

CAPACITY REPORT

CSU, San Bernardino

Western Association of Schools & Colleges
April 24, 2003

Team Members:

Samuel H. Smith, WASC Chair
President Emeritus
Washington State University

Jerry D. Campbell, Assistant Chair/Team Writer
Chief Information Officer & Dean of Libraries
University of Southern California

Rachel Lindsey
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Chicago State University

Nancy Magnusson
Vice President for Planning
Pepperdine University

TABLE OF CONTENTS
FOR KEY ELEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic program reviews	p. 17
Administrative systems	p. 18, 19
Assessment	p. 12, 16, 23
Business practices	p. 13, 22
Culture of evidence	p. 12, 23
Distance/distributed learning	p. 15-16
Faculty diversity	p. 13
Faculty mentoring	p. 20
Faculty support programs	p. 17, 28
Faculty	p. 5, 15, 20
Gay, lesbian, transgender issues	p. 14
Grievances	p. 14, 22
Information literacy	p. 17
Information Technology	p. 18-19, 22
Institutional sustainability	p. 20
Leadership	p. 13, 20, 22
Library	p. 17
Major Recommendations	p. 25
Mission/Purpose	p. 12, 14
Ombudsman	p. 14, 22
Palm Desert facility	p. 16, 18, 24
Preparatory Review	p. 8
Strategic plan	p. 23-24
Student advisement	p. 19-21
Students	p. 19
Teaching/Learning	p. 14-15
Work environment	p. 21

Section I - Institutional Context

California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB) is a constituent campus of the California State University System and is located in a beautiful mountain-framed setting in suburban San Bernardino. One of its primary characteristics at this time is the significant expansion of its student body. It was founded in 1965 as a small liberal arts college and has subsequently grown into a large, comprehensive university with a Fall 2002 enrollment of 12,687 FTE students. Because it serves a large geographical area (encompassing San Bernardino and Riverside counties) with a growing, ethnically diverse population base, the CSU System master plan calls for CSUSB to grow to 20,000 FTES over the next 10-15 years at the expansion rate of 400-600 students per year.

CSUSB's attractive campus includes a substantial and well-maintained fiscal plant. To accommodate its rapid and continuing growth in the student population, it has added nine new buildings over the past 15 years, renovated others, and has capital construction plans to continue a substantial building program. While it has been characterized as a commuting campus, it is increasingly experiencing demand for on-campus housing. This is in part due to the vast, 27,000 square miles encompassed by its two-county service area. Thus its capital construction plans include an increase in the number of residential accommodations.

The size of its service area has also brought demand for CSUSB to increase its capacity to offer distance education and to open a second campus in Palm Desert. Both of these endeavors are in the early stages of operation.

CSUSB currently enjoys excellent administrative leadership, a highly qualified and productive faculty, and a talented and dedicated staff. In addition, the student body is diverse, capable, and enthusiastic about the quality of CSUSB programs.

The accreditation history of CSUSB is as follows:

- 5/64 Commission action: “New campuses of the State University and new State Colleges will be granted two-year periods of initial accreditation as of the dates of their opening to students.” (September 1965)
- 11/66 Visit
- 1/67 Commission action: Accreditation for 3 years.
- 11/69 Visit
- 1/70 Commission Action: Reaccreditation for 5 years.
- 7/73 New policy: full review of institution postponed until fall 1979, with fifth year interim report due by 1/15/75.
- 1/74 Commission action: accept proposal that limited portions of institution be visited each year, with decision on reaffirmation at end of 5 year period, probably 6/79.
- 4/75 Annual visit
- 6/75 Commission action: Receive evaluation report, schedule next visit for 4/76.
- 4/76 Annual visit
- 6/76 Commission action: Receive second annual report, continue special annual visits.
- 4/77 Annual visit
- 6/77 Commission action: Receive third annual report, continue special annual visits.
- 4/78 Annual visit
- 6/78 Commission action: Receive fourth annual report with action on reaffirmation of accreditation to come after fifth annual visit; schedule extra day for visit in spring 1979.

