

Indicator 1 – Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs – Academic Program Review

During the last two years, CSUB initiated a campus-wide discussion of our education programs and students services based on a revision of our institutional mission. These discussions are the first steps in an organizational learning process to analyze the effectiveness of our educational programs. The central focus of this analysis is the assessment of student learning. Academic programs have been systematically shifting from summative compliance reporting towards a formative problem-solving process for assessment. These changes are documented in the content of department 5-year reviews, assessment activities per General Education goals, and consultation of academic and service areas with the Assessment Center.

Departments are designing assessment tools that are both direct and indirect measures of student learning. Recent 5-year program reviews focus on identifying problems and making meaningful revisions based on evidence from their respective assessments. The 5-year reviews completed by seven departments during the last two years—2003-05: Biology BS and MS, Liberal Studies Program, Nursing BSN and MSN, Philosophy BA, Religious Studies BA, Sociology BA and MA and Theatre Arts BA show an increased use of targeted data collection and a more sophisticated use of assessment in their planning process when compared to earlier 5-year reviews. All of these programs instituted higher quality assessments either in preparation of their review process or in response to the campus review of their report. Each self-study reflects the department's conscientious efforts to articulate goals and objectives for the undergraduate degree programs, revise the curriculum, and initiate a process of assessing student learning outcomes. The Philosophy program developed a set of student learning goals and proposed a pilot project in assessment, which includes a methodology for embedding the assessment within the curriculum.

A similar proactive attitude was noted in the Sociology department's development of a mission statement and articulated goals and objectives for its undergraduate program. The articulation of this mission statement has enabled the faculty to enhance the BA curriculum and better prepare students for continued education and/or professional engagement. The Sociology faculty rigorously assessed student learning outcomes for the undergraduate program using three assessment instruments. These instruments include (1) an exit survey developed and administered by the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) in collaboration with the Information Resource Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Planning; (2) focus-group discussions conducted by the TLC; and (3) an alumni survey.

Both the Religious Studies and Liberal Studies programs have established a systematic process to collect feedback from their majors. This information was used in the establishment of four-year roadmaps. For Liberal Studies, the Director facilitated the strategic embedment of the program's goals and objectives in program coursework in all tracks, in the program's well-developed portfolio and in the information competency guidelines. This consistency across courses promotes a student learning environment in which objectives are reinforced throughout the curriculum.

In preparation for the 5 year reviews, departments are now collecting student data for specific learning outcome objectives in identified courses, developing goals-courses matrixes, and engaging departmental faculty in the interpretation of data. This more sophisticated assessment of student skill development and this type of data-driven decision-making continues to evolve as we involve more faculty members each year. Our early efforts helped faculty learn the process of assessment, but our more recent efforts are focused on obtaining useful information for course improvement and curriculum changes. We have learned that well written measurable student learning outcomes provide the cornerstone of the assessment process, thus several programs are in the process of revising their goals and objectives so that assessment tools may be designed with measurable outcomes. As of June 2006, all of the baccalaureate degree programs at CSUB have identified methods and tools to be used for assessing student -learning outcomes. These assessments include (1) objective assessments embedded in essays, papers, oral presentations, or class projects; (2) major field tests exams comparing CSUB students to national samples; (3) survey, interview, and focus group data on student perceptions, attitudes and experiences; and (4) portfolio assessments of student learning outcomes.

General Education: Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes:

The campus-wide discussions of our education programs start with two central questions: What distinguishes a CSUB graduate? And, what knowledge, skills and abilities (KSA) does a CSUB graduate

need? Ongoing assessment of the General Education Program provides information answering these two questions. Through collaboration of the General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), Senate Executive Committee, and the CSUB Assessment Center, data for assessment of specific GE goals and objectives is collected and interpreted by the faculty who teach courses in the GE area under review. One good example was the survey of faculty regarding writing, reading and critical thinking skills of CSUB students. The Critical Writing Task Force used this data in formulating its recommendation to the Academic Senate and in designing a critical thinking and writing rubric to measure student competencies. A pilot program testing this rubric was initiated in the Spring 2005 quarter. Several TLC workshops on the design of writing assignments and grading with rubrics utilize materials from the Task Force assessment projects.

Another example is the collaboration of the Assessment Center with the GE Area and Theme committees to update goals and objectives from their areas. Following a revision of the goals and objectives for Theme II courses, faculty members participated in a review of course syllabi to identify course objectives and activities illustrating the GE Student Learning Outcomes of that area. Based on that review, the Theme II committee recommended that departments initiate necessary re-writing of syllabi to include the Area or Theme goals and to create specific course goals written into the syllabi. A similar review of syllabi by members of the Area A1 facilitated the alignment of courses, taught by different instructors, with the Area goals and objectives. Many faculty who participated in these assessment activities initiated a self-assessment of their courses to identify specific course activities that could be used for assessment of course objectives and GE goals. These activities document direct assessment of student learning using embedded test questions, pre-post testing and rubrics. The findings from these activities were used for the redesign of course assignments.

Finally in 2005-06, CSUB launched its First Year Experience program, "Roadrunner Rush." The core goal of this program is the engagement of freshmen and transfer students into the academic programs and students services of CSUB. This engagement will promote the academic success of these students. Initial assessment projects include surveys of faculty teaching in the program, student opinions regarding course experiences and measures of student academic performance. A review of initial information from each of these projects resulted in revision of materials, activities and course objectives for the 2006-07 academic program.

Qualitative Assessment of General Campus Concerns

CSUB uses a large variety of techniques in assessing the campus community. Over the past two academic years (04/05 and 05/06) there have been over 200 faculty and staff involved and over 900 students in various focus groups, surveys (face-to-face and online) and sessions as part of the campus assessment process. This diverse collection of activities also represents different phases in the cycle of assessment from design and data collection to interpretation of data and finally recommendations or decisions.

For example, numerous faculty used the Group Interview Feedback Technique (GIFT) to improve the teaching and learning environment at CSUB. Sixteen faculty requested Course evaluation sessions during the 2004/2005AY including 6 faculty from the School of Humanities & Social Sciences (HSS), 4 from the School of Natural Sciences & Mathematics (NSM), 5 faculty from the School of Education, and one faculty member from the School of Business. Eight faculty requested Course evaluation sessions in the 2005/2006 AY, this included 5 faculty from HSS and one from each of the following schools, NSM, Education, and Business. These course evaluation sessions provide information used by the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) Director and the faculty member for mid-term changes in teaching style and learning activities to meet course learning objectives.

Our Program Focused Interview Technique (Program FIT) provided an overview of the experiences of students in different academic programs—Faculty Mentor Program, Nursing, Sociology MA program, Intensive Language Institute, and Title V computer literacy program, and Criminal Justice. Data from the FIT activities was used in decision making related to services and/or curriculum of each program. The GIFT and Program FIT are important assessment tools that involve students directly in the improvement of their classroom learning environment, and the participants report that they appreciate being asked for their feedback. We believe that this involvement actually increases their satisfaction with their educational experiences at CSUB.

One measure of the success of our Assessment Center is that a large number of programs—academic, academic support, and administrative—were involved in some type of assessment activity. Over the past two academic years there have been over 62 assessment projects involving a variety of departments. During this period, 16 assessment projects involving departments or schools were completed. These include the following projects: the student survey portion for WASC, Program Feedback by students for the MA in Sociology, first and second surveys for the Reading, Writing, and Critical thinking Taskforce, yearly reports for the Counseling Center procedures, Title V tutoring activities and tutor training, faculty interviews for the CSUB First Year Experience courses, both the Program Feedback by clients and Employee interviews for Academic Advising (AAIC), assessments on runner mail/computer lab and the help desk for IRTS, Rubric Templates for Course Assessment, Faculty Mentor activities, and service rating of the Private Lessons program through E-Learning Services. For each department, these projects provided information they used to improve program.

There are 11 projects currently in the data collection stage of the assessment cycle. These projects include the following: English department rubric and embedded test questions for senior projects, Embedded test questions to assess critical thinking and analysis of Philosophy department courses, goals-course matrix for Intensive English Language Center based on revised program mission and goals, alignment of goals-course matrix for GE Theme II given revision of program goals, Faculty course redesign of the CSUB experience, and design of WASCU themes given survey and discussion groups among staff, faculty and community members. There are also 8 projects in the design state of the cycle. These projects build on department assessment plans proposed in the spring 2006 and various service areas involved in strategic planning and revision of mission statements.

CSUB administration has supported this establishment of a “culture of evidence” in a number of important ways. The campus has funded an Assessment Center, located at the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center, to provide “support for all campus groups in developing and maintaining an assessment culture.” This Center hosted a half day training program on department assessment plans, January 2006, facilitated by Dr. Mary Allen. Dr. Allen also consulted with academic and service groups to discuss issues and to identify strategies of assessment across areas. These campus wide activities broadened the participation of staff and faculty in assessment and set the baseline for our accreditation activities of WASC.

Contact: Terry Dunn, Asst. to the President and
Director of Institutional Planning and Research
E-mail: tdunn@csub.edu

Accountability Report—CSU Channel Islands

- 1.1 Coincidental to the preparation of the WASC Educational Effectiveness Report for 06-07; from an identified set of program learning objectives developed by each program, one learning objective from each major will be evaluated in 06-07 and within a five-year window each program will have sequentially reviewed each learning objective. The development of GE and mission-based learning objectives will be completed in 06-07.

Goal for 08-09

In the third year of the five-year process, each program will have reviewed 1-2 learning objectives, and will be in the process of reviewing the 3rd or 4th learning objective.

- 1.2 In 2002, Channel Islands opened its doors to students who were admitted into eight majors.

In 06-07, the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) will have completed the development and implementation of Guidelines for Program Review. As proposed by PARC, the Guidelines are based on a two-year process that includes a self-study, and external review; with a faculty committee making recommendations to the Provost for appropriate action in the second year. The results of the annual assessment of student learning will also inform the program review process. The plan calls for the review of four programs beginning in 07-08 and the review of four programs in 08-09.

Goals for 08-09

- a. to act on recommendations from first year of program review of four programs
- b. to begin the two-year review cycle for the second group of four programs
- c. to identify the third group of majors for review in the next review cycle

Contact: Ernie Gonzalez, Director, Institutional Research
E-mail: JE.Gonzalez@csuci.edu

1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

Assessment efforts continue to be monitored, guided and supported by our **All University Responsibility for Assessment Committee (AURA)**. [AURA](#) provides campus leadership for ongoing campuswide conversations on the nature of student learning assessment and its relationship to effective teaching, learning and advising. All major programs have or are in the process of developing or further refining program missions, program goals, student learning outcomes, course alignment matrices and assessment plans. Members of AURA serve as individual coaches to the efforts within their respective colleges.

Continuous improvement is also being recorded in the assessment of general education (GE). Good progress is being made in terms of defining student learning outcomes in core areas of [GE](#) as well as in creating the rubrics that are helpful in assessing and evaluating student work products. The collection of cross-sectional data on student performance in writing, oral communication and quantitative reasoning in GE classes allowed comparisons of first-year students versus seniors, across colleges and between native and transfer students. Assessment data are being shared widely on campus and are guiding efforts at curricular and pedagogical changes to enhance student learning.

The institutionalization of these assessment and evaluation efforts is further stimulated by an [academic program review project](#) designed to refocus programs toward becoming more systematic and intentional about gathering data about the right things –performance and effectiveness—and on using the resulting information to continuously improve what the program does. The elements of this new framework will align under the strategic priorities of the university, the ten principles of Cornerstones, the principles of the CSU Accountability Process, and the “core commitments” to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that are embodied in the new WASC accreditation standards.

2-4. Progress to Degree, Persistence, and Graduation

Traditionally, CSU, Chico has turned in respectable performances in the area of student success in terms of progress to degree, persistence and graduation. Chico continues to be vigilant in these areas by experimenting with new approaches to ensuring continued success. One such new approach has been the instigation of departmental conversations on data derived from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). Conversations, involving students, are structured around an examination of changes in student behaviors and faculty behaviors that would help deepen student engagement as a means of creating academic communities. The sharing of departmental best practices has suggested a number of important lessons. We have learned that active learning occurs both inside and outside the classroom. We have learned that breaking down barriers to communication between professors and students is essential to student success and faculty satisfaction. We have learned that if we want our students to be engaged citizens, we must provide them with opportunities for ethical growth and involvement in real leadership opportunities. It turns out there is no right or wrong way to go about building learning communities; it will vary by department and college. What we must do is to continue the dialogue and share our experiences in an open and positive manner, which is what assessment is all about.

6. Relation with K – 12

The Early Assessment Program (EAP) developed by the California State University in partnership with the California Department of Education and the State Board of Education was designed to test students' proficiency in mathematics and English and to reduce the likelihood that students will have to take remedial classes once they enter college. Within the [EAP](#) framework, CSU, Chico has continued its efforts to increase the college readiness of high school students as well as to increase the understanding of mathematics and science at all age levels. Most notable among these efforts are the seven California Subject Matter Programs (CSMPs), including the [California Writing Project](#) and programs sponsored by our [Center for Mathematics and Science Education](#), including the [Chico Mathematics Project](#) and [the Hands-On Lab](#). Each offers a variety programs for both teachers and students in the Northstate. Such efforts are further supported by other programs such as [Educational Talent Search](#), [America Reads/Counts](#), [Summer Bridge](#), [Upward Bound](#), [MESA](#) and [Community Service Learning](#).

9. University Advancement

The arrival of a new Vice President for University Advancement has allowed CSU, Chico to strengthen its to a values-based philanthropic culture and the execution of bold initiatives in the areas of fund raising and university advancement at both university and college levels. Advancement efforts are now connected to our vision, mission, values and strategic priorities and are becoming a critical element of an integrated, multifaceted approach to resource acquisition and stewardship. The investment of resources to establish a high performance advancement operation that serves the entire university community is already beginning to bear fruits. In 2005-06, the number of gifts has increased by almost 2500 (a 13% increase), the number of individual donors has increased by almost 2000 (a 18% increase), and, most importantly, our fundraising in 2005-2006, has increased by more than \$4 million over the previous year making it one of the most successful fundraising years in the University's history. The University endowment is now valued at nearly \$31 million, almost a 50% increase since 2001-2002. Although we are only the 12th ranked campus in the system in terms of enrollments and budget, we are seventh ranked in the size of our endowment.

We will continue to invest in strengthening our Advancement infrastructure and culture as we take the initial steps towards a major fund-raising campaign in conjunction with the University's 125th anniversary, which we will celebrate in 2012.

Contact: Arno J. Rethans, VP for Planning and Resource Allocation
E-mail: ARethans@csuchico.edu

Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

In 2005, all CSU Dominguez Hills' academic programs had evidence of measurable, learner-centered student outcomes on file with University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC). This achievement is attributed to: (a) systematic and consistent use of the Essential Elements of Learning Outcomes Assessment to report student learning data in assessment reports required by USLOAC; (b) integration of a campus-wide assessment process which combined existing program review and the student learning outcomes assessment process into a Performance Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT) that is reviewed by faculty peers including USLOAC members; (c) requirement to include student learning outcomes in every submission of new and modified program and/or course proposals by the University Curriculum Committee; and (d) mandatory workshops for all new tenure-track faculty on syllabus construction highlighting student learning outcomes and assessment.

Exemplary evidence of how assessment results are being used to improve programs can be found in the following highlights. The B.A. in Business Administration gathers data from its course-embedded assessment to the capstone course applying assessment rubrics that faculty consistently use to assess stated program-level outcomes. The B.A. and minor in Digital Media Arts uses faculty generated assessment rubrics and learning is identified in relation to achievement of stated program-level outcomes.

During AY2004-05 program review was completed for the B.A. in Liberal Studies, the M. A. in Education, B.A. in Applied Studies, and B.S. and M.S. in Nursing. Applied Studies assesses student learning outcomes by measuring graduation rate, performance in APS 490 (Seminar in Occupational Leadership), GPA, and results of the Graduate Writing Examination. Graduation rate for the program shows that nearly 50% of the students enrolled graduated within a two-year period. The campus GPA for APS students is significantly better than students in other programs within the College. As a result of program review, the B.S. in Applied Studies was modified to enhance the learning outcomes and to streamline the applied component (formerly management component). As part of the modifications, six elective Business Administration courses were replaced with courses from Public Administration, Psychology, Sociology, and Labor Studies. An introductory course to Applied Studies (APS 300) also was added as a required course.

