qualifying paper/exam. The criteria for evaluating the qualifying paper/exam also address the quality and tone of scholarly writing. Information gathered from these reviews is studied by the program faculty for the purpose of improving instruction in related courses.

Candidate Assessment. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are clearly delineated in the Ed.D. Program and constitute an important element of the Ed.D. Program Assessment Plan. The Student Handbook lists the SLOs and other program materials. The program, and consequently the plan, are relatively new and have not yet undergone a campus program review; however, the program administration is responding to requests from Academic Affairs pertaining to assessment. The College of Education has an Assessment Office overseen by an Assessment Coordinator appointed in 2007. The Coordinator is a tenure track faculty member who also teaches in the Ed.D. Program. An Assessment Committee is charged to review college level data and make recommendations on program and unit operations. Based on evidence, it appears that this program is “on track” to meet assessment process requirements in a timely manner and to continue to use data for the purpose of ensuring overall student success.

Program Resources:

Finances: The Ed.D. Program receives funding for instruction from student tuition/fees along with Chancellor’s Office support. Program applications, at this time, do not appear to have been impacted by the economic crisis. Financial aid information is readily available for students who, though working in professional positions, are making a considerable financial commitment.

Faculty: Eleven Core Faculty members (tenure-track) are assigned to the Ed D. Program along with 17 Affiliated Faculty from the College of Education and other CSULB colleges. Six adjunct faculty have been selected to provide instruction, as needed. According to the Dean, one new faculty position has been allocated to the Ed.D. program. When this position is filled, the Core Faculty roster should be complete. A review of faculty “brief vitae” and faculty expectations point to high expectations in the hiring process. A minimal qualification is an “ongoing record of scholarly work.” In December 2010, the College of Education will host the First Annual Symposium on Educational Leadership – Practice, Policy, and Research. The Call for Proposals was being advertised at the time of the EER visit. The EDD Personnel Committee reviews applications and develops a recommended list of qualified faculty to teach each doctoral course.

Physical Space: The doctoral program is housed in the Library in a modern suite of rooms designed for working professionals. Students can enjoy a lounge area with microwave facilities, a separate computer study room, and administrative and faculty offices and classrooms within the same complex. The room configuration is conducive to interactive or solitary study with

direct access to research, technology, and other learning materials and tools. Classes are scheduled for late afternoons, evenings, and weekends when students can attend and when the Library is usually open.

Materials Reviewed and Persons Interviewed:

Prior to the site visit, the College of Education sent links to online Ed.D. materials which were then reviewed along with website information regarding the program. Before and during the visit, the following documents were studied: Ed.D. Assessment Plan, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Qualifying Paper/Exam Rubrics, Dissertation Rubrics, Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, CDs of the Ed.D. Program Plan with Samples of Student Work, and charts containing various kinds of data analyses.

A meeting with College of Education Dean Marquita Grenot-Scheyer and Ed.D. Program Director Anna Ortiz occurred in the doctoral program offices located in the Library. The team member was given a tour of the facilities, including classrooms and computer labs used by program students.

Summary: The Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership has, in a short period of time, established itself as an important contributor to the institution's goal and history of connecting with the community – in this case, the educational community surrounding CSULB. It will be exciting to watch one of the first independent Ed.D. Programs as it evolves in the coming years. Program review findings, together with the Carnegie study, should provide valuable insights to this doctoral program which is responding to the dire need in California of finding and preparing highly-qualified educational leaders.