- 4/79 Annual visit
- 6/79 `Commission action: Reaffirm accreditation; schedule fifth-year visit in spring of 1984 and full visit in spring of 1989. The Commission expressed concern about unit inflation and requested that this issue receive attention in the fifth-year report.
- 2/80 Deny request for annual reviews during the next five years; maintain the regular accreditation schedule. At the time of the fifth-year visit the institutional report should respond to the accreditation standards in the *Handbook*.
- 2/83 Commission action: Confirm dates for expanded fifth-year visit in the spring of 1984.
- Spring 84 Visit for reaffirmation
- 6j/84 Commission action: Reaffirm accreditation. Schedule a fifth-year visit in the spring of 1989 and a full visit in the spring of 1994. California State College, San Bernardino changed California State University, San Bernardino.
- 3/89 Fifth-year visit: 3/9-3/10/89; Chair: James Meyer
- 6/89 Commission action: 1) Reaffirm accreditation; 2) Schedule the next comprehensive visit for the spring of 1994. The Commission wishes to stress the importance of developing a distinctive role for CSU, San Bernardino, within the State University system. In preparing for the next self study the University should give attention to: 1) progress in creating a campus learning environment that is multi-cultural and multi-racial; and 2) implement Standard 2.C.
- 9/90 Substantive Change action: Defer action on proposal regarding initiation of an off-campus Master of Public Administration program in Ontario. Inadequate library resources were cited as a serious concern.
- 1/91 Substantive Change action: Approve the off-campus M.P.A. program in Ontario, California.
- 11/93 Off-Campus and Substantive Change Committee action: Approve the proposal to begin an internship version of the teaching credential program in Special Education, Learning Handicapped authorization. The proposal was approved at two sites—one in Stockton beginning fall 1993 and the second at a site to be determined in southern California beginning fall 1994.
- 2/94 Reaffirmation visit: 2/14-1/8/94; Chair: Deane Neubauer

- 6/94 Commission action: 1) Reaffirm accreditation. 2) Schedule a fourth-year visit in the spring of 1998. 3) Schedule the next comprehensive visit in the spring of 2002.
- 3/98 Fourth-Year visit: 3/11-13, 1998; Chair: James Renick
- 7/98 Commission action: 1) Receive the report of the Fourth-Year Visit team; 2) Reschedule the date of the next comprehensive visit to the spring of 2003.
- 1/00 Off-Campus and Substantive Change Committee Action: The Committee acted to approve the proposal to offer an MBA to be held at the International Management Graduate Institute, Fachhochschule in Fulda, Germany.
- 9/00 Substantive Change Committee action of September 7, 2000: The Committee acted to defer the approval of the Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second Language program off-site and via distributed learning in collaboration with Dankook University in Korea. Before the Committee reconsiders the program it asks that the appropriate University committee review the curriculum; a letter be written clarifying the relationships and responsibilities of the Colleges involved with the program; collaboration with the library and other support services be established; syllabi be provided for at least one course demonstrating how it is being converted for WebCT; and the MOU delineate minimum class sizes required, if any, for the courses to be provided.
- 3/03 Preparatory Review

Section II - Alignment of the Institutional Presentation with the Proposal

Though the Preparatory Report differed from the Proposal in two significant ways, the Visiting Team found the changes to be clearly understandable and superior to the original Proposal. These changes may be characterized as follows.

In the first place, the Proposal was to organize the Preparatory Report (and the Self Study) around four key themes:

- Becoming a Teaching and Learning Community
- Becoming a Safe, Supportive and Welcoming Campus Community and Physical Environment
- Engaging with the External Community and the Region
- Development of responses to the major recommendations of previous WASC visitation team report and Senior College Commission action letter in 1998

After consultation with WASC, CSUSB amended the approach 1) by moving the fourth theme into an appendix and dealing with it in detail and 2) by refocusing the interpretive essay around the four standards and weaving the remaining three themes into the essay as appropriate. In its utilization of the Preparatory Report, the Visiting Team found this strategy to be extremely clear and useful. The three remaining themes were successful as prisms for focusing issues at this stage and will be similarly useful for the educational effectiveness review.