The campus program review followed an extensive accreditation review by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) for the B.S. and M.S. programs in Nursing. The programs have addressed ways to improve student learning outcomes by including an intensive writing feature in two BSN courses to improve critical thinking and literacy skills; the re-design of the MSN Clinical Nurse Specialist role options to increase preceptor clinical time for student practice; and the introduction of a hybrid model for offering some MSN online courses to increase student and faculty interaction. Based on recommendations by the campus Program Review Panel, the department also is making arrangements for more clinical affiliations with hospitals in the greater Los Angeles region to accommodate these new pre-licensure students.

In response to the program review, Liberal Studies (LBS) was given department status and an interim chair was appointed. As the program builds the department infrastructure, it plans on: developing additional subject matter options to provide students a greater choice in their depth of study, continuing to work with departments to offer sufficient sections with convenient scheduling for LBS majors, and improving articulation to increase the number of LBS majors entering the credential programs.

After the program review for the M.A. in Education, the College of Education moved to incorporate the results of the assessments into improving their programs and enhancing teaching and student learning. The program has extensive course offerings and external reviewers suggested streamlining the program so students could complete their degree in a timely manner. There also were specific recommendations, which have been implemented for each of the options. For example in the Special Education option, after reviewing comprehensive exam results, a Blackboard community was created to post study materials, including a grading rubric for the essays. Based on student needs and information from school districts, assistive technology was added to the Moderate/Severe curriculum. In the Educational Administration option, graduate and employer surveys indicated the need for more practical, real-life information and projects, as well as a need for more technology use. The program was revised completely, including fieldwork (real-life applications) and technology (classes are 25% online) in each course. Finally, in the Multicultural Education option, based on student feedback and examination of the master's comprehensive exam, the program revised its curriculum, creating several new courses to increase the amount of culturally related subject matter.

There are currently 20 degrees and a minor only program completing the program review process initiated in AY2005-06.

B.A. Economics	B.A. Labor Studies	B.A. Political Science
B.A. Human Services	B.A. Physical Education	B.S./M.S. Health Sciences
B.S. Clinical Sciences	B.A. Anthropology	Minor in Dance
M.A. Humanities	B.A. Philosophy	B.A. Behavioral Science
B.A./B.S. Chemistry	B.A./M.A. Psychology	B.A./M.A. Sociology
M.A. Teaching Mathematics	B.A. Economics	

Contact: Jamie Dotie-Kwan, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
E-mail: jdotekwan@csudh.edu

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

A student outcomes assessment plan (SOAP) has been developed for all degree programs. Each has been reviewed by campus review committees and posted online. Outcomes assessment is also being implemented for the Smittcamp Family Honors Program and the university General Education Program. A faculty assessment coordinator works with the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning to help departments incorporate assessment into ongoing program review and accreditation efforts. A Program Review schedule has been developed for all programs on a 5-10 year cycle depending on whether the program is subject to accreditation and the length of time between accreditation visits. Department chairs provide a summary of their assessment activities in their annual reports to the Provost and also report on changes made in response to assessment results. Student learning outcomes have been incorporated into all new course syllabi and are being added to existing course syllabi as those courses are reviewed. The provost has funded an Academic Excellence Competitive Grants program that focuses on faculty initiatives to improve instruction and curricula through learning communities, civic engagement, research, and other innovative and transformative mechanisms.

2. Access to the CSU

Only two impacted programs exist on campus. First-time freshmen are not eligible for either program.

3. Progression to degree and 4. Persistence & graduation

The President appointed a Student Success Task Force (SSTF) that has focused on five major efforts: mandatory orientation, mandatory advising, academic roadmaps, learning communities and mentoring. Considerable progress has been made. Approximately 90% of first-time freshmen and 85% of transfer students attended the Summer 2006 Dog Days orientation. Mandatory advising language has been added to the catalog. Roadmaps have been completed for all programs. A Mentoring Institute plan has been developed and implementation began in Fall 2005. Learning communities have been launched and we are planning for their expansion. Most majors now have 120 unit minimums. The combination of these efforts is anticipated to improve continuation rates, time to graduation, and graduation rates. In addition, the SSTF is adding strategic initiatives in the area of student-centered learning, the freshman experience, career development and the senior year experience.

5. Areas of special state need

Credential numbers are beginning to increase after the recent decline brought on by the CSET exam plus a slightly reduced demand for new teachers.

6. Fully prepared new freshmen and 7. Remediation

The Early Assessment Program and campus efforts targeting those in need of remediation should have an impact allowing the university to continue to make progress in reducing the need for remediation. In addition, the university adopted a five-year Directed Self-Placement program for freshman English and has developed an improved Math pre-test and placement program for entering students. We anticipate that all of these efforts will support the preparation of first year students in mathematics and English.

8. Facilities utilization

The campus has successfully implemented a transactional interface between PeopleSoft and R25 event scheduling software, providing real-time information about classroom usage and availability. Emphasis has been placed on optimizing classroom utilization over the next few semesters. Summer 2007 is being planned as part of YRO.

9. University Advancement

The university launched a multi-year comprehensive campaign on July 1, 2005. The purpose is to raise support primarily for academic programs and to increase the endowment. Excellent progress continues on finding lost alumni and increasing the number of alumni association members. We strive to create a culture of philanthropy and generate a significant increase in private support.

Contact: Christina Leimer, Director, Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning
E-mail: cleimer@csufresno.edu

Indicators 1.1 and 1.2

With fifty-five undergraduate programs including thirteen that are nationally accredited, it is not easy to summarize the rich array of student learning outcomes, their assessment, and the use of results for program improvement succinctly. All Fullerton baccalaureate programs have explicit student learning outcomes. They are widely shared in departments and colleges, with students, and with other stakeholders such as employers and advisory board members.

- Proposed new courses are required to have student learning outcomes that are explicitly linked to assessment strategies embedded in the new course proposal. The quality of both the goals and the assessment plans is a key criterion for new course review and approval.
- Many departments include their student learning goals in the catalog description of their programs as well as in departmental view sheets and websites. Another example of the prominence of program and college learning goals is the College of Education's inclusion of them on every course outline.
- All of the General Education categories have student learning outcomes which are required to be listed on all course syllabi in each category. Eight pilot assessments were funded for 2006-07. Among them are
 - Reading faculty are working with a national expert to develop, calibrate, and plan to implement a critical thinking scoring rubric which will be used across multi-department critical thinking courses.
 - Geological Sciences faculty are analyzing pre-and post-introductory geology course performance data using the Geoscience Concept Inventory. Their assessment includes comparisons in value added with and without the concurrent supplemental lab for the course.

A wide variety of learning assessment strategies are used at Fullerton across all major programs, and the results are used in program improvement. Since 1997, Fullerton's guidelines for Annual Reports and Program Performance Reviews have required demonstration of assessment of student learning outcomes. Since 2004-05, the guidelines have required demonstration of the use of learning assessment results to improve programs.

- Course coordinators are continuing to proliferate across the campus. They play a key role in ensuring consistency of student learning outcomes across multiple sections and instructors. They are especially invaluable when departments embed a common assessment in all sections of a course. For example, the College of Business has developed a council made up of the course coordinators for each of their core courses in accounting. The council plans and implements assessments and uses the results to improve the program as a whole.
- Assessment of learning in the Political Science major led to the development of a new lower division course, "Skills and Methods in Political Science", an introduction to research methods, to foster greater success in advanced major coursework.
- In one of the annual exit surveys of graduating seniors in Kinesiology, students reported some weakness in computer application skills. This was addressed by adding computer applications assignments in all of the core courses.
- Sometimes assessment results indicate that students are achieving the learning standard set by faculty, so that the monitoring value of assessment practice is primary (and not program improvement). Such was the case in the College of Business during their latest cycle of assessing business knowledge of their majors in a 300-level class versus an advanced/senior class using a nationally normed instrument. The seniors achieved statistically significantly higher scores as well as scores at or above the threshold for the learning outcomes. Only fine-tuning on a few subtopics was needed.
- Health Sciences faculty convened focus groups of alumni who had been out in the field for one to four years, and used the feedback and suggestions to improve the program. For example, alumni wished they had acquired more job search skills, so the department has added resume development and interview skills to their internship course. This department also administers nationally normed exams and uses the results (six sub-scores for different knowledge areas) to improve the program.
- Close relationships and partnerships with the employers of our students generate an important validation of student learning outcomes, the level of achievement, and ideas for program improvement. The College of the Arts receives explicit feedback, both solicited and

unsolicited, from employers who hire their students. Twice each year, the employers of our graphics art students are invited to campus to assess students' portfolios. They provide formal feedback not only to individual students on their work, but also to the department regarding the program and ways to improve it.

- Both the College of the Arts and the College of Communication, among others, use feedback from internship supervisors to assess student learning outcomes and evaluate their programs.

Indicators 2.1 through 9.4

Setting goals and monitoring progress on the quantitative performance indicators has

- Realigned campus beliefs about how we are doing to match our actual performance
- Provided common indicators to compare campus performance across the CSU
- Provided a way to select campuses whose performance matches or exceeds ours for consultation on best practices.

In order to ensure the sustainability of assessment efforts, the campus is in the process of advertising for a permanent Coordinator of Educational Effectiveness and Assessment.

Contact: Dolores Vura, Asst. Vice President
for Institutional Research
E-mail: dvura@fullerton.edu

At CSU East Bay, our emphasis is on embedding assessment of student learning into the program curriculum. Our belief is that institutionalizing assessment in ways that build upon existing assessments of the faculty and that respect the culture of the disciplines involved is of vital importance if assessment at CSU EB is destined to become part of its culture of evidence in the future.

CSU East Bay has been making steady progress in the area of student learning outcomes. The new 2006/08 University Catalog lists student learning outcomes for all degree programs.

Our departments have developed assessment strategies that have led to significant improvements in their academic programs. The most dramatic evidence, has been the revised Program Review completed for twenty-one degree programs during the 2005/06 academic year which included student learning objectives and assessments. The descriptions of these assessment show that serious thought and substantial time has been devoted to identifying and making more public and explicit faculty commitments and focus to student learning at CSUEB. The university is well on its way and all programs are anticipated to have a fully functioning assessment program by 2007-8.

In short, feedback from assessment of SLOs has led to a number of improvements in the educational experiences of our students. These improvements can be seen in the design of new courses and the manner in which critical courses in the majors are actually being taught. More significantly, existing academic programs have been modified and new options developed based, in part, on feedback from the assessments.

The following narrative highlights some of these activities and improvements.

- ✓ A number of departments have modified critical courses for majors or added an important capstone course. For example, Engineering modified a senior design course and added two essential laboratories. Physics developed a capstone course. Statistics added two seminars designed to assist in reinforcing critical foundational and applied material.
- ✓ Improvements in teaching have occurred in response to the assessment process. In Math/CS, responses to student surveys have helped professors determine whether student learning outcomes were being met and actions taken as a result. Our Environmental Science program has modified its capstone course a number of times in response to assessment feedback.
- ✓ Program modifications have also occurred. For example, Physics has modified current B.A. and B.S. programs, in part, to better help students meet SLOs. Biological Sciences and Chemistry and Biochemistry have added new options to help their students better prepare for today's workplace demands.
- ✓ In the College of Business and Economics both the Business Administration degree and the Bachelor's of Art in Economics have been altered based on feedback from assessment of student learning.
- ✓ Assessment of student learning in the Business Administration degree program uncovered four areas in which students were not achieving the expected learning outcomes: global orientation, communication skills, ethics, and general business knowledge. In response, the College changed program and course requirements to increase student learning in each area. To increase the students' global orientation, a new course was designed. To increase students' communication, two degree-required courses mandated communication assignments. A written and presentation assignment is now required in some courses.
- ✓ The entire Business curriculum was restructured and revamped to focus coursework more tightly around the general business knowledge that students were expected to gain. For example, MGMT 3100 was changed to become a decision sciences course and courses not tightly connected to building core business knowledge were dropped as requirements.
- ✓ Assessment of student learning in the BA in Economics degree program uncovered two areas in which students were not achieving the expected learning outcomes: oral and written communication. In response, the Department adopted a writing requirement in all upper

division courses and developed a new capstone course (Econ 4896: Senior Research) that requires students to write a research paper and present findings.

- ✓ The College of Education and Allied Studies is also actively involved in program assessment. As part of our continuing Strategic Planning, we are moving full swing in terms of assessment. An assessment council has been formed and faculty development has been geared toward how to use assessment rubrics for evaluating learning through TaskStream.

Contact: Roseann Hogan, Assistant Vice President of
Institutional Research and Assessment
E-Mail: roseann.hogan@csueastbay.edu

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

Campus Highlights: Outcomes that have been identified for all baccalaureate degree programs and most areas of general education are undergoing refinement as we deepen our understanding of how student performance can demonstrate the competencies that we value most. While it takes time for assessment results to work their way through the program review process, an example of using assessment results (in this case, to seek more focused information in order to improve and refine our goals) grew out of concern about results of the NSSE assessment. The faculty worked together to develop an in-depth survey to test and focus the NSSE results, in order to identify underlying patterns that will better guide us in program improvement. Another highlight: as a campus community, we committed to two crucial, interlocking initiatives as the focal points of our WASC process. The first is to identify cross-university learning outcomes -- the knowledge and skills that all HSU graduates should have -- and determine effective performance measures for assessing and tracking student achievement of those attributes. For the second initiative, we are exploring and implementing ways to improve the success of all students, particularly those who are members of an underrepresented minority. Both initiatives assist the campus in identifying our goals in some detail, and in developing the measures that will allow us to determine how close we are to those goals, so that we can base future decisions on data that is grounded in our common vision.

2. Access to the CSU

The number of admissions of both first-time freshmen and upper-division CCC transfers in 04-05 was not significantly different from the previous year's number, though there was a very slight decline.

3. Progress to degree

While transfer retention rates tend to be strong and relatively steady from year to year, as compared to those for freshmen, the retention rate for first-time freshmen continues to vary widely from year to year, making it difficult to identify significant factors contributing to student success. The Freshman Interest Groups continue to have a positive effect on retention, and about 50% of all freshmen are involved in some type of intentional, supportive academic learning community: Freshman Interest Group, Summer Bridge, Fall Bridge, and so on. Last year saw an increased focus on enhancing students' progress toward graduation, as high-unit programs were analyzed, advising practices examined, policies established, tutoring programs enhanced, and targeted mentoring programs initiated; we expect corresponding improvement in student progress to degree.

4. Persistence and graduation

Predicted graduation rates have generally held steady for both first-time freshmen and CC transfer students; both were higher in 2004 than in the previous year. The graduation rate for community college transfer students is likely to improve due to the recent reduction in articulation problems, resulting in a common set of transfer protocols. The graduation rates for transfer students and full-time freshmen alike are also likely to improve due to the efforts undertaken to enhance progress to degree.

5. Areas of special state need

The number of credential-seeking students has declined system-wide this year, and Humboldt's credential program is no exception. However, our programs in nursing, a critical shortage in the state, have continued to be impacted. Funding has recently been received from St. Joseph's Hospital, for the purpose of adding twenty students to the cohort. Several options to expand the size of the nursing program are under consideration, including the possibility of developing opportunities for students to do clinical experiences in distant communities while enrolled in online coursework.

6. Relations with K-12

Humboldt exceeded the 04-05 goal for admitting new freshmen who were fully prepared in math, but fell substantially short of the goal for admitting those who were fully prepared in English. That was the first time, in fact, that the percentage of students fully prepared in math exceeded the percentage of students fully prepared in English, albeit slightly. We recruit throughout the state, and the remediation rates among students in the main feeder schools has tended to be lower than in the incoming class as a whole.

7. Remediation

While the number of students needing remediation in English has increased somewhat, 04-05 also saw an increase in the percentage of students who completed their remediation within one year.

8. Facilities utilization

While campus facilities utilization rates dropped somewhat in 04-05, probably due to declines in enrollment, there were marked increases in both online and off-campus offerings. This follows a growing trend to take learning out to the students, expanding opportunities for a broader range of students. Overall, the percentage of non-traditional instruction, while slightly lower in 04-05 than in the previous year, has remained fairly steady over time.

9. University advancement

The instability of the advancement office over the past few years has made it difficult to grow either friend-raising or fund-raising efforts. However, in spite of organizational difficulties, it is to the credit of the advancement staff that we exceeded our goals for 04-05 for all of the performance indicators. A new Vice President for Advancement has very recently been appointed, and our expectation is that the office will thrive under his direction.

Contact: Jena Burges, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
E-mail: jb139@humboldt.edu

Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs. In fall 2004, CSULB re-organized the Division of Academic Affairs, assigning responsibility for program review and assessment to a new Associate Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Programs. At the same time, the Academic Senate reorganized, centralizing responsibility in one new Program Assessment and Review Council. Responsibility for student learning in the majors is overseen by Academic Affairs, which provides funding to the colleges, and coordinated by a new full-time Director for Program Review and Assessment. Assessment of student learning outcomes is decentralized to colleges. Each college has a college assessment coordinator, each of whom in summer 2005 summarized the status of assessment for each degree program. GE assessment is overseen by the General Education Governing Committee, functioning under the umbrella of the Academic Senate. Assessment of learning in General Education is structured around the identification of Core Skills Areas. Ten core skills have been identified, including critical thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, and appreciating human diversity.

In fall 2005, the CSULB campus adopted a revised process for assessing student-learning outcomes. A timetable and responsibilities were endorsed by the Academic Senate. This new process requires an annual report on assessment from each degree-granting unit on campus. The first annual reports were provided in June, 2006, and indicated, for each program, the learning outcomes, where the outcomes were published, and how the outcomes are assessed.

In 2005, the Academic Senate adopted the first formal program review policy and created a new Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC) to implement it. The program review process culminates in a memorandum of understanding that sets out expectations for program performance over the next review cycle (seven years in most cases) and provides resources where appropriate. Each program follows up with an annual report on progress toward meeting the goals stipulated in the MOU. Programs with external professional accreditation may qualify for an expedited review under the new policy.

In the first year of implementation, PARC undertook twenty-six separate reviews, covering 46 academic degree programs and six non-degree programs. Thirteen of the program reviews have completed the MOU. The remaining thirteen are expected to complete the process by the end of the fall 2006 semester.

This revised process has produced meaningful and substantial changes in a number of programs. For example, programs lacking learning outcomes or assessment plans have now adopted them. Programs with unacceptably high student-faculty ratios have received additional positions to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. One academic unit has been directed to adopt new technology to provide more on-line and web-based instructional support services to students. The responsibility for and supervision of general internships earning academic credit (not associated with a major) has been overhauled. The new program review process has won widespread approval across campus and the new Program Assessment and Review Council is helping to tie together program review and assessment with both resources and accountability in ways never before experienced on campus.

Access. Long Beach admitted a then-record number of freshmen in fall 2004, 4,000 more than the prior year and the largest of any campus in the CSU that year. About 5,000 eligible freshmen and about 500 eligible transfer students were denied admission based upon campus impacted status in 2004-05. The figures placed Long Beach 3rd and 2nd in the CSU with respect to admission denials and were similar to the prior year.

First year continuation rates. Long Beach retention improved about 7% in one year with the first impacted freshman class of 2002 but has been stable since that cohort. Transfer rates have improved over the past three years. Long Beach has invested a good deal of effort to improve first year programs in recent years and these indicators suggest that the campus can look forward to improved graduation rates. Long Beach ranks 4th among all CSU campuses and first among large CSU campuses in freshman continuation rates and 3rd among all CSU campuses in transfer continuation rates.

Upper division units to degree. Long Beach exceeded its native student goal for units to degree but fell just short of its transfer goal on this indicator. The campus ranks in the middle of the CSU on these indicators, similar to the prior accountability cycle.

Persistence & Graduation. Long Beach shows a strong upward trend on freshman graduation rates, with a gain of over 12% in the time frame of the accountability data, and 17% over a longer period of time. The campus exceeded its goal for freshmen. Long Beach ranks 5th among all CSU campuses and 2nd among large CSU campuses in freshman graduation rates. Long Beach is in the middle of the CSU rankings on transfer graduation rates and fell slightly short of its transfer graduation rate goal.

Relations With K-12 - Fully Prepared New Freshmen. Long Beach is in the middle of the CSU rankings on the preparation indicator. Although an impacted campus, Long Beach has maintained a strong commitment to access and admits a large percentage of its freshman class from local high schools at CSU minimum criteria, without turning students away to community colleges for remedial work. Like virtually all other CSU campuses, Long Beach did not reach goals on this indicator.

Completed remediation. Long Beach is in the middle of CSU ranks on this indicator and experienced a decline from the prior cycle. The campus accepted a larger freshman class due to enrollment growth funding and this group included a larger percentage of students who needed both math and English remediation. This double remedial group is most at risk. In the year of these accountability data, the mathematics department experimented unsuccessfully with large lecture format remedial classes, an approach that has been discontinued.

Facilities Utilization. Long Beach is in the middle of CSU ranks on the percentage of non-traditional instruction, including Friday utilization. Slight declines on facilities indicators since the last cycle probably reflect slightly relaxed pressure on facility usage associated with enrollment declines caused by budget reductions of recent years.

University Advancement. With a new president in office in January 2006, CSULB began initial planning for a seven-year comprehensive campaign. With expansion of the university's endowment a primary focus of the projected campaign, CSULB is working on establishing timelines and fund-raising priorities and goals. Year-over-year private support increases of at least 10 percent are projected.

Contact: David A. Dowell, Vice Provost, Academic Affairs,
E-mail: ddowell@csulb.edu

Indicator #1– Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree Programs

1.1

California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA) has responded to the CSU Accountability Process and to *Cornerstones* by establishing and assessing student learning outcomes for major degree programs and general education, and assuring that students attain the core competencies of their degrees. Compelled by the principles of *Cornerstones*, the initiation of the CSU Accountability Process, and the accreditation requirements of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), the campus revised its assessment policy and commenced to complete its plans to assess learning outcomes acquired through each academic major, the general education program, co-curriculum, and technology. The university has become more experienced and knowledgeable about assessment during this time. Measurement of student learning outcomes has informed the campus about what students in each major and general education know and can do, has engaged faculty in reflection on the effectiveness of instruction, and led to program improvements. CSULA made substantial improvements in developing common assessment language and is becoming more systematic in the application of assessment measures. Each annual Accountability Report submitted by CSULA has chronicled the advances made in the assessment of student learning outcomes, and the progress of programmatic assessment made by the major degree programs participating in program review each year. Efforts continue in the refinement of assessment measures that accurately reflect educational success in a student population that is demographically diverse from that of the traditional college student population (with significant work-related, and personal commitments associated with low-income), and to assist students in achieving the educational goals set by the students and the university.

The campus disseminates information about assessment through student learning outcomes assessment websites for academic programs and general education. Assessment activities are stimulated through annual assessment mini-grant competitions for programs, workshops on program-level assessment, meetings with the deans, department chairs, and faculty, and provision of technical assistance to academic units developing self studies for program review or developing assessment plans for degrees. The campus continues to explore the best committee structures and systems for supporting teaching and learning, including assessment of student learning outcomes. After the campus identified a need for greater discussion and dialogue, a new faculty forum has been created. The new Educational Effectiveness Council (EEC) will focus on the development of a higher level of engagement and expertise in the assessment of learning outcomes and in the achievement of educational excellence.

Specific general education (GE) assessment activities began in 1999. A General Education Assessment Plan was developed by a special faculty task force over a two-year period, and academic governance committees approved the plan in 2001. Within this plan, goals and objectives for the general education program were developed, assessment measures identified, and a timeline for implementation set forth. The Assessment Plan calls for each block of the general education program to be the focus of assessment activities on a rotational basis, with a goal to complete all GE blocks of the program within a 5 to 6 year period. Assessment showed that students who had completed the GE critical thinking course improved their scores on the California Critical Thinking Skills Test when their scores were compared to those of a control group. A portfolio review of student papers from a required English composition course confirmed the course's general effectiveness, but also revealed a need for a greater emphasis on sentence-level and editing skills. An embedded assessment in a lower division GE biology class disclosed that over the course of the term students became more proficient in hypothesis testing. The Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE) was used to assess the students' understanding of the outcomes of "diversity" in the GE program. In a blind rating, Writing Proficiency Exam essays were rated by faculty graders using a rubric to identify understanding and appreciation of GE diversity goals and objectives.

Particular attention was paid to the assessment of the three upper division GE courses that are thematically linked, as these courses are required for both native and transfer students. To assess the upper division GE theme courses, faculty graded reflective essays to measure how well students could integrate knowledge from different courses in each theme. Students showed greater ability to synthesize interdisciplinary knowledge as they progressed in completing the three course upper division GE sequence. At the conclusion of the assessment of the upper division themes a number of actions were taken to strengthen the integration of the natural sciences, social sciences, and

humanities perspectives of the theme topic, and to assure student attainment of the learning outcomes for the themes. Courses that did not adequately support the upper division theme topics and outcomes were deleted and new courses were certified. All course syllabi for GE courses, and theme courses specifically, are required to include greater information about the courses and the learning outcomes of the specific block of the GE program.

1.2

Major degree programs regularly provide evidence of the assessment of student learning outcomes and how the information is used to improve the program. Each program is reviewed on a 5-6 year cycle, and external evaluators and peer committees examine the progress being made. Academic units have used capstone experiences, embedded assessments, standardized tests, and other measures to learn what their students know and can do, and have made changes to their programs and processes in an effort to become more effective. While degree programs with accreditation or licensing requirements (e.g., Nursing, Engineering, and Music) have the more fully developed assessment processes, non-accredited programs at CSULA have made significant headway. Examples of programmatic assessment at CSULA come from the programs of Biological Sciences, Sociology, Psychology, and Modern Languages and Literatures, and are described below.

In the Department of Biological Sciences five general attitudes were assessed. In general, the assessment showed that while students enter the program with attitudes that are desired, the program reinforces and improves those attitudes. Two course alignment projects were undertaken. One project sought to determine how well the stated attitudinal outcomes were addressed in the program's core courses. The department found that syllabi did not sufficiently state the attitudinal outcomes as objectives for the courses, and that only three of five desired attitudinal outcomes were covered in the courses. The course alignment project to assess skills determined that all 17 desired skills were developed in the Biology program, and that 16 of 17 skills were developed in the Microbiology program. Data collected from the pilot capstone course project supported the conclusions obtained from the course alignment projects and indicate that the department's graduates are adequately prepared to perform at or above the expected level in 10 of 11 assessed skills. However, the evidence also showed that students are not adequately prepared for "using mathematics and statistics to evaluate scientific evidence". The department has used the assessment results to modify instructional strategies and course content. Based on survey results, the department modified certain instructional strategies to emphasize the importance of ethical conduct for scientists. The department stressed to students that ethical conduct is very important in the pursuit of scientific knowledge, and reinforced basic statistical analysis of the data even in introductory level courses. The skills assessment done in the capstone course found that students were not adequately prepared for using mathematics and statistics to evaluate scientific evidence. As a result, the Biometric courses have placed additional emphasis on the relationship between the design of an experiment and the appropriate statistical test.

The Department of Sociology developed and implemented a fairly comprehensive assessment process addressing both undergraduate and graduate student outcomes. The assessment plan involves: embedded authentic assessment; student self-assessment; student and alumni attitude/opinion surveys; comprehensive exam exit interviews; interviews with faculty thesis committee members; evaluations from the on-site supervisors of student doing internships; service learning; and cooperative education projects. Data is collected at significant intervals and assessment is used to inform program improvement efforts. A few highlights of the program improvements as a result of on-going assessment are as follows: additional focus and specificity of the program goals and objectives led to ten well-articulated outcomes expectations for use in program planning and improvement; two cooperative education courses were improved and service-learning was brought into three courses; development of career-linked curriculum that created opportunities for increased internship placements in social agencies, and led directly into employment for students. Content analysis of thesis exams, along with student exit interviews, indicated that the MA comprehensive exam required modification. As a result, the test was modified to utilize computers rather than handwritten responses. The change allows students to produce better quality responses through revision and better use of time. Content analysis of the exam also showed the application of methods to be the weakest aspect of methods performance at exit for MA students. As a result a new course was developed to support both comprehensive exam preparations and thesis methodology preparation work.

The Department of Psychology uses several assessment measures including surveys and review of course syllabi. One of the major efforts of the department was to assess whether students graduating from the program had sufficient skills to present grammatically correct and articulate written and oral arguments on issues in the discipline. The department developed a scientific writing rubric that consisted of six broad writing dimensions: ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency and conventions. The rubric was applied to samples of student work from the required upper division writing course in the major, as they learned a disciplined approach to writing of acceptable American Psychological Association (APA)-style scientific papers. The results of the writing assessment project provided empirical means for assessing the degree of writing improvement. The department, wishing to effectively leverage resources, developed a specific reference handbook on scientific writing skills. The handbook systematically takes students through the complete writing process in the development of an APA-style paper. Through a series of chapters in the handbook, students are presented with relevant materials and samples to guide them in improving their scientific writing skills. The handbook is easily accessed by students through the department webpage, and now is utilized in all the department's upper division writing courses.

The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures implemented a two-step assessment plan to assess all majors. Upon entry into the program students are assessed in four areas: listening comprehension, speaking, reading comprehension, and writing. Students must achieve a rating of "advanced" or 80% in French and Spanish in order to be approved as competent in the language. Students also develop portfolios of documents that provide evidence of their professional knowledge, skills, reflections and proficiency in language, culture, linguistics and literature. The department also uses surveys of students and alumni and comprehensive exams. The department has made appropriate adjustments in response to relevant information it receives through the assessment process. Curriculum changes have been made. Two on-line courses in French were created to mitigate what are often low-enrolled courses. In Spanish, a new course in Hispanic film was created, and a number of courses were modified to reflect recent advances in linguistics. The department also created a service-learning course in intermediate written Spanish to be offered in general education. In response to student comments about the graduate comprehensive exam in Spanish, the pattern for administering the exam was modified.

CSULA is making significant strides towards more systematic assessment with the development of an annual reporting template for all degree programs. This annual reporting focuses on student outcomes assessment and its results at the department and program level, with the goal of providing trend data at the program level. In the annual report each program indicates direct and indirect assessment measures, how the results of the assessments are used to improve the program, and other information. This annual report, along with program review, ensures that all major degree programs sustain engagement in the process of assuring students meet program competencies prior to graduation. One of the most significant changes is that faculty have generally improved in their knowledge and attitudes about assessment since 1999. CSULA is committed to helping all students to succeed academically, to graduate with a wide range of skills, to succeed in jobs in the increasingly global economy, and to continually improve its programs.

Contact: Susan Cash, Acting Associate Vice President
for Academic Affairs - Academic Programs
E-mail: SCash@cslanet.calstatela.edu

Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Program:

Policies, processes and procedures are in place to assess student learning in all courses. The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee reviews all new courses and all changes to programs and courses. Before any new course or course change is approved, there must be an assessment plan for that course including learning outcomes, appropriate measurement tools, a review method for evaluating the student learning and a method for modifying the course if student learning outcomes are not met.

Another area of significant ongoing effort is "Writing Across the Curriculum". The assessment of student writing in many courses and many majors indicated improvement needed to be made in the students' ability to write. A program that included writing and information fluency was started in 2004-2005. It was started at the lower division level and has shown dramatic improvement in students' writing as indicated by passing rate of the Graduate Writing Exam and in improved writing in courses throughout the majors. In academic year 2006-2007, this program is being expanded to include upper division courses in ALL majors.

One area that still needs work is the development of university wide outcomes. That is being addresses by a committee and should be adapted by the end of the current academic year.

A policy for program review was developed in the fall of 2005. The program review process is a two academic year process, with the department developing a self study during the first academic year and a review by an external and an internal team, the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee, during the second academic year. The process looks at what has gone on in the past, but also requires the departments to do strategic planning. Two programs, BS in Marine Engineering Technology and BS in Facilities Engineering Technology are both currently conducting program review which will be reviewed by an external review team (ABET) in October. All programs will go through review in the next 4 years.

During this self-study, the Engineering Technology Department discovered that there was a noted weakness in the students' ability to apply calculus to engineering problems. This was occurring in a number of junior level courses. As a result, the curriculum was changed so that the students in the two engineering technology majors took calculus based physics prior to the beginning of the junior year. This change required coordination with the Math and Science Department which teaches these courses. This new requirement started in the 2006-2007 academic year so the results will not be known for another year.

2. California Maritime does not have any programs that are impacted. The current freshman class has 245 students, the largest entering class in the history of CMA. This was our goal for 2006-2007. The vast majority of applications are first time freshmen.

CMA continues with a high rate of both first year continuation rates with 85% of first year students continuing on to a second year. The upper division units earned to degree is very high but contains a number of professional courses such as co-ops and summer cruises.

California Maritime has a cohort system which allows all students who stay on track graduate in 4 years. This assists the students in handling the large number of upper division credits required and still graduate. The graduation rate has remained above 75%.

The nature of the programs at California Maritime are unique and very rarely does a student transfer to another CSU campus.

The number of freshmen fully prepared in Mathematics and English has remained constant at approximately 85% for both. Cal Maritime has an EAP coordinator but because the freshmen come from all over the state and not more highly from local communities, it is difficult to evaluate the impact of this program.

All students a Cal Maritime completed remediation during the first year.