In addition, the Visiting Team notes that CSUSB's efforts to organize to carry out the self study as projected in the Proposal was highly successful and that the level of participation was broad and inclusive.

All in all, the team found the Preparatory Report to be candid and well representative of the state of the university.

Section III - Evaluation of the Institutional Presentation

As noted above, the team found the Preparatory Review to be well-organized, understandable, and helpful to the team in its efforts to determine institutional capacity. Organized around the four standards, the essay managed to address key issues without digressing into a prescriptive series of responses. The effort was clearly to grapple with both the strengths and challenges in the four areas as CSUSB understood them.

The team found the substance of the essay largely to reflect accurately the actual character and conditions of the university.

As they were woven into the essay, the three themes may be viewed as organizing principles through which to approach improvements in all four standards. As such they constitute effective strategic pathways to improvement and excellence.

The supporting assessment data were commendable and well-organized. Presented in Appendix I to the Preparatory Review, the data were organized by Standard and were well adapted to support the essay and document institutional capacity. By virtue of placing supporting data on the Web, CSUSB made the data easily usable. It also made it possible to present more useful data than would have been practical in a paper compendium. Supporting data also included over 1,300 pages of pertinent and easily browsable materials in PDF format on a CD. The team considered the assessment data to be excellent and believes it will be of significant value to CSUSB if kept up and utilized for understanding and decision making.

Section IV - Visit Strategy and Validating Evidence

The Visiting Team as a whole is responsible for the Capacity Report. After preliminary conversations, review of the Preparatory Report and supporting data, and in light of the previous accreditation report, however, team members individually or in pairs assumed responsibility for particular areas of interest or key issues. These included:

- Planning, physical plant, budget, and linkage
- Assessment of student learning
- Diversity
- Curricular innovation
- Distance learning/TV/New Campus
- Student life, campus community, residential life

In addition, each team member took the lead on drafting portions of the essay pertaining to institutional capacity under the standards (Section VI). Findings on areas of interest and key issues were incorporated as appropriate into the essay.

Subsequent to this division of labor, team members gave extra attention to the portions of the Preparatory Report and supporting data relevant to their assignments. Similarly, during the site visit they divided responsibility for attending meetings, talking with individuals, and raising questions as appropriate for their assignments. This methodology allowed team members to verify the written materials through direct conversations with a variety of campus community representatives. Finally, prior to drafting the essay, each member spent time reviewing their respective findings with the team in order to verify their understandings and conclusions.

Section V - Response to Previous Commission Issues

The Visiting Team found that CSUSB made substantial efforts to respond to each aspect of the WASC fourth-year visit to CSUSB in 1998 (see Appendix II of the Self Study). It also found that CSUSB had also made substantial progress in each of the areas identified by major recommendations. Indeed, the progress with regard to planning and assessment has been particularly impressive, and the Visiting Team judged the university now to have resolved this concern.

Recognizing the seemingly intractable nature of the problem, the Visiting Team found some aspects of diversity to be a lingering problem and has made appropriate comments in the essay in Section VI below. Similarly, the Visiting Team found remnants of the matter of inadequate student advisement still to be present and has also commented on those. In both cases, CSUSB's has made serious efforts to respond, and those efforts have significantly reduced the intensity of these issues since the 1998 report.

Section VI - Review of Institutional Capacity under the Standards

With regard to defining institutional purposes and ensuring educational objectives, the Visiting Team was impressed with the degree to which CSUSB constituencies were consistent and cohesive in their understanding and awareness of the university's vision and mission (<http://www.csusb.edu/president/vm.html>). The Preparatory Report and those with whom the Visiting Team spoke emphasized CSUSB's dedication "to serving its two-county service area both by delivering educational resources (on its main campus, at its Palm Desert Campus, at other off-campus sites), and by means of technologies contributing to distributed learning (Self Study, p. 6)." Furthermore, the faculty and staff appeared to take pride in these purposes and the success they have achieved in fulfilling them.

The university has been invested in developing a "culture of evidence" which pervades the institution and is apparent in outcomes assessment, the tremendous documentation included in the Preparatory Report, and the additional information presented upon request during the site visit. There have been important improvements in implementing outcomes assessment that have been effective throughout academic programs (below, pp. 16, 23). Relative to Standard 1, it is clear that the university has structures in place that encourage and support the assessment process. It is equally clear that the assessment process serves the purposes of CSUSB's larger vision.