Cal Maritime has regularly scheduled classes 5 days a week including evenings. The training ship "Golden Bear" provides off-site educational opportunities for all students regardless of major. The only summer programs are offered through Extended Learning and are not state supported. Cal Maritime does not have any CPEC- approved centers.

The alumni participation and giving have increased over the past two years. A new Director of Alumni Activities was hired last spring and a better data base of alumni has been developed.

Contact: Paul Jackson, Director of Professional & Institutional
E-mail: pjackson@csum.edu

In recognition of an increased emphasis on accountability, the following outlines the university's progress towards meeting nine broad institutional performance goals in facilitating the development of its students, serving the community in which it resides, and its continued contributions to the California economy and society.

1. Each campus will provide a brief summary of campus academic program reviews, broadly characterizing assessment results and describing how those results have been used to improve teaching, learning, and the programs that were reviewed.

CSUMB program reviews assess the needs and demands for a program, the program's appropriateness for the university, the quality of the program, and its costs. Program reviews include a self-study and external reviews, which are utilized by program personnel in developing an enhancement plan. Results from the last round of program reviews indicated the presence of student learning outcomes for all baccalaureate degree programs, and led to the specific goal of refining the program review process to include clearer measures of student learning outcomes. In addition to reviews of academic programs, the University Learning Requirements (ULRs) are assessed within faculty learning communities, with results used to refine the learning requirements and improve teaching and learning. CSUMB's Service Learning program provides a strong example of how data on program effectiveness is collected and analyzed semesterly through a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative methods and longitudinal design, including pre- and post-experience self-assessment of students' attitudes related to the core service learning course, as well as student, community partnership, and faculty evaluations of the service learning process and program experiences, providing the program with vital information to improve both program effectiveness and the evaluation process.

2. Eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus. CSUMB continues to admit all eligible students.

3. The CSU provides clear paths to the baccalaureate degree for first-time freshmen and transfer students.

First year continuation rates for the 2003-04 first-time freshmen increased over the previous college year and returned to a similar continuation rate for 2004-05. CCC transfer students continue through the university at a higher rate than their first-time freshmen counterparts. Efforts to retain and graduate California Community College (CCC) transfer students continue to improve. Newly adopted pathways to degree will assist students in completing graduation requirements in a more timely manner. Efforts to retain first-time freshmen continue to be strengthened with additional lower-division undergraduate advisors and the clarification of degree pathways. These efforts as well as a renewed commitment by the campus community in the retention of all students are expected to strengthen the continuation rates for current and future cohorts of first-time freshmen and CCC transfers.

Both groups based on regular admittance criteria, had an increase in the number of upper-division units earned and did not meet the designated goals. After experiencing a slight drop in the number of units earned in 2002-03, the next two years have again increased. Thus students are again taking more units to graduate.

The gap in the number of upper-division units earned to degree between native freshmen and CCC transfer students has decreased considerably from past performance years, indicating that both cohorts of students progress through upper-division work at a similar pace. It is expected that pathway improvements currently underway will have a noticeable impact on CSUMB's future performance in this area of accountability.

4. The CSU, through clear statements of graduation requirements, effective advising, and effective access to courses, will assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

CSUMB's graduation rates for CCC junior transfer students have increased nicely for the Fall 2002 class. Graduation rates for first-time freshmen continue to fluctuate slightly from year-to-year, yet they remain competitive within and without the system. Efforts such as improved advising

opportunities at orientation, the strengthening of lower-division advising, more timely information presented to students entering their junior year regarding major and graduation requirements, comprehensive graduation counseling and more timely degree audit data available, and the adoption of clearly stated pathways to degree are currently underway. These efforts will have a positive effect for both native and transfer students in improving their continuation and graduation.

Perhaps in the next iteration of this report, the goals could be conservatively increased due to the development of new Pathways to Degree that the faculty have just agreed to and are now published.

6. Although the CSU cannot assume full control of the academic preparation of entering students, our universities can influence the level of preparation.

Continued strengthening of our outreach efforts enabled us to reach our goals for 2004-05. We witnessed significant gains in Mathematics and moderate gains in English. Moderate gains in English may be attributed to the demographics of our service area. As we continue to enhance our EAP outreach efforts, further develop our relationships with the local schools as well as improve collaborative efforts in the community, including working with parents and community support efforts, we should continue to see positive gains.

7. The CSU successfully remediates, within one year, students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English.

CSUMB continues to experience great success in helping first-time freshmen gain full proficiency. Eighty-five percent of regularly admitted first-time freshmen enrolled Fall 2004 who needed remediation gained full proficiency before their second year in college, an increase of 4 percentage points above the 2003-04 performance year. This result exceeds the campus' 2004-05 accountability goal, and outperforms the system average (84%) for the same cohort of interest.

8. To meet growing enrollment pressure, the CSU will expand its capacity by using existing facilities more effectively.

CSUMB continues to use space more creatively and efficiently by offering more weekend and hybrid courses, as well as offering courses during the "college hours" (MW 12-2 p.m.).

"Evenings after 4 p.m." space utilization remains unchanged, while "Friday" non-traditional instruction decreased by approximately 16%. This is most likely due to the new Science Academic Center building coming on line.

"Weekend" usage is up by 20% as a greater number of computer-related courses are now being offered after 4 p.m. on Fridays, and "Distance-learning" usage has increased over 30% as more courses are offered as hybrid courses.

"Off-site" instruction is down approximately 27%, possibly due to increased distance-learning (via hybrid courses) and weekend instruction.

Although "overall instruction" actual FTEs were up 6.1% for 2004 reporting, "overall non-traditional instruction" did not increase. "Overall non-traditional instruction" percentage decreased from 47% to 45%. This could be attributed to the new Science Academic Center which brought in new science/math labs and lecture spaces housing courses during traditional instructional hours M-TH 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. This new building released space in older lecture/lab spaces. Due to 2 computer lab closures in recent years, we would like to see at least one more computer lab open for interdisciplinary use in the Science Academic Center. This would also increase lab space utilization in Building 53. It appears that we are holding steady at 45-47% in overall non-traditional percentage.

9. To support educational excellence, CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions. CSUMB's Advancement performance indicators for 2004-05 exceeded our goals in the areas of charitable gift receipts (40%), Alumni memberships (18%), and Addressable Alumni (3%). The fulfillment of several major gift pledges, over \$3,544,000 that year, contributed to our unexpectedly high gift receipts total. Alumni participation continues to be a high priority. We are proud of our Alumni Relations efforts in engaging our alumni and maintaining their interest in CSUMB.

Contact: Abe Abrams, Research Analyst
E-mail: abe_abrams@csumb.edu

Success in Meeting 2004-05 Goals: Of the close to 25 accountability goals set in mid-2002, Northridge has met or exceeded most. In Advancement, the gap between goal and achievement reflects a recent change in the way gift receipts are calculated.¹ Numerous campus initiatives have enabled us to exceed our goals significantly in two areas: the one-year continuation rate of our first time freshmen, and the percentage of freshmen fully remediated one year after entry. The number of likely graduates among recent cohorts of freshmen has also shown steady growth.

The Benefits of Cornerstones: After nearly a decade, it is time to assess Cornerstones. It has focused the CSU on outcomes, not just inputs. Access ratios, retention/graduation, fund-raising, and utilization of space are telling indices of how well a university operates. However, the CSU has had more difficulty getting its arms around the quality of academic programs. Yes, we have outcomes in all programs; yes, we have direct measures of student learning; yes, we have compiled reports for accrediting agencies; yes, we have made many changes because of these reviews. But tough methodological issues plague and perhaps undermine the process; and certain assumptions about the unit to be evaluated—the department, the college, the university, the system—need to be reviewed in the context of a system that values transfer so highly. If quality inheres in the distinction of programs, yet access requires the equivalence of those programs, we have an anomaly to think through.

Here at Northridge, the determination of program quality has influenced policy, as well as curriculum in these exemplary ways:

- The English Department requires students to take a writing pedagogy course, because assessments indicated that they were not able to explain the rationale for “process.”
- The Writing Proficiency Exam has been changed from a pure writing to a reading/writing prompt to reflect the findings of the local Reading Initiative for Academic Progress.
- Liberal Studies instituted a senior seminar in science to redress graduates’ deficits in understanding method and synthesizing the disciplines.
- Findings from a two-pronged assessment of Business students’ writing skills, which relied in part on the views of employers, led the faculty to reduce the size of the lower division communications course, move it from the 100 to the 200 level, and make the 100-level freshmen writing course a prerequisite.
- The Art Department is redesigning the foundation courses for the major. The changes resulted from the faculty’s assessment of student portfolios. The reviews disclosed gaps in the preparation for upper division work.
- An assessment of students’ understanding of the concept of “culture” in an anthropology series revealed gaps in student learning. As a result, the faculty are collaborating to define and institutionalize the understanding of culture.
- Several departments in the sciences have embedded queries about method in freshman and senior courses to determine the gain over time.
- After surveying students about their familiarity with two new electronic search and retrieval systems, staff in the Oviatt Library used the findings to develop procedures for teaching students about their use. Library staff also played a key role in identifying student learning outcomes for the information competency requirements in Northridge’s new GE program.
- We experimented with the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)—a national standardized test—to assess what value we add to students’ abilities to write and think critically.

¹ We have adjusted our 2008-09 goals accordingly. In addition, the conservative new goals for alumni association membership reflect the new method for counting these members and recent efforts to clean our database.

- We are engaged in a major study that correlates CSUN candidate data with LAUSD teacher and pupil data to track our programs' effects on K-12 learning. We are partnering with two research institutes to analyze the data. Given the size of our pre-service programs, this effort functions as a model for assessing university impacts on a variety of professions. We beat the Spellings' Report to the punch!

We are aware that these successes actually mask profound concerns that Cornerstones overlooked. First, as the Education/LAUSD project has revealed, valid, reliable, and theoretically sound assessment is challenging. Getting at "quality" through effects, in other words, is an undercapitalized social science. Second, authentic assessment depends on consistent practices by professors; but the academy values autonomy—consistency is its hobgoblin. Third, assessment requires an infrastructure for training, data collection, and analysis. The CSU has developed CMS to support its business practices. We must now build AMS—an academic management system—to support assessment and begin the next phase of Cornerstones.

Were the CSU system to adopt a value-added approach that emphasizes a) gains over entry characteristics and b) the impact on the professions, we would have an accountability process that could change departments as well as shape state policy. So, here is the question that the builders of the new Cornerstones must answer: will the CSU lead the nation? Or, will it follow? We can choose; but we must choose now.

Contact: Bettina J. Huber, Director, Institutional Research
E-mail: bettina.huber@csun.edu

Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) has a history of internal and external accountability. The President's annual report, published for over a decade, and reports submitted annually by divisions, colleges, and units are examples of internal accountability. The campus has many professionally accredited programs. Accreditations, along with academic program reviews and WASC institutional accreditation, are examples of external accountability.

Area 1: Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

Nearly all departments now have written an assessment plan and begun implementation of that plan. Results from the assessment plans will be integrated into department program reviews beginning in 2007-08. Between 2003 and 2006, two departments and two colleges successfully completed accreditation reviews, 17 departments developed assessment plans, and one department completed a program review. Assessment tools being developed include capstone courses, exit interviews, and student portfolios.

The Academic Senate developed a process to assess general education that included forming committees for each of the sixteen GE areas. At this time, eight committees have been formed, and plans to assess four GE areas will be piloted this year. Four more committees will be formed in the coming year.

The campus submitted a proposal to WASC in May 2006 which was approved with the highest rating given to four-year colleges at that meeting. A Capacity and Preparatory Review Committee and an Educational Effectiveness Committee have begun work, and investigations are being conducted concerning how to best collect and store evidence.

In 2003-04, the University formed a Learning Community on Being Learning Centered. In 2005-06, the Community was expanded into a Task Force. During those three years, a number of events were held to bring together different campus constituencies to discuss various aspects of teaching, learning, and promoting student success. In 2006-07, the year will begin with a Month-Long Focus on Becoming a More Learning Centered Campus. The event will conclude with a poster session saluting learning centered efforts by faculty, staff, and students.

Area 2: Access to the CSU

All CSU-eligible students who completed their applications before the deadline have been admitted to CPP with the following exceptions: Impaction at the program level was implemented for Architecture (Fall 1997 to 2003); Computer Science (fall 2000-2002); and Computer Science (Fall 2002). Beginning with fall 2004, impaction at the campus level was implemented for freshman admission to manage increased number of applications. With freshman impaction, all local area CSU-eligible students who completed their applications before the deadline were admitted. CSU eligible students in the non-local area were "rank-ordered" for possible admission to the university, eligibility indices (EI) computed, and admissions offers made in descending order of EI totals until enrollment capacity was reached.

Area 3: Progression to Degree

First-year continuation rates for freshmen and transfers have increased steadily each year. The campus has developed common goals for all first-year programs and services, and several new programs are being piloted or have been implemented.

Over 80% of CPP academic programs have now reduced the number of units to degree to 180. Most of the remaining programs have accreditation constraints that prevent their reducing the number of units to degree to 180 units. The steady decline in the number of upper division units earned to degree for both native and transfer students is expected to continue.

Area 4: Persistence and Graduation

Graduation rates for both first-time freshmen and CCC transfers have shown a steady increase. The campus has implemented several strategies to facilitate graduation, including mandatory orientation, policy and process revisions, technology enhancements, improved advising, improved student communication, increased reporting. Roadmaps for all programs are now available for all academic programs.

Area 5: Areas of Special State Need

None

Area 6: Relations with K-12

Cal Poly Pomona continues to provide substantial outreach and academic preparation programs to K-12 students, teachers, and schools in the regions, serving over 25,000 students at more than 260 schools in 2005-06. Cal Poly Pomona continues to be involved in the Summer Bridge, Gear Up, and Upward Bound Programs. Although the PAD and CAPI programs were discontinued, K-12 teachers are assisted in teaching mathematics and English in workshops offered through the RIAP and EAP programs. Students receive tutoring and mentoring in programs such as Master², Friendmobile, Shadow Day, and Youth with Pride.

The percentage of entering students fully prepared for math is above the CSU system average. The lower percentage of students fully prepared for English reflects the diversity of our student population. English is not the native language of more than a quarter of our students.

Area 7: Completed Remediation

The University supports student success in remediation before and during students' enrollment at Cal Poly Pomona. The EAP director frequently visits the schools in the campus' service area, promoting participation in the program. Students who require remediation are encouraged to begin their studies in the summer, either as part of the Summer Bridge Program, or in the Early Start Program. Throughout their remediation, students are required to attend supplemental instruction in mathematics and English, and are encouraged to seek extra assistance from the Mathematics Tutoring Center, and the University Writing Center.

Area 8 – Facilities Utilization

Cal Poly Pomona continues to use course offering times which maximize student enrollment and satisfaction, effectively meeting their needs in terms of time, place and mode of instruction. Co-curricular activities, which are a hallmark of the campus's learn-by-doing philosophy, create substantial Friday, evening and weekend use of facilities which does not appear in the course schedule.

The campus has experienced some challenges in keeping the Space and Facilities Database current, which has resulted in space utilization being underreported. This has been addressed in the most recent update cycle and will be reflected in the 2006-07 performance.

Course offerings in Summer 2004 were a clear aberration in the previous growth pattern for the campus, caused by severe budget cuts. Summer 2005 showed a partial recovery and Summer 2006 has put the campus back on track to reach the YRO goal.

Area 9 – University Advancement

2005-06 has been a transition year for the Division of University Advancement that saw significant progress on key campus and system-wide initiatives. A new vice president joined the university in August 2006. This enabled a comprehensive review of division processes, empowering the staff to restructure and redeploy organizations and budgets. Outcomes included the addition of a new associate vice president for university development, who will lead the development officers, the annual fund and gifts processing. In addition, positions were filled to support engineering development, planned giving and development events. Governmental Affairs was formally transferred to the division, working under the associate vice president for university relations.

In preparation for a nine-figure comprehensive capital campaign, the division leadership secured a multi-year funding commitment. This will enable the division to hire key positions, beginning in July 2007. University Advancement took a lead role in support of the CSU Advocacy Initiative, promoting the program in its award-winning publications and participating in a number of discipline and cultural-based events. The division also hosted one of the university's most successful fund-raising events, netting \$334,000 at Founders' Celebration 2006.

Contact: Diane Cuneo, Director, Institutional Research
E-mail: docuneo@csupomona.edu

1.1 - As of summer 2006, 71% of the courses offered in the General Education Program have approved assessment plans and are collecting data. One of the primary results of the assessment process has been to identify the need for clarification of our foreign language graduation requirement learning goals and the need to articulate information competency learning goals. Both of these areas have been addressed by faculty senate action. In general the process has significantly raised the campus awareness of and involvement in the General Education Program.

1.2 - All departments have developed assessment plans. However, the sustainability of these assessment plans varies greatly. Departments with unwieldy plans are finding them difficult to implement. A review of assessment plans reveals that many have far more learning objectives than can be realistically and meaningfully evaluated by a program on an ongoing basis. In addition, changes in faculty who are responsible for assessment within each department means that often, faculty members spearheading assessment efforts are new to program assessment and unfamiliar with institutional requirements. On the other hand, many departments have developed workable assessment plans that are sustainable and yield meaningful information. These departments have either 1) limited the number of learning objectives identified or 2) focused on only a few critical objectives. Finally, departments with outside accrediting bodies are able to use the accrediting bodies' guidelines to direct their assessment activities thus facilitating the assessment process. Currently, 30 of our departments are accredited or seeking accreditation by outside agencies. Departments are using such things as capstone courses, portfolios, pre test/post test, and surveys as methods for assessing student attainment of learning objectives. The following are observations gleaned from program assessment and the outcomes resulting from the assessment.

- Several departments use a capstone course as a means of assessing program and university learning objectives. Capstone courses are developed so that multiple sections have uniform content. Grading rubrics for a course project and pre-test, post-test were two of the methods used to assess student learning. Departments are also using portfolios and research papers as direct measures of student learning. Results indicate that students are meeting program objectives and competencies in most areas.
- Departments identified areas of weakness as the ability to use critical analysis, focused and organized writing style, and integration of knowledge. One department noted that their students displayed "more interest in pragmatic courses than in the theoretical and intellectual aspects of the field." Departments identifying these areas all have plans to meet with faculty in order to address these concerns. These plans include clarification of course assignments to ensure that competencies are addressed and assessed, reorganization of some courses and the use of exemplars of competent work.
- Many departments use student or alumni surveys as indirect measure of attainment of learning objectives. These reports tend to be consistently favorable indicating that students feel they have mastered the learning objectives identified by their programs.

2.1.a - Based on the data for F'06 and estimates for S'07, we will exceed the goal for 2006/07. The goal for 2008/09 has been set at 10,100.

2.1.b- Assuming we have a normal Spring 07 admission cycle, we will exceed our goal for 06/07. We have set a goal of 5,700 for 08/09.

3.1.a - Preliminary data for the F05 cohort shows a decline to 76.4%, probably caused by lower completion rates for remedial students. We have set a goal of 80% for 08/09.

3.1.b - Preliminary data for the F05 cohort indicates a slight decrease to 82.1%. Because of observed trends, we expect to fall a little short of our 06/07 goal. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 85%.

4.1.a - Preliminary data for the F00 cohort indicates a rate of only 52.3%, well below the goal of 58% we set for 06/07 (F01 cohort). We expect to fall a little short of our goal for 06/07. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 57%.

4.1.b - With a lower than expected rate for the F03 cohort of 69%, we do not expect to achieve our goal for 06/07 (F04 cohort). We have set the goal for 08/09 at 74%.

6.2.a - Preliminary data for our Fall 06 cohort indicates a proficiency rate of only 55.2. We have not achieved our goal for 06/07. Given where the rate is for the current year, we have set a more realistic goal of 58% math proficiency for 08/09.

6.2.b - Although we have not achieved our goal for 06/07, we have seen an increase over the past three years. We have set a goal for 08/09 at 52%. The goal for 08/09 anticipates continued positive impact from EAP and implementation of the 12th grade writing curriculum.

7.1 - Our excellent record of moving students through remediation within their first year (87% for the last two years) has taken a slight dip for the Fall 05 cohort (down to 84.2%). We will not achieve the

goal for 06/07. We attribute the lower completion rate to a larger portion of students placing in the lowest level of remediation. The goal for 08/09 will be 87%.

8.1.a - Evening courses are often cancelled because of low enrollment. Evening enrollment is also affected by the decline in post-baccalaureate enrollment. Preliminary data for F06 indicates that we will be well short of our goal for 06/07. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 4,400

8.1.b - Although preliminary 05/06 and F06 data indicates an increase in Friday utilization, we will fall short of the 06/07 goal. We have set our goal for 08/09 at 1,750.

8.1.c - Preliminary 05/06 and F06 data indicates a substantial decline in weekend FTES. Some of this decline may be a result of decreased enrollment in post-baccalaureate programs where many of the weekend courses were offered. It's clear that we will not achieve the goal for 06/07. We have set a more realistic goal for 08/09 at 102, corresponding to a 2% enrollment growth from what we expect to generate in 06/07.

8.1.d - Actual Summer 06 enrollment was 677 FTES, a decline of about 20 from Summer 2005. We clearly have not achieved the goal for 06/07. Most of the decline has been at the graduate level in the college of education. We anticipate no growth in Summer 07 and modest growth for Summer 08. We have set a goal of 715 FTES for 08/09.

8.1.e - Preliminary figures for 05/06 and F06 show a significant increase in distance learning enrollment. Some of the increase is due to expanded capabilities to offer distance education courses coming from our new Academic Information Resource Center. However, other changes come from more accurate identification of the distance education courses. Because of the substantial growth, we set our 08/09 goal at 400.

8.1.f - Preliminary data for 05/06 and F06 indicate a significant decline in off-site courses. Some of this decline is attributable to more accurate identification of the distance education courses noted above (i.e., courses that used to be flagged as off-site are now being correctly flagged as distance education). However, the further decline in F06 may result from decreases in teacher credential course offerings, many of which had been offered at off-site locations. With the anticipated expansion of courses offerings in the Placer county area, we have set our goal for 08/09 at 550 FTES, about 150 more than what we estimate for 06/07.

9.1-9.4 - Sacramento State's total philanthropic productivity goal exceeded the 10% goal for 05/06. The goals for FY 2006-07 and FY2008-09 are based on the assumptions that the campus general fund budget will increase in each of those years and an optimistic projection that the development unit will keep pace with the increased philanthropic productivity goals. The increases projected for alumni participation are based on enhanced programming that will allow for increased contact and engagement by the Alumni Relations office with alumni in the region and beyond.

Contact: Larry Glasmire, Director of Special Programs
E-mail: glasmirel@csus.edu

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs-Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes-CSUSB steadily moved forward in its efforts to establish a culture of evidence about students' learning. CSUSB has a number of outcomes assessment structures & processes in place. Outcomes assessment is organized around an infrastructure, institutional funding, an array of planned & tracked assessment initiatives, formative & summative assessment methodologies based on agreed upon programmatic learning goals & objectives, & developing baselines & norms. Overall, assessment practices are being implemented in many areas of the campus in a visible, systematic, & substantial way. Assessment plans have been developed for all undergraduate majors & a significant # departments have already evaluated their programs under self-designed & institution-approved instruments, reported their results, & begun to use the findings for program improvement. (See <http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/>.) Programs have been required to submit annual assessment status reports since 1998. Programs outline their assessment activities, findings, & how they have used the results for program improvement. Forming an integral component of CSUSB's commitment to continuous program improvement & student learning, the annual status reports have begun to provide us with a systematic method to gather specific information on student learning & how departments are improving programs. This information is made public through its annual Accountability reports to the CSU Board of Trustees. (See <http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/bycollege.html> and <http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/statusrpt.html>.) The majority of programs use assessment information to facilitate curriculum decisions. Programs employ their assessment findings to shape curriculum & used their assessment findings to add & delete courses, change course sequences, revise course content, guide changes in degree programs, develop new degree program options, change degree requirements, & justify past curriculum changes to show program improvement resulting from those changes. For some programs, assessment information has led to a greater emphasis on advising, & other institutional functions designed to enhance student development, resulting in some departments' development of new avenues of career exploration & career services for their students. For other programs, the results from their outcomes assessment activities have led to changes in instructional emphasis for current faculty & changes in emphasis for new & vacant faculty positions. Assessment information has enabled programs to strengthen ties with the community by sharing assessment information with alumni, review boards, & advisory boards composed of community leaders. Signaling a growing willingness to engage in a continuous process of self-examination, more than half of the departments with an approved assessment plan report that besides aiding them in curriculum & staffing decisions, assessment information is useful in helping them to further refine their assessment methods & implement new ones. (See <http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/improvements.html>.)

2. Access to CSU-The campus continues to accept all qualified freshmen, lower & upper division transfers, graduate & credential students. CSUSB is committed to serving the growing number of high school graduates & transfer students in our primary service region seeking a college degree. Our early outreach efforts with elementary, middle & secondary schools have been in operation for over a decade & are having a positive impact on Latino & African American enrollments. Additionally, we are having a positive impact on the percentage of high school graduates attending college, as well as the number & percentage of students taking the required college preparatory course sequence for admission to the CSU. We are participating in the Early Assessment Program, which should reduce the number of students requiring remediation & increase the number of students who are CSU eligible.

3. Progression to degree- Continuation rates for first-time freshmen have, as predicted, held steady since the last report. Initiatives related to "Facilitating Graduation" will generate a modest increase in fall-to-fall retention for first-time freshmen. The increased attention to better advising & to the graduation rate will increase the percentage of students who take six or fewer years to graduate.

4. Persistence & graduation-The projected improvements are predicated on having no more than 13 to 16% part-time students. If this holds steady, the predicted fall-to-fall persistence & graduation rates should be fairly accurate. Graduation rates have changed less, but policy changes made in the "Facilitating Graduation" are likely to help us reach our targets over the next 3 to 5 years.

5. Areas of Special State need-CSUSB College of Education (COE) enrollments have been affected by changes in the new CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing & the No Child Left Behind initiatives at the national level, leading to a decrease in enrollment over the last two year period. Indications are

that enrollments have leveled off & are beginning to increase as evidenced by an increase in enrollments in beginning level courses. The educational administration program has continued to rebound from lowered enrollments, with five off campus sites offering cohorts for the credential & master degree. CSUSB is identified to pursue the EdD program in Educational Leadership. It is expected to begin Fall 2007 with emphasis in K-12 leadership & community college administration. The Gear UP grant has had tremendous impact on the educational success of over 10,000 students in the Inland Empire. Out of the middle school students who started in 2000, & have been receiving resources through Gear Up grant initiatives, 67% of those graduating seniors have applied & been accepted to college. The success of these initiatives reflects the various expertise of COE faculty directed toward community & school based outreach for this grant. The BSN program at CSUSB remains impacted due to receiving more qualified applicants than it can accept each of the two application cycles each AY. The major causes of the impacted program are lack of funding for more faculty positions, competition among local nursing programs for clinical sites, & increasing difficulty finding faculty with needed clinical specialization. The BASW enrolled its first students in fall 2003 when there were 40 applicants for a class of 25 students. In fall 2004 class we had 100 interested applicants. Thus from the start, this program has been impacted. For fall 2006 we were able to accommodate all but one BASW applicant due to the IV-E funding that added another IV-E faculty member. It is clear these impacted programs in Nursing & Social Work require an increase in funding levels to meet the increasing demand for nurses & social workers.

6.1 Relations with K-12- The keystone of our academic outreach efforts is now the Early Assessment Program. Our second largest program continues to be our GEAR UP grant, & we are now in the 2nd year of our 2nd GEAR UP grant. We expect that the new doctoral programs with the CSU will begin offering in 2007 will improve both our relations & contact with K-12. We are also fully involved in three P-16 partnerships in our region.

6.2 Fully Prepared new freshmen-We expect small, generally linear, gains in percentage of freshmen fully prepared in math. Given the demographics of our region, the percentage of freshmen fully prepared in English is likely to increase at a much slower pace and may even show further decline in some years. The percentage of non-native English speakers has increased in our service area, and continues to impact the preparation level of incoming freshmen. Holding steady is actually a sign that improvement efforts by all segments are having a positive impact. The level of preparation will also be impacted adversely by pressure to increase enrollment. The most capable students apply and are admitted fairly early in application process. Less capable (but fully eligible) students tend to apply late in the process and are often accepted if campus has not closed admissions for a specific academic year.

7 Remediation- A significantly larger percentage of our students require remediation than is true for the system as a whole. The quarter system format works as a deterrent to remediation in English because what non-native speakers of English need is more time on task, and the quarter system does not afford them that added time.

8.1 Facilities Utilization-Nearly half (46%) of all instruction at this campus is in non-traditional courses. We have a strong history of offering courses & degree programs for full- and part-time students during the evening. We have increased non-traditional course offerings 14% over the past 5 years. Over the past 5 years our course offerings have increased 20% in the evenings. However, in the past year significant declines in Teacher Education enrollments have continued to impact our progress toward targets. These courses are held almost exclusively in evening. Causes for the decline include districts' revision of teacher to student ratios & school district lay-offs, & increased competition from private institutions. However, Teacher Education continues to be a high priority for the university & demographic trends indicate strong demand for teacher preparation & post-credential courses & programs. Thus, we expect to show an increase in evening enrollments despite this short-term drop. Consistent with national trends the most frequently cancelled courses due to low enrollment are courses offered on Fridays, in early morning, & in late evening. We have seen an increase both in proportion & number of students who are entering as Freshmen & such "traditional" undergraduate students are less likely to select courses at non-traditional times. On the other hand, an increasing percentage of our students are living in the residence halls which might make them more amenable to evening & week-end courses. With establishment of an Office of Distributed Learning, substantial federal funding for development of the infrastructure to support distance

learning, & completion of telecommunication projects, the campus experienced steady growth in off-campus & media-assisted instruction.

8.2 Enrollment at approved Off-campus Centers- Originally the Palm Desert Campus had a large percentage of its enrollment in liberal studies & teacher credential programs. Recently the number of students in other undergraduate programs has been growing but not sufficiently to offset the drop in liberal studies & teacher credential programs. The rate of growth will increase with the establishment of new programs. In 04-05 the first class for R.N. to B.S.N. students was accepted, & in 06-07 a new four-year nursing program offered in cooperation with the local community college will be implemented. With three buildings on a permanent site, the campus is now able to host community events & increase its visibility in the community. Over 5,000 people visited the campus for lectures & performances in the Indian Wells Theater in 05-06. The campus has also developed joint marketing programs with the local community college & dual admission programs with three area community colleges.

9. Advancement- Total scholarships from external contributors increased by 48% since the 2003-2004 AY. This year 725 scholarships were awarded and 473 awarded in the 2004-2005 AY. As a result, there was a 40% increase in external scholarship dollars awarded over the last two years totaling \$1,085,346 in 2005-2006 as compared to \$672,297 last year. Internal scholarships grew by 26 since the 2003-2004 AY representing an increase of 7.3%. Total dollars awarded was \$709,486 and \$762,851 respectively for the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years representing an increase of 27.9% since the 2003-2004 AY. During FY met its mandate to raise 10 percent of its operating budget. CSUSB raised over \$15m by the end of May, a 74% increase over Fiscal Year 2005 & a 588% increase over Fiscal Year 2004. The Annual Fund raised over \$200,000 for the first time, including over \$58,000 from the first annual faculty-staff campaign. With automation through funding from the CSU, the Annual Fund increased performance for the first two college phonathons: For the College of Arts & Letters, the amount pledged by donor increased by 119%, the # pledges by 77%, the # requests for information by 60%, completed calls by 134% for a total increase in calls of 34%. For the College of Business & Public Administration, the amount pledged by donor increased by 29%, the # pledges by 7%, the # requests for information by 66%, completed calls by 86% for a total increase in calls of 30%. The College of Education started the first capital campaign on campus with a \$4 million campaign for its building & raised over \$1.7m to date, including \$80,000 in contributions from faculty & staff of the college. To celebrate the 40th anniversary of the campus, year-long celebrations were held including the first black-tie gala which raised just under \$200,000 for endowed funds scholarships & for faculty support. The university received an irrevocable trust with a value of \$2.2m & efforts to secure planned gifts were increased with a change of oversight of the retired faculty association, the reactivation of a lapsed Legacy Society & the appointment of a long-standing alumna to assistant to the VP of Advancement for Planned Gifts. Scholarship awards increased with 356 scholarships awarded on-campus in FY '06 against 346 in '05--a 2% increase & 725 scholarships awarded off campus in FY '06 against 473 in '05--a 53% increase. The total amounts awarded increased by 3% for on-campus recipients & by 53% for off-campus recipients. CSUSB changed the parameters for counting lapsed members, so the data on alumni memberships remained constant at 3,087 because of this definitional change.