The Visiting Team found CSUSB to be a responsible member of the CSU System observing System principles and requirements (<http://policies.csusb.edu/speechadvocacy.htm>). At the same time, it found that the university has taken advantage of System flexibilities to develop its own strong identity,

distinctive purposes, and customized practices. Conversations with administrative leaders demonstrated business practices to be clear and well managed (see below, p. 22) as well as generally well known throughout the university.

The Visiting Team found the Self Study to be well-prepared and candid. As portrayed in the Self Study, the university's self-representation is largely consistent with institutional reality. For instance, discussions with faculty confirmed that the spirit of academic freedom is strong and consistent with institutional policy as reported in the Self Study (p. 7).

Based on information included in the Preparatory Report and conversations during the site visit, it is evident that significant progress has been made in the area of diversity since 1998 for which the university is to be congratulated. Faculty and administrators report that these improvements are the result of changes in leadership, structure and process. Dr. Karnig is considered to be committed to and supportive of improving diversity and is credited with providing the leadership for the changes in the improved campus climate for minority individuals. A notable sign of progress is the establishment of a University Diversity Committee and the development of a strategic plan for diversity by that committee. In addition, Human Resources now provides diversity training for all existing and newly hired staff.

The Visiting Team found that there is still significant work to be done and gains to be made with regard to diversity. The following areas are particularly ripe for improvement. Faculty diversity lags behind student diversity, a finding perhaps not surprising given the limited availability of faculty of color. Faculty diversity, however, is inconsistent across departments and colleges. CSUSB's diversity efforts, therefore,

might benefit significantly from greater university level facilitation. The President indicated evidence that faculty of color are maintained at rates comparable to other faculty, and an ombudsman program has been made available to help overcome faculty concerns. The Visiting Team suggests that the faculty mentoring program be made consistent across campus and that the ombudsman function be strengthened as well as widely advertised. The Preparatory Report indicates that student diversity is rapidly increasing due to the population characteristics of CSUSB's service area. Through its Student Transition Advising Retention System, the university has already made significant gains in retention of selected student groups (Self Study, pp. 4, 23), but a general improvement in advisement might produce even greater gains (below, pp. 19, 21). In summary, while modest variations in the level of concern were expressed among the various constituencies, the fundamental message communicated during all of the several conversations about diversity issues was that CSUSB does not have sufficient mechanisms in place to encourage and insure that Dr. Karnig's commitment to diversity and the UDC's strategic plan are uniformly implemented in all units or to provide avenues of redress for those with grievances.

One additional area of similar concern reported during the visit was lack of progress in the area of sensitivity and responsiveness to gay/lesbian/transgender issues. The Visiting Team did not have sufficient opportunity to gage the substance of this report and suggests that CSUSB further investigate the matter.

Overall, with regard to Standard 1, the Visiting Team found CSUSB to be sound with a clear sense of purpose which it pursues with openness and integrity. There is still work to be done in some areas, but demonstrable progress has been made in recent years.

The Visiting Team also focused on CSUSB's ability to achieve its institutional purposes and attain its educational objectives through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for students learning. Consistently, the CSUSB faculty and administration speak with pride about the high quality of teaching they offer to the students of their two county region. The faculty hiring process yields candidates with impressive qualifications; new faculty members typically possess degrees from the country's premier research institutions. Because they typically possess outstanding research skills but have little teaching experience, CSUSB is intentional about encouraging its new faculty members to acquire an understanding of pedagogy and learn teaching skills. The Teaching Resource Center [TRC] (Self Study, p. 20), in collaboration with other units of the university, offers 15 to 20 workshops and retreats per year, a classroom camera project for 20 instructors per quarter, support for developing technology skills, a multi-year new faculty development program, grants totaling \$200,000 for course development, and an innovative Learning Research Institute to promote the research of teaching. The highly respected TRC director is deliberate about promoting all variables related to effective teaching—developing teaching skills, improving the classroom facilities, and providing motivation through the rank, tenure, and promotion process for high quality teaching.