Contact: Jenny Zorn, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Professor, Geography Department
E-mail: jzorn@csusb.edu

Accountability Response for Performance Areas 1.1 and 1.2

San Diego State University has made a successful transition to a culture of assessment by institutionalizing a focus on student learning outcomes. This intentional attentiveness to outcomes is a chief part of the way that we address issues of student learning, assessment, and the quality of our academic programs. All departments and programs in the University now submit annual reports that detail specific learning outcomes, how these outcomes were measured, and how the results are used for program improvement. These reports are reviewed and evaluated by members of a committee of the University Senate, the Student Learning Outcomes Committee. Extensive feedback letters are written for each department or program, describing the strengths of their assessment program and providing strategies for improvement. This process has been viewed favorably—a change in perception that is integral to a change of culture—and it is evident that departments are becoming more knowledgeable about student learning outcomes and increasingly incorporating a number of direct measures to assess student learning. Most importantly, departments and programs are refining their ability to use the annual results for program improvement. We strive not to simply engage in assessment, but assess for the purpose of improvement.

Our attention to student learning assessment has been furthered by requiring that student learning outcomes be noted on all syllabi routed through the curriculum committee, as well as for all courses considered for inclusion in the general education program. The curriculum guide, which all faculty rely on to develop syllabi, course proposals and program proposals, has been revised and rewritten to insure that learning outcomes are well understood and widely used. Additionally, the Center for Teaching and Learning aligns its activities and programs with our institutional focus on student learning, articulation of learning outcomes, and assessment of learning outcomes (for improvement). This alignment enables us to include new faculty in discussions about student learning from the outset, assisting them to embrace our culture of learning. And it should be noted that the culture of learning even extends beyond the bounds of Academic Affairs. Student Affairs, for example, has developed its own set of learning outcomes consistent with its program goals and objectives.

The focus on assessment and student learning was a major emphasis as San Diego State University underwent its recent WASC review. One of the lessons we learned while undergoing review was that, initially, many faculty members were simply unclear about useful means through which to gauge student learning, rather than resistant to the very idea of assessment. It was by working to align the activities of the Student Learning Outcomes committee, Curriculum committees, the Center for Teaching and Learning, the WASC review team, Student Affairs initiatives, and other efforts across the campus that we prompted and guided a cultural shift. Curriculum committees, policy committees, and departments now accept, as a matter of course, the responsibility for focusing on student learning outcomes and evidence-based strategies for improvement.

Clearly, it is not possible in a summary report to recount all of the assessment practices that have been developed, however we would like to point out the following. The most common *indirect* measures employed by departments and programs are surveys of students, alumni, and employers. Some programs have also used focus groups designed to ascertain students' perceptions about strengths and weaknesses in their learning. On the other hand, *direct* measures of student learning include an examination of student work, generally in a capstone course or experience or through use of a portfolio. Taken together (and most San Diego State departments employ both direct and indirect measures), these measures have already resulted in the following institutional changes:

- A number of departments have developed curricular matrices to ensure that students are receiving multiple opportunities to achieve the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected of graduates. This exercise has resulted in faculty conversations about course articulation and alignment and modifications to the curriculum.
- Several departments have undertaken syllabi reviews of General Education courses that are offered in multiple sections. This has resulted in alignment in course content and learning objectives to provide a more consistent experience for the students.
- The College of Engineering primarily uses information from surveys of students, alumni, and industry advisory boards. Analyses of these measures has resulted in increased emphasis in

oral and written communication skills, increased emphasis on computer applications skills, additional hands-on design experiences, and physical improvements to laboratories.

- Internships are a common capstone experience in a number of departments. Analysis of student work during these experiences has led to modifications in the internship itself, as well as curricular modifications to better prepare students for the capstone experience. The most common skills cited as meriting additional attention are oral and written communication skills, critical thinking, and problem solving.
- Some departments, such as the Liberal Studies program, require a student portfolio. At the conclusion of each portfolio review process, faculty meet to discuss student work and the level at which students are performing. In turn, these conversations and discussions inform future decisions regarding student coursework, student assignments, and refinement of standards to which students are held in particular classes.
- Some departments and programs, such as the School of Accountancy, map *all* of the learning outcomes in their department to *every* one of the courses that they offer—a complex and extensive undertaking. The process, however, affords them a comprehensive vantage from which to consider what students should learn as a result of the program, and at what particular steps along the curricular path. In addition, it allows faculty members to determine where in the curriculum a particular learning outcome is mapped, regardless of competency that is being tracked (e.g., writing, quantitative reasoning, oral articulation, etc.). In the long term, it is this ability to map competencies and content domains across the curriculum that allows the department to know where improvements should be focused when examining the evidence of student learning outcomes.

Although no one approach describes all departments, overall there have been significant changes to curricular content, to course design (and re-design), and to course sequencing have already resulted from examining indirect and direct measures of student learning. In addition, faculty engagement in these discussions has led to an increased understanding of the critical connectedness between articulating student learning outcomes, aligning curriculum, and choosing among pedagogical strategies. Because that cultural shift is centered on assessment for improvement, we understand that achievement not as having achieved perfection, but rather as an intentional and systemic commitment to excellence.

Table 1. Best Practices: Student Learning Goals and Objectives

Best Practices Department Learning Goals and Objectives

College of Arts and Letters

Africana Studies

Goal 1 Demonstrate a thorough knowledge of African culture and worldview.

Objective 1.1 Explain the major principles and values of Africana worldview and culture.

Objective 1.2 Explain the major moral, philosophical and ethical elements of Africana worldview and culture.

Objective 1.3 Explain the role of Africana worldview in contemporary society.

Classics and Humanities

Goal 1 Develop critical faculties to describe literary and artistic form and content, to interpret meaning, and to gauge effect.

Objective 1.1 Apply sound rhetorical principles to argumentation and discussion.

Objective 1.2 Distinguish between literal and figurative expression and between sound logic and fallacy.

Economics

Goal 1 Develop the ability to explain core economic terms, concepts and theories.

Objective 1.1 Explain supply, demand, and the function of markets and prices as allocative mechanisms.

Objective 1.2 Apply the concept of equilibrium at the macro and micro economic levels.

Objective 1.3 Identify key macroeconomic indicators and measures of economic changes and growth.

Objective 1.4 Identify and discuss the key concepts underlying international trade and international financial flows.

Objective 1.5 Assess the role of both domestic and international institutions and laws in shaping different economic outcomes, especially in the context of market-based economies.

European Studies

Goal 1 Illustrate knowledge of the cultural history of Europe.

Objective 1.1 Compare the origins of a specific cultural manifestation in two or more European countries.

Objective 1.2 Differentiate among the diverse cultures that form modern Europe.

Objective 1.3 Interpret differing perspectives on European unity.

Linguistics & Oriental Languages

Goal 1 Demonstrate the ability to think critically, reason logically, and comprehend scholarly writing on a linguistic topic.

Objective 1.1 Produce academic papers synthesizing notions from topics in linguistics.

Objective 1.2 Articulate similarities and differences across different theoretical positions in linguistics.

Rhetoric & Writing Studies [MA]

Goal 1 Create new knowledge by synthesizing, analyzing, and evaluating rhetorical scholarship and cultural artifacts.

Objective 1.1 Develop and discuss original scholarship by applying the conceptual apparatus characteristic of the discipline.

Objective 1.2 Identify valid disciplinary concerns, issues, or problems in order to formulate an appropriate research project.

Women's Studies

Goal 1 Understand the intersectionality of different dimensions of social organization (gender, race, class, culture, etc) as concepts and as lived experience.

Objective 1.1 Articulate a way of looking at the world from the standpoint of diverse women nationally and internationally.

Objective 1.2 Discuss the way that gender is shaped by race, class, and culture.

Objective 1.3 Identify ways that people negotiate and represent multiple identities.

College of Business Administration

School of Accountancy

Goal 1 Demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of accounting regulation, including application of income taxation and assurance standards.

Objective 1.1 Analyze, research, implement, and report on federal income tax provisions in the context of planning and compliance decisions.

Objective 1.2 Analyze, research, implement, and report assurance (attestation and audit) standards in audit planning, audit program design and

implementation, and accountants' reporting for the major types of engagements.

Financial Services [BS]

Goal 1 Understand consumer financial needs and the mechanism available for fulfilling their needs.

Objective 1.1 Describe the various financial products, services and strategies offered by a variety of financial services institutions.

Objective 1.2 Evaluate financial products and strategies offered by a variety of financial services institutions for suitability and appropriateness in meeting consumer needs.

Objective 1.3 Prepare a plan for efficient wealth creation and management including planning for cash and debt management, investing, insurance, retirement, education needs, incapacity, and efficient wealth transfer.

Goal 2 Understand the role of technology and the legal, ethical and economic environment as it relates to financial services.

Objective 2.1 Analyze the impact of tax and pension law on various financial decisions including accumulation and transfer of wealth.

Objective 2.2 Identify conflicts of interest between market participants and between principal and agent.

Objective 2.3 Evaluate the economic environment and the impact of governmental economic policies on consumers and financial services firms.

Objective 2.4 Describe the impact that financial innovation, advances in technology, and changes in regulations has had on the structure of the financial services industry.

Masters of Business Administration

Goal 1 Develop a solid foundation in theoretical concepts and managerial skills needed to lead business organizations.

Objective 1.1 Apply concepts and decision models in organizational behavior, finance, economics, marketing, and production to make business decisions.

Objective 1.2 Employ methods of financial and cost accounting and statistical data analysis to support business decision-making.

Goal 2 Develop an awareness of the domestic and global economic, legal, ethical, and technological environment in which managers make and implement decisions.

Objective 2.1 Identify and critically analyze salient legal and moral business issues.

Objective 2.2 Evaluate the impact that changes in the domestic and global economic environment have on the business climate.

Objective 2.3 Analyze the impact that technological and product innovations have on the competitiveness of firms.

Operations Management [MS]

Goal 1 Demonstrate a fundamental knowledge of operations management that leads to competency in managing the operations management activities of manufacturing, service, and other industries.

Objective 1.1 Discuss elements of building and using analytic models to investigate the behavior of complex business systems, with an emphasis on various operational and business decisions.

Objective 1.2 Analyze quality system problems within organizations, including manufacturing, small business, service, health care, not-for-profit, and educational settings using various quality concepts and techniques.

Objective 1.3 Execute a project or program in project management, specifically in the application of modern techniques and systems, that achieves predetermined outcomes in scope, quality, time, and cost.

Objective 1.4 Explore ways to improve an organization's product structure, master scheduling, and materials requirement planning.

College of Education

Postsecondary Education Leadership Program

Goal 1 Describe and evaluate the major theories of adult learning and select a theory(ies) upon which to build practice in a postsecondary environment.

Objective 1.1 Recognize the major adult developmental stages affecting learning.

Objective 1.2 Design a lesson, unit, or program taking into account adult developmental tasks associated with one or more stages.

Objective 1.3 Construct a philosophy about adult learning and teaching adults utilizing adult learning theories.

College of Health & Human Resources

Speech, Language & Hearing Sciences [Graduate Program]

Goal 1 Assess and appropriately interpret an individual's abilities and/or performance.

Objective 1.1 Apply diagnostic and psychometric information in the assessment of individuals.

Objective 1.2 Use appropriate procedures to evaluate the speech, language, hearing and other areas, which impact the communication of individuals.

Objective 1.3 Accurately interpret the results of assessment data and develop appropriate conclusions and recommendations.

Goal 2 Plan, implement, and modify educational or clinical interventions across a wide range of ages, disorders, needs, and settings.

Objective 2.1 Apply academic information to clinical experience.

Objective 2.2 Develop appropriate treatment plans based on assessment results.

Objective 2.3 Provide effective clinical or educational services to meet the communication needs of individuals.

Objective 2.4 Critically evaluate philosophies underlying current intervention and treatment methods.

Objective 2.5 Appropriately measure the progress of clients and/or students.

College of Professional Studies and Fine Arts

Child and Family Development

Goal 1 Understand family dynamics and interaction across the life span.

Objective 1.1 Discuss theories of family dynamics throughout the life span.

Objective 1.2 Explain the dynamics of prevention and treatment in families.

Objective 1.3 Apply family theories to contemporary and ethnically diverse families.

Master of Criminal Justice and Criminology

Goal 1 Define researchable criminal justice policy questions and identify and apply appropriate qualitative and/or quantitative social science methods to answer them.

Objective 1.1 Conceptualize research questions, operationalize research questions, develop measurements and become familiar with common strategies in research instrumentation.

Objective 1.2 Demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of at least one social science research methodology and be able to apply it to answering a research question.

Goal 2 Demonstrate a thorough knowledge of the major theories underpinning criminal justice and criminology, including the ability to compare and contrast their conceptual and empirical adequacy, and to utilize at least one of them as a useful framework for analyzing relevant policy issues.

Objective 2.1 Name, compare, and analyze at least two categories of theories underpinning criminal justice and criminology policy.

Objective 2.2 Apply a theory to a policy issue and describe how the issue can be understood more fully through the lens of the theory.

Recreation, Parks, & Tourism

Goal 1 Create and implement effective services and experiences to various market segments through public and private agencies, organizations and businesses.

Objective 1.1 Describe the process for implementing a new program in a hotel, restaurant, tourism or attraction.

Objective 1.2 Compare and contrast the factors that determine the success and/or failure of a specific experience in a hospitality or tourism setting.

College of Sciences

Biology Department

Goal 1 Explain the interactions of organisms with their environments and with each other.

Objective 1.1 Describe ecosystems as existing of populations of organisms plus physical characteristics, nutrient cycles, energy flow and controls.

Objective 1.2 Explain how populations of the same and different species interact dynamically in communities.

Objective 1.3 Propose one or more hypotheses that plausibly suggest how species can play similar roles and co-exist in a community.

Goal 2 Explain the process of natural selection and how it contributes to the formation of species and biodiversity.

Objective 2.1 Compare the modes of sorting for biological variation, including natural selection, random drift and sexual selection.

Objective 2.2 Explain how genes, chromosomes and alleles are related to one another, and compare their roles in the transmission of genetic information.

Objective 2.3 Propose one or more hypotheses that plausibly suggest mechanisms for changing gene frequencies within and among populations.

Goal 3 Explain the mechanisms by which biomolecules assemble and function to form uni- and multicellular organisms.

Objective 3.1 Describe the structural characteristics and mechanisms of assembly of the main categories of biomolecules (nucleic acids, proteins and lipids), and how each group of biomolecules contributes to cellular structure and function.

Objective 3.2 Explain prokaryotic and eukaryotic cellular structures, and their functions, and discuss the ways in which prokaryotic cells exist in their environments, and the ways in which eukaryotic cells contribute to tissue and organ structure and function.

Objective 3.3 Discuss cellular energetics by describing the processes of glycolysis, oxidative phosphorylation, photosynthesis, the flow of carbon amongst these processes, and how the chemical energy resulting from the process is used to support life at the cellular level.

Geological Sciences

Goal 1 Understand field-based geological and geophysical investigations, emphasizing earth structure and dynamics.

Objective 1.1 Integrate diverse physical and structural data to reconstruct Earth history and understand Earth's physical dynamics.

Objective 1.2 Apply appropriate physical and mechanical principles to quantify and predict the actions of Earth processes and resulting physical structures.

Goal 2 Understand the nature and collection of evidence in Earth Sciences.

Objective 2.1 Construct accurate and interpretive geologic or geophysical maps in the field from data gathered during field-based investigations.

Objective 2.2 Communicate the results of any type of Earth Science investigations via complete, concise, and coherent written and oral reports.

Psychology

Goal 1 Understand the developmental, cognitive, social, and biological bases of normal and abnormal/maladaptive behavior.

Objective 1.1 Explain the roles of persons and situations as causes of behavior.

Objective 1.2 Explain the nature-nurture controversy, and cite supportive findings from different areas of psychology for each side.

Goal 2 Understand the process of psychological inquiry, including the formulation of hypotheses and the methods and designs used to test hypotheses.

Objective 2.1 Formulate scientific questions using operational definitions.

Objective 2.2 Demonstrate familiarity with the concepts and techniques of testing hypotheses.

Division of Undergraduate Studies

Liberal Studies

Goal 1 Develop an understanding of how practitioners in the five major subject areas--the visual and performing arts, literature, science, history, and mathematics—produce new ideas and confirm new knowledge.

Objective 1.1 Clearly and succinctly explain what types of issues or topics practitioners in the different areas explore and what types of products they produce.

Objective 1.2 Explain with supporting examples what processes practitioners in the different subject areas use to create their products, including how they get their ideas, whether or not they make observations, how they use evidence, if at all, and how they create their final products, theories, theorems, or interpretations.

Objective 1.3 Describe how the intrinsic quality of the “product” is determined.

Goal 2 Develop a more robust knowledge of the concepts taught in specific lower division courses, specifically the introduction to art or theatre and the earth science and biology courses.