To address an issue of curriculum development, specifically the use of technology to deliver coursework, the Faculty Senate in conjunction with the Office of Distributed Learning produced this past summer a policy statement intended to guide the development of mediated instruction with an emphasis on maintaining quality. The

policy favors a mixed mode of delivery of on-site, off-campus courses, balanced by two-way interactive televised instruction, media-assisted instruction, and on-line courses.

The Office of Distributed Learning is clear about its purpose: to become a model for Hispanic serving regions and the best provider of distributed learning in its two counties, with a presence at every community college and high school in the region. The plan for distributed learning includes offering a degree completion program, initially in liberal studies and nursing, at every community college. Currently, the mediums for distributed learning include Blackboard, video conferencing, and a network of cable-access channels.

The newly constructed Palm Desert facility realizes the goal of serving the two county regions by offering access to quality education in an underserved area.

To understand the quality of its core endeavor, CSUSB has been developing its assessment of student learning programs for more than ten years. Efforts to establish goals, objectives, and plans for assessment for each academic program have been intensified in recent years by the appointment of an associate vice president for assessment, who has developed a “flexible and hands on” process. A central Outcomes and Assessment Committee chaired by the AVP reviews and approves assessment plans developed by the departments. She supports the work of the departments in a variety of ways; including the offering of training for assessment through meetings and off campus retreats. To date, 54% of the departments have received approval for their plans; in addition, most of the departments that have not yet submitted plans are subject to specialized accreditation and complete rigorous plans through that process. Funding is allocated to the departments for assessment: \$300 base and \$12 per student based on

enrollment at the time of the approval of the plan. Depending on the size of the department, these funds can provide reassigned time for a coordinator of assessment within the department. Assessment methods for evaluating the effectiveness of the general education curriculum are being constructed, and will include the assessment of expected competencies of basic skills of the CSUSB students.

In addition to assessing student learning, departments engage in rigorous five-year program reviews, featuring external consultants and surveys of graduates. The reviews result in action plans approved by the provost. In addition, annual plans developed by the departments align with the strategic plan. Finally, each dean establishes personal goals at the beginning of each year and reviews accomplishments at the end of each year, aligned with the strategic plan. Recommended next steps for the university, as it moves toward becoming a culture of assessment, include folding together the five-year program review with the assessment process, and using the data from Institutional Research and the assessment process to inform annual planning and budgeting.

The Visiting Team also found CSUSB to be actively encouraging scholarship. Faculty scholarship is funded at the department level, including sabbaticals and reassigned time in conjunction with seed money grants of \$5,000. Although support for research is available, the faculty is aware of the unintended consequences of accepting reassigned time for scholarship or other purposes such as course development--class size and the number of courses taught by the part-time faculty increases. Faculty research is supported at the university level also, through an Office of Sponsored Programs (Self Study, p. 19). Support is offered for grant writing, an activity that has increased during the past several years, yielding considerable success in increased dollars.

Library services at CSUSB are robust and modern. The University librarian is active as chair of the CSU consortium of librarians, which shares access to electronic databases. The interlibrary loan program is strong also. The library building on the main campus, recently renovated and enlarged, houses 720,000 books and bound periodicals. Remote access to library resources is available through the library's attractive and functional web page, including 58+ databases, 15,000+ full text journals, electronic books, and access 24 hours per day and seven days per week. Services offered on site at the new Palm Desert Campus are attractive, customer oriented, and easily accessible for its local students. The librarians and faculty face the challenge of teaching the CSUSB students information literacy skills. Currently, five to seven thousand students annually receive training in the library on information literacy. Because the freshman seminar is not required, there is not an obvious place in the curriculum for including information literacy skills. Recommended next steps include developing a plan for insuring that all CSUSB graduates possess information literacy skills.

The Library and central technology services comprise the IRT group. Within IRT, a centralized academic computing group hosts 150 seats in computer labs heavily used by students, open seven days per week until 10:00 p.m. Academic departments also support specialized technology functions, including discipline specific computer labs. Lack of standardization of these labs creates some frustration for students, especially for printing. The central academic computing group has brought up approximately 100 smart classrooms throughout the university and sponsors Blackboard for instruction, currently used by more than 150 faculty members and 4,000 students. The media services group currently video streams the graduation ceremonies, and is making

preparation for video to be added to the Blackboard functions. As illustrated by these initiatives, the technology infrastructure necessary to support distributed learning is being put in place systematically.

The CSU system has chosen People Soft as its vendor for new administrative software, and is requiring that each campus implement the student, human resources, and finance systems without central funding. Costs are expected to amount to between \$6 and \$12 million, including large consultant fees. CSUSB has chosen to begin implementation of the human resources and finance systems, but to postpone the implementation of the student system. Successful implementation of these systems requires not only large amounts of local funding, but also staff support and commitment to the development of new business practices that align with the capability of the software. IRT is advised to be proactive in leading these implementations, to ensure buy in and good project management through thorough preparation. Finally, the IRT group is in the best position to bring together the technology personnel from throughout the campus for consultation and planning. The technology strategic plan is good evidence of such an approach. Recommended next steps include increasing efforts to coordinate decentralized technology personnel and projects, with a special sensitivity toward the impact of technology projects on students.

Because of the nature of its student body, CSUSB faces a challenge in supporting students. Many CSUSB students are the first members of their families to attend college. The university administration is enthusiastic about serving these students and has taken some steps toward improving the consistency of the information available for advising; nonetheless, the challenge to offer helpful and accurate advising to this population

remains significant. Although some services for underrepresented students are centralized, the function of student advising is decentralized to departments, where advising is valued differentially and services are inconsistent. Some academic departments fund a professional advisor while others do not, some have elaborate peer advising systems, while others do not. Recommended next steps include establishing central expectations for departments for the effective delivery of student advising. Also, the deliberate recruitment of faculty committed to the development of the region's student population as stated in the mission of the university, could increase the contact between faculty and students outside of the classroom. Also, deliberating rewarding the faculty for this type of support of students outside of the classroom could, in turn, advance the mission of the university. Finally, requiring the freshman seminar for all students could enhance their connection and acculturation to the university, as well as facilitate the advising process.

With regard to institutional sustainability, the team found CSUSB to be in a strong position for each of the three areas emphasized in the standard.

The faculty and staff are well qualified and talented and in general exhibited enthusiasm for the university and the president. The university has well articulated policies and practices for retention, promotion, and tenure that have resulted in attracting and maintaining a well-qualified faculty and low turnover rates. The university also provides significant support structures and mechanisms to encourage and maintain faculty quality. These include incentive systems (Self Study, p. 26) and direct support systems such as the Teaching Resource Center, the Office of Sponsored Programs, and

professional growth opportunities (Self Study, p. 28). The Team found that the faculty made particularly good use of and was appreciative of the direct support systems.

In its discussions with faculty, the Team heard two concerns that presents CSUSB with opportunities to strengthen its already sound infrastructure for academic support. The first is in the area of mentoring junior faculty. Faculty reported the current practice to be department based and uneven. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate has already taken action to improve the situation with monthly luncheons for first year faculty and bimonthly luncheons for second year faculty. More attention to mentoring could improve performance in a number of important areas including faculty diversity, quality, and morale (WASC Handbook, 3.2, p. 25). Similarly, the second area pertains to the lack of a university-wide approach to student advisement. This, too, is largely departmentally based, leaves some students to fend for themselves, and is likely a contributor to low graduation rates. The university is aware of this need (Self Study, p. 21) and attention here may have a significant and positive impact on CSUSB's educational objectives (WASC Handbook, 3.4, p. 25).

The Self Study (p.27) was candid in noting faculty concerns with workload as CSUSB has grown as the student population has rapidly expanded. Recent changes in the CSU System workload requirement allows for variation among faculty workload but is neither well understood nor easily possible in the current fiscal environment. The rapid expansion of the number of students has also increased reliance on part-time faculty, a trend that the university would like to change (Self Study, p. 25). This is situation that should be watched closely as the university expands to the targeted number of 20,000

students so that the university will maintain a sufficient number of full-time faculty (WASC Handbook, 3.1, p. 25).