Objective 2.1 Compare and contrast two artists, musicians, playwrights, or philosophers from different time periods.

Objective 2.2 Describe major scientific ideas in earth and life science as well as the evidence that supports these ideas and be able to apply these ideas to individual life or human society

Contact: Ethan Singer, Assoc. Vice President, Academic Affairs
E-mail: singer@mail.sdsu.edu

During the years of the Cornerstone Implementation Plan, San Francisco State University has realized notable change in a number of the accountability measures associated with Cornerstone Principles.

Assessment - In the area of assessment at the program level, all of the University's 81 degree programs have developed assessment plans and student learning outcomes. Moreover, thirty-one programs have some form of direct measure for student learning. An analysis of the assessment across program review and accreditation reports indicates satisfactory results on student learning outcomes within majors. The deficiencies that are noted usually occur in the area of skills such as writing and oral communication. It appears that we need more emphasis on writing, spoken communication, and quantitative reasoning in the major. SFSU has responded to this conclusion in several specific ways.

The first response is in the area of writing. An assessment of outcomes in remedial writing courses and a subsequent pilot project indicated that the inclusion of reading development in composition courses substantially facilitates writing improvement. As a consequence, the University is incorporating a reading component in all basic writing courses.

The second response is in the area of science and math. An NIH funded study of the inclusion of supplemental instruction for science and math courses with high failure rates demonstrated that those who participated in supplemental instruction had higher course performance and higher rates of taking subsequent courses in the discipline. The study also revealed that performance levels for under-represented minority students in supplemental instruction often surpassed that of non-supplemental instruction takers.

In general, departments and faculty have gradually embraced the value and need for student learning outcomes assessment. Although our efforts are circumscribed by the resources available for development in this area, we are finally beginning to see an impact of assessment on student learning.

Providing for student needs – Since 1999, SFSU has seen a substantial increase in the use of facilities and scheduling innovation in order to meet the diverse needs of students and to maximize the University's resources. The utilization of facilities on weekends, after 4 p.m. and in the summers has increased from 37% to 45% for on-campus programs. Moreover, at the off-campus site, utilization of facilities during non-traditional periods has changed from 100% to 66%, reflecting the fact that the MBA program and the Cinema program now use these facilities during the day-time as well.

Active Learning – Faculty and staff interaction with students has increased due to the development of road maps, a graduation planner, and improved student advising.

In the area of interactive technology, a project to inventory and encourage the use of electronic portfolios is currently underway. Fifteen academic departments now use electronic portfolios, impacting 5,000 students. This number is expected to dramatically increase as the project moves forward.

In the area of community and service learning experiences, the SFSU Institute of Civic and Community Engagement has served as the central campus entity for promoting and organizing this area of the academic program. Each year, more than seven thousand students enroll in 264 Community Service Learning courses, providing over 199 hours of service to the Bay Area. This campus, along with other CSU service learning organizations, participated in a student and faculty assessment in 2003. This assessment was comprehensive and thorough, and certainly deserves a place in the final Cornerstones analysis. From the SFSU point of view, the assessment demonstrates that students feel that SL courses provide more favorable learning conditions than do traditional courses, that SL courses provide significant opportunities for students to connect with potential employers, that community organizations feel that these experiences are valuable to the community, and that campus support structures for these courses is very good.

Reinvesting in faculty – Like campuses across the CSU system, SFSU has staged a major hiring effort in the past five years as senior faculty FERP and retire. Along with the hiring effort, we have

developed and lengthened the new faculty orientation; we have revised our RTP process, and we have supported new faculty with course releases in order for them to develop and initiate research agenda.

Undergraduate Education – SFSU has formed a task force that is currently evaluating the graduation requirements that are a part of the General Education program. We expect the report from this task force to result in a reconsideration and major revision of the GE program with an eye toward updating the program for the skills and knowledge needed for students to succeed in the 21st century. In addition, we have a fully functioning EAP program and on-going articulation efforts with area community colleges. We believe that these latter two efforts account for the improvement in first year continuation rates from 77% in 1999 to 80% in 2006 for first time freshmen and from 80% in 1999 to 84% in 2006 for transfer students.

Graduate Education – At the end of the last academic year, the program review policy and guidelines were revised and approved for the 6th cycle of program review. This cycle will focus on assessing the quality of graduate programs. (All departments, however, will still be required to submit annual assessment reports.) New elements in the guidelines require an analysis of grade distribution, an analysis of direct and indirect assessment measures, a description of curricular or pedagogical change based on program assessment, and a capacity analysis of the appropriate balance between graduate and undergraduate programs. A worksheet that includes these guidelines has been developed for external consultants.

In addition to this assessment effort, SFSU is expanding its commitment to graduate education with the addition of a joint doctoral program in audiology and an independent graduate program in Educational Leadership. Both programs are based upon a state-supported/fee-supported model, which will allow for the development of rigorous well-supported programs without draining resources from undergraduate education.

Indicator 1.2 Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

See above

Indicator 2. Access to the CSU

Except in the impacted undergraduate programs in Nursing, Social Work, Apparel Design and Merchandising, and Interior Design, SFSU presently admits all eligible first-time freshmen and upper-division CCC transfers who apply during the open enrollment period.

Indicator 3.1 – First –Year Continuation Rates

Increased continuation rates may be attributable to a number of initiatives put in place in response to the Chancellor's Office focus on success to graduation. These initiatives include departmental road maps, graduation planners and improved advising.

Indicator 3.2 – Average Total Units Taken as Upper-Division Students

This indicator is slightly improved from the 2004-2005 cycle probably as a result of roadmaps. The University, however, expects this figure to stabilize now around the current levels due to the fact that some students will always have slightly more than 60 units because of professionally accredited high unit majors.

Indicator 4.1 and 4.2 – Persistence and Graduation

This indicator has gradually increased over the past four years. As noted in 3.1 above, a number of initiatives have been put in place to increase continuation and graduation. Our analysis also indicates that fluctuations in this variable coincide with budget crises.

Indicator 6.1 a and b. Regularly-Admitted Freshmen Fully Prepared in Mathematics and in English

Improvements on this indicator are likely a result of the EAP program and better prepared students.

Indicator 7.1 – First-Time Freshmen Remediated within One Year

The use of the first summer to remediate students, the experimental writing/reading program for remedial writing courses, and allowing students a leave of absence to remediate at community colleges appear to have had an impact on this indicator.

Indicator 8 – Facilities Utilization – SFSU continues its efforts to offer non-traditional classes. One major change that will take effect starting January 2007 is that the graduate programs in the College of Business will move from the main campus to a CPEC-approved center. Because of the large number of graduate business classes offered after 4pm and because the number of FTES currently generated at the CPEC-approved center is relatively small, this category of non-traditional utilization will increase significantly at the CPEC-approved center starting in January 2007. There is likely to be a corresponding decrease in facilities utilization after 4 pm on the main campus, but this change will be small relative to the number of FTES generated on the main campus.

Indicator 9 – University Advancement

The campus has made a major investment in expanding its development staff, adding a position in each of its eight colleges, as well as four central major gifts officers and a new fundraiser for corporate relations. The Alumni Association is currently dormant and future memberships are projected to be based on a lifetime membership model. Given the number of individuals in the database with no degree information, we will focus this and future reports on alumni with degrees, so addressable alumni numbers will decrease (the recent opt-out mailing also reduced this population) and participation percentages are expected to increase.

Contact: Linda Buckley, Associate Vice President,
Academic Planning and Educational Effectiveness
E-mail: lbuckley@sfsu.edu

1. Quality of Undergraduate Programs

Quality Assurance in General Education. San José State has received national praise for the quality of our General Education Program, including its embedded assessment process. The basic framework for our current GE program was implemented in 1998. All courses in the program had at least one full cycle of assessment data by 2004. These data were used in a revision process that included a questionnaire to all chairs, three open forums, and an Educated Person dialogue. In response to what was learned the GE requirements at SJSU were revised in 2005 with the most significant changes involving a revision of the overall learning goals for the program that define the target level of attainment for students at the time they graduate. These changes were supported by changes in the goals and student learning outcomes for each specific area within the GE program, including increased coverage of information literacy, increased requirements for practice and feedback in writing, and a more explicit definition of diversity. Assessment plans are in place for all GE courses that include course embedded assessment of GE learning objectives. Several approaches have been or are being developed to assess the overall success of the overall goals of the GE program which are cumulative across the specific areas within the program. The first is to "role up" the assessment information from the course embedded assessment to provide an overall assessment across the program. The second is to use the ETS Information Literacy test to assess skills that are developed from courses in many different areas in the program. The third, that is currently under development, is to design new prompts for the writing sample component of the WST to assess the degree to which our core GE program has succeeded for our native freshmen, and the degree to which the community colleges have succeeded for the transfer students who come to SJSU having completed the core program. Finally, a more integrated SJSU studies program (upper division GE) is under development that will allow overall assessment, using course embedded assessment, of the overall program goals.

Quality Assurance in Majors. Since Fall 2005, SJSU has made significant progress in the development of a sustainable infrastructure for assessment of all degree programs on campus. The key piece in the puzzle was the appointment of two Assessment Facilitators for each College, one faculty (with 20% release supported by the university) and one administrator (generally an associate dean). These individuals have been working successfully with chairs/program directors to move programs forward with respect to assessment. These measures have produced a set of learning outcomes for every undergraduate and graduate program on campus, and these are available on a University web site. All programs have assessed at least some of their student learning outcomes, and some have assessed all learning outcomes. Assessment results are reported in a standardized reporting system that allows chairs, deans and other administrators to quickly review assessment activity, recommendations for improvement, and progress in implementing recommendations. In a process that links assessment of GE with assessment of the degree programs, a matrix has been developed that maps the overlap between goals and student learning outcomes in GE with the goals and student learning outcomes of the degree programs to support our overall assessment of educational effectiveness. Spring 2006 assessment reports provided several examples of how assessment data are being used to improve student learning, and a couple of illustrative case studies follow. The Economics department conducted a pretest/posttest administration of the Test of Understanding College Economics (TUCE) to approximately 1000 students in Econ 1A and 1B. Preliminary analysis of results revealed uneven student performance amongst the multiple sections of the courses. This has led to a reevaluation of core competencies and textbooks required for the classes to ensure more consistent delivery and learning of course content. In addition, assessment of the effectiveness of online experimental economics labs that were implemented in Fall 2003, revealed that these are an effective strategy for motivating students and engaging students in the material. Based on the data, the department plans to increase the use of the online interactive experimental economics games. In an assessment of recent graduates, The College of Education found that there students were very well satisfied with the preparation their education had provided, but if an area should receive more attention it is Technology training. Anthropology used portfolio assessment with their graduating seniors and discovered that students were weak on the learning objective of knowledge of the connections and influences of other disciplines on anthropology. The Department is modifying assignments in current courses to address this weakness. The department of Linguistics and Language Development is modifying curriculum because assessment results indicated that its curriculum that insured the development of writing competencies underestimated the competencies of some of their students and placed them in courses they did not need.

The overall quality of Academic Degree Programs is monitored by a Program Planning (program review) process that was also revised in 1998. Like the General Education Policy, the Program Planning Policy places heavy emphasis on defining learning goals, devising an assessment

plan, assessing student learning, and modifying courses and program requirements based on assessment data. Forty-nine degree programs completed the Program Planning cycle in the 2005-2006 year in which the new assessment process has been in place. There is clear evidence of improved use of assessment data, and the guidelines are currently being revised in a way that will continue this trend.

2. Access to SJSU

SJSU has only one impacted program, Nursing. Because of the societal need and student demand and because of the high cost of expanding the nursing program, we have developed a self-support program in nursing which will parallel the state support program, and we have obtained several million dollars in support to defray part of the cost (most importantly from the Moore Foundation). Although no other programs are impacted, there are some that are near capacity with bottleneck courses that slow progress to degree. These issues are being monitored and addressed where possible.

3. Progression to the degree

The SJSU strategic planning process has identified the initial experiences of students in their first semester as one crucial factor in promoting persistence and has allocated additional resources to enhance the FYE programs for first-time freshmen and analogous programs for transfers. First-year continuation rates for freshmen in 04-05 was 80.6% which exceeded our goal of 79%. With more students participating in a variety of first-year programs and with a commitment of additional resources to these programs and a move toward mandatory FYE, we hope to see continued improvement. The continuation rate for transfers was 83.8% which exceeded our goal of 81.5%. We are piloting a FYE-like program for transfers this year. The current plan is to have mandatory department or college specific programs for all transfers by 2010 to continue this course of improvement.

In the last several years the number of upper division units taken prior to graduation has shown little improvement for both freshmen and CCC transfers. Despite the reduction to 120 unit majors for many programs, the high-demand majors in professional programs such as Engineering and Business, that require more than 120 because of accreditation requirements, have weakened the effect of this change. In addition, our relatively large and still growing number of international students who must enroll in 12 units to maintain their student visas even if the courses do not advance them toward graduation, also inflates the number of units. The campus is currently engaged in implementing a number of improvements to the advising process to try to reduce the number of units to graduation, and, again, this is a priority that has been identified by SJSU's strategic planning process and additional resources have been allocated.

Persistence and Graduation

Persistence to graduation rates exceeded our goals substantially for first-time freshmen (55.2%) and slightly undershot our goals for CCC transfers (69.9%). Campus analyses indicate a gradual improvement in 6-year graduation rates. The same activities that are intended to improve continuation rates (FYE, improved advising system) are expected to improve graduation rates.

6. Relations with K – 12

In the last year the proportion of first-time freshmen who were fully prepared in mathematics has decreased slightly to 60.6%, while those prepared in English increased slightly to 44.4%. However, our longer term trend is improvement in mathematics preparedness and decreases in English. Both trends are partly explained by the high proportion of students who self-identify as speaking a language other than English (more than 50%) as their first language and by the increased emphasis on mathematics instruction in the K-12 system. We are hopeful that the EAP program will ultimately lead to improvement in both numbers.

7. Remediation

The reported remediation rate of 79% is at the low end of the range for SJSU for the last six years, but there does not appear to be any trend. Most of the first year attrition is among students who fail to remediate. In this instance also we expect that the programs that have been instituted to increase persistence and graduation rate should also lead to some modest increase in remediation rate.

8. Facilities Utilization

In order to better serve working adults in Silicon Valley, SJSU has moved toward a higher proportion of evening classes, and increased the number of on line and hybrid classes. Our attempt to increase the number of weekend classes has been less successful because of low student enrollment. All these changes allow serving more students despite space limitations. The campus has converted most weekday classes to twice a week, either Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday with Fridays consisting mainly of once per week classes and lab sections, which explains the decline in utilization on Fridays.

9. University Advancement

SJSU has seen a modest growth in Alumni Association membership in the last three years, although it is still small proportion of alumni. The University has increased its investment in the Advancement division, and has plotted an ambitious set of goals despite past limited success. A recent donation of \$10,000,000 is an important early success of this effort. The University has hired a new Vice President of Advancement, and he has been very active in improving the operation of the division. In addition, grant activity continues to be an important source of additional campus resources with annual amounts continuing to be in the vicinity of \$50,000,000.

Contact: Robert Cooper, AVP, Undergraduate Studies
E-mail: rocooper@email.sjsu.edu

During the past two years Cal Poly SLO has made steady progress in implementing the assessment of student learning outcomes throughout the campus and applying assessment results to achieve program improvement.

The Cal Poly Assessment Resource Team (CPART), led by former Faculty Associate Linda Bomstad, was called upon by a number of academic units to assist them in their assessment efforts. Further assistance was provided on a re-vamped assessment website which includes a step-by-step learning outcomes assessment guide, with examples and links as well as an assessment glossary to define the terms that strike many as jargon. Marilee Bresciani, a noted expert in assessment from Texas A&M University (since hired by San Diego State University), led workshops attended by faculty and staff from both Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.

All academic units were called upon to report annually on their assessment planning, in a form that relates to the educational effectiveness indicators used by WASC in its accreditation process. Units undergoing program review were asked to demonstrate, as appropriate, not only that they had defined learning objectives at the programmatic level but also how the application of assessment results had already led to significant improvements.

The following extract from the combined report by the external and internal reviewers of the Philosophy bachelor's program exemplifies the kind of finding that we have now come to expect in reviews of all academic programs:

... the department takes seriously the task of monitoring its teaching effectiveness. It has a clearly worded mission statement and has identified its six primary educational objectives. It has a plan of action for determining whether these objectives are being met. It has evaluated a sample of senior projects using a scoring rubric based on the desired learning outcomes, and surveyed alumni as to their satisfaction with the program and perceptions of benefits. The department is considering also using portfolio assessment and standardized testing of graduating seniors as to philosophical knowledge and proficiency.