CSUSB also enjoys an dedicated and talented staff and recently received an award as one of the area's best places to work (Self Study, p. 25). The Team found strong administrative support structures for the staff that included training programs, self-assessment mechanisms, and customer feedback loops. The only notable staffing issue is the reliance on a large number of part-time staff. This, however, does not reflect any difficulty in recruiting but, rather, is the by-product of the current state budgetary constraints. The President indicated that CSUSB an ombudsman function has been established, and the Team believes that this initiative is warranted and should be strengthened as appropriate to further the university's goals.

With regard to its budget, CSUSB is a part of the larger CSU System and falls within its fiscal policies and practices. Its campus specific budget practices are well-designed, open, and highly participative. Even with the fiscal constraints caused by the State budget shortfall, the Team found the university's fiscal resources adequate to maintain a healthy environment within which to pursue its vision, mission, and goals.

CSUSB enjoys a spacious, attractive, and well-planned campus that is suitable to its approved expansion to a student population of 20,000. A number of administrators reported to the team that at the current time both its academic and administrative space is utilized to capacity. The university is aware of this circumstance and maintains a recently revised Campus Facilities Master Plan (Self Study, p. 25) that clearly anticipates its growing need for new facilities. The plan is being implemented at the maximum rate allowed by the CSU System.

As noted above, the Team found the information resources to be adequate and well deployed to achieve the university's purposes.

The Team found a clear organizational structure in place and observed that it was generally well understood throughout the university. The president and provost enjoy widespread respect among university constituencies and have mounted an effective administrative effort throughout the system. The organizational structure is designed to encourage participation in decision-making from all segments of the university community, and as a result communication among university constituencies appeared healthy and active.

CSUSB has created a well-articulated strategic plan that clearly demonstrates its commitment to learning and institutional improvement. The strategic plan identifies a series of objectives that are potentially attainable and consistent with the institution's stated mission and vision. Moreover, the institution's plans are also consistent with its capacity, both in organizational structure and financing.

CSUSB also provides clear evidence of progress in involving the broader university community in its planning process. This inclusion of the broader community was evidenced in the team's meeting with a wide range of constituencies, including faculty, staff and students. Further, CSUSB has achieved a logical balance of time and effort spent on gaining input into the planning process and moving forward with implementation.

The strategic plan clearly targets enhanced access to an increasingly more diverse audience. The three themes selected for inclusion in the Educational Effectiveness

Review are consistent with the strategic plan and the institution's mission and vision statements.

Assessment of learning outcomes has been well developed and appears to be utilized in the institution's decision making process. Programs for which assessment plans have not yet been completed are in process or are receiving support from the University Assessment Committee.

The university clearly intends an alignment of its budgeting process with the priorities identified in its strategic plans. Progress towards these goals has been stimulated by the use of discretionary funds. These discretionary funds though, are a very small percentage of the total budget and are probably not sufficient to create the desired changes. It is strongly urged that a more aggressive, reallocation process be established if the goals of the strategic plan are to be met.

An increase in the rate of progress toward the stated goals would also be greatly enhanced with an increased commitment to acquiring private funds. The progress towards private fund raising over the last few years needs to be complimented and further encouraged.

The impressive enhancement of strategic priorities through the use of private, contributed funds is very apparent with the progress achieved on the Palm Desert Campus. This campus is poised to significantly enhance CSUSB's ability to service the students in this portion of its geographic service area.

Section VII - Team Findings and Analysis

On the basis of studying the documentation and carrying out the Preparatory Review site visit, the Visiting Team found no issues that merit major recommendations. With regard to each of the four standards, CSUSB manifests sufficient capacity to achieve its institutional objectives.

Indeed, the Visiting Team found much to commend in its review. Among the most notable institutional strengths are the following:

- A sound organizational structure that encourages participation;
- The strategic plan and institutional mission are broadly known and embraced throughout the university;
- Confidence in executive leadership;
- Well-qualified faculty;
- Well designed and well utilized academic support programs;
- Enthusiastic and positive students;
- A broad based and growing culture of outcomes assessment.

As would be the case with any large and complex institution, however, the Visiting Team found and commented on and made suggestions for areas in which additional gains can reasonably be made. These include the following:

- Diversity: This was an area identified for improvement in the 1998 Fourth Year visit. Subsequently, as documented in Appendix II of the Self Study, CSUSB made substantial efforts to ameliorate the diversity problems. Notable among these are President Karnig's personal involvement in raising diversity awareness (see <http://diversity.csusb.edu>), required diversity training for all managers and staff, and the establishment of a Diversity Committee.

Pursuing this matter throughout several interviews during the site visit, however, the Visiting Team still found elements of the problem remaining in certain areas. Specifically, these areas involved keeping minority faculty and creating better acceptance for gay, lesbian, and transgender members of the university community.

To make further improvements regarding these diversity matters, the Visiting Team suggested that CSUSB 1) consider means of creating greater consistency across departments and colleges in mentoring new faculty and 2) creating the position of ombudsman. The Visiting Team noted that the Director of Human

Resources indicated that she is already actively considering establishing some kind of ombudsman function.

- Student advisement: This area was also identified for improvement in the 1998 Fourth Year visit. Once again, the Visiting Team found that CSUSB has made substantial progress including the development of a plan by Undergraduate Studies “to improve the academic readiness of incoming freshmen, deliver better advising, and improve the graduation rate” (Self Study, Appendix II, p 16) and the establishment of the Office of Advising and Academic Services “to provide academic advising for all undeclared students, as well as provide academic retention counseling for all first-time probation students.” (Self Study, Appendix II, p. 16).

In assessing the progress made in this area, the Visiting Team found that the quality of student advising still varied considerably from department to department and school to school and that it often required a degree of proactivity on the part of students to avail themselves of it. The Visiting Team, therefore, suggested that CSUSB consider 1) establishing central expectations for departments for the effective delivery of student advising and 2) deliberately recruiting faculty committed to the development of the region’s student population as stated in the mission of the university.

- Funding the Strategic Plan: The Visiting Team found clear evidence that the university is endeavoring to align its budgeting process with the priorities identified in its strategic plans. It is doing so at this time primarily by the use of discretionary funds. These discretionary funds, however, are a very small percentage of the total budget and are probably not sufficient to create the desired changes. The Visiting Team, therefore, suggests that a more aggressive, reallocation process be established in order to advance the Strategic Plan more decisively.

Section VIII - Preparations for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The Visiting Team found CSUSB to be well prepared and fully engaged in accreditation process. It was well organized throughout all areas of its constituency; its documentation was full and impressive, and its Preparatory Report was thorough and candid. Based on the documentation, level of participation in the Preparatory Review, and the seriousness with which it is engaged in the process, the Visiting Team believes that CSUSB is well prepared to engage in the Educational Effectiveness Review even though it will not have a full twelve month period from the date of the Preparatory Review.

As noted earlier (p. 23), the three themes selected for inclusion in the Educational Effectiveness Review are consistent with the strategic plan and the institution's mission and vision statements. In addition, they are sufficiently broad so as to allow the university to engage the key issues pertaining to core mission and educational effectiveness.

As a cautionary note, however, the Visiting Team points out that the breadth of the themes can also invite attention to issues that may be interesting but not particularly pertinent to the Educational Effectiveness Review. Thus, in pursuing the themes, it would be advisable to keep in mind the four objectives noted at the top of p. 45 of the WASC Handbook of Accreditation.

And while there are no major recommendations concerning institutional capacity, the Visiting Team hopes that CSUSB will respond to the suggestions listed in Section VII above.

Section IX - Summary of Findings and Major Recommendations

The key findings resulting from the Capacity Review are that based on the four Standards in the WASC Handbook of Accreditation:

- CSUSB has the necessary institutional capacities to achieve its mission and educational objectives;
- CSUSB has responded adequately to previous accreditation reports;
- CSUSB is ready to undertake its Educational Effectiveness Review;
- CSUSB has challenges to meet in the areas of diversity, advisement, and funding that do not rise to the level of major recommendations;
- CSUSB has a commendable number of institutional strengths (above, p. 25)