Assessment results in Philosophy led directly to significant curricular changes and were the basis for defining the area of expertise of the department's latest faculty hire.

As another example, the Department of Natural Resources Management has reported on the following actions taken in response to assessment results:

1. Developed an Academic Honesty Policy to address increasing instances of plagiarism and declining classroom civility.
2. Developed a standardized lab exercise reporting format in order to reinforce expectations of professional/technical written communications.
3. Developed a new advising policy to identify and assist students who are not making sufficient progress toward graduation.
4. Revised the Senior Project Manual to aid students in writing their senior project reports.

The Statistics Department provides a third example of how assessment has been implemented at Cal Poly:

For the past several years, we have been formalizing an assessment process in our department. This includes gathering data about freshmen and graduating seniors that is directly tied to our departmental goals (which we have also revisited and revised in recent years). One very successful approach has been to administer both an out-going senior survey as well as a formal assessment of statistical knowledge during senior seminar. We are currently incorporating the latter efforts as part of the capstone course (Stat 465), which is now required of every major. ... This on-going data collection plan will also allow us to monitor changes in the knowledge and communication skills of our majors over time. It has already pointed to some aspects of the curriculum that we will seek to address. The department is

continuing to seek new ways of assessing via written and oral work the extent to which students have mastered key statistical concepts and methods.

Curricular changes already made by Statistics include the replacement of a one-unit orientation course by a more substantial four-unit "Introduction to Statistical Investigations;" and the introduction of a new four-unit course on "Statistical Communication and Consulting."

Improvements resulting from outcomes-based assessment throughout the University are thought to have contributed to greater student success, as reflected in indicators of "progression to degree" and "persistence and graduation." Cal Poly's multi-faceted Student Success Initiative, which has now completed four years, is also thought to have been a significant factor.

Contact: David Conn, Vice President for Academic Programs and
Undergraduate Education
E-mail: dconn@calpoly.edu

California State University San Marcos, one of the youngest and fastest growing campuses in the CSU system, symbolizes the intent and commitment prescribed in Cornerstones. Its creation in the years approaching the 21st century enabled the CSU to ensure future access to higher education and educational results and, through smart growth and development, to maintain financial stability and accountability. As the campus nears the close of its second decade, it can celebrate its accomplishments of accommodating rapid enrollment growth, building high quality education programs and becoming a recognized resource and partner in the community it serves. But with the success of growth and the continued increase in first-time freshman, CSUSM must also address the challenges of retention, persistence and graduation and continue to create a vibrant and engaging campus life. It must also be prepared to respond to changing socioeconomic environments, leverage new opportunities and adapt to the digital age learner.

1.1 Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

All programs at CSUSM have identified core student learning outcomes. The campus is currently in the process of developing specific "student learning outcomes" for each course, to be completed by spring 2007. The campus has identified "Assessment of Learning Outcomes" as a theme for its upcoming WASC accreditation and, this fall, will begin administration of the Collegiate Learning Assessment as one method for assessing critical thinking and analytic reasoning.

All program outcomes are carefully reviewed at least once every five years through the Program Review Process. As part of the program review process for proposed new programs, the University Curriculum Committee, in addition to college level curriculum committees, carefully considers and approves all student learning outcomes before programs are approved. Programs are now being asked to report on assessment of program learning outcomes each year as part of a new Annual Program Report.

2.1a Access to CSU San Marcos – First Time Freshmen

Cal State San Marcos has experienced significant growth in the number of first-time freshmen, from 541 in 2001 to 804 in 2005. As of fall 2006 census, the campus had over 1350 first time freshman (headcount). This increase is expected to continue.

Cal State San Marcos is striving to build an ethnically, racially and culturally diverse population of students, faculty and staff that demographically reflects the region. To that extent, the campus is involved in a number of programs aimed at increasing the number of underrepresented students eligible for college. The "Partners for Success" agreement was established with the San Marcos Unified School District to guarantee admission to CSUSM for graduates of the district who are CSU eligible and meet benchmarks throughout the four years of high school. The university will realize a stronger relationship with the district, greater involvement in the academic preparation of high school students and an enhanced pipeline of prospective students. Cal State San Marcos is continuing to strengthen K-16 and other educational partnerships.

2.1b Access to CSU San Marcos – CCC Transfers

As a result of continued outreach and aggressive recruitment, Cal State San Marcos is experiencing a surge of transfer student applications, even when many other four year campuses across the state are experiencing declines.

The Bridge Building Partnership through the TRIO/SSS and EOP&S programs at the regions' community colleges reaches out to first-generation students in historically economically and educationally disadvantaged communities to attract them to the university. This partnership has increased the number of transfer students to CSUSM.

3.1a Progression to the Degree – First Time Freshmen

To ensure the success of first time freshmen and improve retention and remediation rates, the campus is focusing on expanding existing first year programs that have demonstrated results. CSUSM has identified retention of first-year students as a core theme for the upcoming WASC accreditation process and as a key component of its new strategic plan. Academic and student services professionals are collaborating to assess current programs and recommend solutions for expanding the infrastructure needed to support a first year student.

The campus is increasing enrollment in its General Education Learning (GEL) courses. Preliminary data indicate that GEL students are retained at a greater rate than students who do not enroll in GEL. Through the National Survey for Student Engagement, the campus is tracking increased participation in co-curricular activities, class project teams and learning communities and assessing the level of support needed to thrive socially, to meet non-academic challenges and to succeed academically.

3.1b Progression to the Degree – CCC Transfers

Cal State San Marcos enjoys relatively high transfer student retention rates, exceeding both its target and the CSU average. Upper division roadmaps and the continued engagement of students will further improve the transfer retention rate.

3.2 Upper Division Units Earned to Degree

CSUSM is consistent with the CSU and other semester campuses on this indicator.

4.1 Persistence and Graduation

The average six-year graduation rate for FTF at CSUSM consistently falls towards the bottom of all CSU campuses. A key component of the university's new strategic plan is aimed at closing this gap.

As part of the Facilitating Graduation Initiative, the campus is setting required units to 120 for all programs except biochemistry and business administration, emphasizing graduation in new student orientation, advising students to declare a major by the time they reach 60 units, disseminating degree roadmaps suited for both lower- and upper-division students (these roadmaps recognize that students begin their study at Cal State San Marcos at varying levels of preparedness), aligning class schedules with roadmaps, and, providing student services that foster student success and support learning across the disciplines to meet the needs of our dynamic student population.

The campus launched a formal training program for undergraduate academic advisors, "Advisor Academy", which will enhance and strengthen their knowledge and skills in working with students on issues related to retention and graduation.

6.1 Relations with K-12 – Fully Prepared New Freshmen

The university has determined the level of preparation of FTF is a significant factor for low retention. CSUSM has taken several steps to address this, including implementation of CSU-wide initiatives such as the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI), SSS/EOP, and the Early Assessment Program (EAP). Local initiatives include the Math Acceleration Summer Program and the Partnership for Success agreement with the San Marcos Unified School District that will increase the level of preparation for the CSU in exchange for guaranteed places in the freshmen class. CSUSM is continuing to build relationships with additional local school districts to support them in their efforts to improve proficiency rates of high school graduates.

7.1 Remediation

The Cal State San Marcos strategic plan emphasizes academic and student services support for student retention, success and graduation.

Several programs and centers have been expanded, including the Math Lab and the Writing Center, which support first year students. Students needing English remediation are required to visit the writing center nine times. The Math Lab supports the Math 15, 50 and 51 courses consecutively year round in support of Math remediation. The CSUSM Mathematics Acceleration Program in the Summer (MAPS) program experiences high success rates in the remediation of students in the summer prior to their freshmen year.

A cross-divisional collaboration is developing systems to identify at-risk students in order to provide prompt advising and other interventions to achieve full remediation.

8.1 Facilities Utilization

As with any growing campus, Cal State San Marcos experiences challenges with space utilization and the limited addition of new space. The campus recognizes that it must be creative in utilizing current space through course scheduling during non-traditional times and online delivery of instruction. As part of its strategic plan, the campus is assessing current usage of space and is developing explicit strategies to leverage opportunities for online instruction, expand the number of courses offered after 4pm, Friday and weekends and expand summer enrollment.

9.1 University Advancement

As the university nears the close of its second decade, it will leverage several opportunities to launch advancement campaigns and fundraising efforts leading up to its 25th anniversary. CSUSM has hired a Senior Director for Development and is implementing a new system to involve alumni, parents, and the community in successful annual and capital fundraising campaigns.

9.2 University Advancement – Alumni Participation

Despite the growth in numbers of CSUSM alumni, participation in the Alumni Association has remained relatively constant over the past four years. The campus is recruiting for a Director of Alumni Affairs to improve engagement of alumni in the campus community and campus events and build a strong alumni program. Cal State San Marcos is also a pilot campus for the CSU systemwide e-Advocacy initiative.

9.4 University Advancement – Private Support Goal

The College of Business Administration received a pledge of \$5 million — the single largest pledge in CSU San Marcos' history.

The First 5 Commission of San Diego County provided a grant of \$7.6 million to fund construction of the Center for Children and Families.

Palomar Pomerado Health pledged \$2.5 million to convert 15,000 square feet of available space into a nursing school and resource lab center.

The University raised \$2.4 million in external funds to construct the McMahan House on campus for the specific role of linking/bridging the University with the community through meetings, conferences, and community events held at the House.

Contact: Matthew Ceppi, Director, Institutional
Planning and Analysis
E-mail: mceppi@csusm.edu

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs

All academic majors and General Education have identified student learning outcomes. Examples of innovation in assessment activities are listed below.

Literacy Studies and Elementary Education Digital Portfolio: The faculty of the Literacy Studies and Elementary Education Department (LSEE) believe learning and teaching are complex social acts involving reflection that lead to growth over time. The digital portfolio is a way for candidates in the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Program to demonstrate professional growth. Overall teaching preparation is represented through a combination of reflections and self selected entries. Entries are comprised of documents and artifacts created in the program that represent the candidate's learning teaching experiences. The LSEE Digital Portfolio (supported by LiveText Software) allows for individual candidate assessment as well as programmatic assessment of student learning outcomes within the Multiple Subjects Credential Program. The cost of the software is defrayed by a charge to the credential candidate, who retains access to the portfolio and can utilize it in securing a teaching position upon completion of the credential. Department faculty can independently rate each candidate's achievement of the learning outcomes. This becomes a means of achieving inter-rater reliability and provides a platform for department feedback that can result in improved educational effectiveness.

Hutchins School of Liberal Studies Qualitative Portfolio Assessment: The Hutchins Portfolio allows students to record and evaluate the range of educational experiences and ideas that constitutes the individual's particular pathway through the Liberal Studies. At the same time, the Portfolio is a means of assessment appropriate to evaluating the student learning outcomes of the Hutchins program itself. Unlike tests, which are the usual means of evaluating a student, the completed Portfolio furnishes a portrait of the independent learner and captures a sense of the shaping process through which he or she developed intellectually. For the purposes of Program assessment, faculty review the individual portfolios and then meet with the entire faculty of the school in order to do programmatic evaluation, which is qualitative in nature.

Kinesiology Department: The Kinesiology Department's learning outcomes were derived from the California State University Kinesiology Student Core Learning Outcomes Document developed in 1999 through a collaborative process across the CSU system resulting in 17 program outcomes. SSU's Kinesiology Program adopted 15 of these outcomes, which provide a strong base for the curriculum. The department has a well developed and thoughtful approach to program assessment, utilizing five instruments for assessing student learning at the program level: course embedded questions; graduating senior surveys; focus groups with senior level students; student portfolios for majors in the physical education concentration; and department faculty discussion. In their recent program review, the external reviewer has suggested adding a sixth instrument in order to obtain additional information from graduates, which can be extremely effective in curriculum development. The department is considering such an instrument at this time.

3. Progression to degree

SSU has very high first-year continuation rates both for first-time freshmen and California Community College (CCC) transfers. The first-time freshmen rate has fluctuated between 75% and 83.1%. Given the many factors that contribute to retention, a small change over time is not surprising. The CCC first-year retention rate has been consistently around 83%. Not surprisingly, the CCC juniors have a much higher one-year continuation rate as they have already been successful in college.

The number of upper-division units completed by Junior CCC transfers is between 66 and 70. The upper-division units for our native first-time freshmen is between 65 and 68. Therefore there is no significant difference between the number of units completed by our native freshmen compared to our CCC transfer students.

4. Persistence and Graduation

We estimate that about 53% of our first-time freshmen will eventually graduate from SSU. When we track freshmen students who start here and graduate from another CSU campus, that increases by about 12%. SSU is second highest in the CSU in this six-year graduation rate. About 75% of our CCC transfers will eventually graduate either from SSU or another CSU campus.

6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen

In 2004-05 SSU had 70% freshmen fully prepared in Mathematics and between 67% of our new-freshmen fully prepared in English. SSU's students are better prepared than the systemwide average of 63% in Mathematics and 53% in English. With continued efforts working with the K-12 sector to reduce the need for remediation, we do hope to reduce our need for remediation in Mathematics and English.

7. Remediation

Our goal for 2004-05 was to have 84% of our first-time freshmen fully remediated within one year. Our actual remediation rate was 83%. We make every effort possible to contact students individually and advise them on what is needed for them to be fully remediated within one year. Both the English and Mathematics remediation sequences can be completed in two semesters for those students in the lowest quartile of the EPT or ELM. Students who do not complete remediation within their first year are required to take summer classes before being permitted to return to SSU.

8. Facilities Utilization

The percentage of non-traditional instruction at SSU is consistently around 34%. The Provost works closely with the School Deans to maximize use of classrooms for instruction and to offer a variety of choices for students. Given our student body preferences, 34% seems appropriate for non-traditional instruction.

9. University Advancement

The Development Office has consistently increased the areas of voluntary support, special revenues, and alumni participation. We expect this to continue. The Development Office has established a goal of raising 15% from the private sector. We believe this goal is achievable.

Contact: Rose Bruce, Director, Assessment and Analytical Studies
E-mail: rose.bruce@sonoma.edu

1. **Quality of the Baccalaureate.** CSU Stanislaus has promoted the assessment of student learning since the early 1990's. As a result, all degree programs have established and have been assessing formal student learning outcomes. Within the context of the Cornerstones' principle for public accountability, faculty have built on the traditional indirect methods to assess student learning (such as surveys) through more sophisticated direct measures of student learning. Examples include student portfolios, course-embedded assessment prompts, performance-based tests, and rubrics for writing assessment. The Collegiate Learning Assessment performance-based test of critical thinking and writing has been implemented as an external assessment of student performance. The academic program review process provides examples of ways in which student learning improved as a result of assessment information: curricula revised, pedagogy diversified, prerequisites adjusted, and admission policies altered. Two examples highlight the effective use of assessment results for improving student performance. The nursing program used assessment data from local and national tests to institute curricular changes and out-of class-resources to assist students in improving their knowledge of medical terminology, leading to substantially high pass rates on licensure examinations. The business administration faculty received a national award honoring their assessment efforts leading to curricular changes in international finance and human relations to be more responsive to workforce demands.

2. **Access.** Student access to CSU Stanislaus has increased steadily as a result of vigorous enrollment management actions. This Cornerstones principle has been achieved through increasingly sophisticated recruitment materials and strategies, increased scholarships for high-achieving students, continued commitment to diverse first-generation college students, and strategic actions for increasing the number of freshmen. As a result, the University has increasingly enrolled larger first-time freshmen classes over the past several years. All eligible freshmen and transfers have been admitted, with the exception of the impacted pre-licensure nursing program. Several outreach programs have increased interaction with local high schools to encourage early testing and collegiate preparation. Additional partnership programs with community colleges have been undertaken to increase the upper-division community college transfer.

3. **Progression to Degree.** CSU Stanislaus has instituted several strategies to support students' progression to degree. First-time freshmen have the opportunity to complete a baccalaureate degree within four years. The University has maintained high one-year retention rates for both first-time freshmen and upper-division transfer students, with rates increasing slightly for full-time freshmen and transfer students. Through an advising program—Academic Wellness, implemented in 2005/06 by Student Affairs—five mandatory checkpoints support students' timely progression toward their degree objectives.

4. **Persistence and Graduation.** As part of its 2005 Graduation Rate Outcomes Study, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities featured CSU Stanislaus as one of 12 universities nationwide for its exceptional achievements in retaining and graduating students. These high persistence rates are attributable to many programs implemented in recent years, including the First-Year Experience, Supplemental Instruction, the Faculty Mentor Program, and the Summit Program (upper-division, theme and cohort-based general education). Student Affairs offers the Probation Project, providing intervention to students placed on academic probation. In 2003, the University began implementation of its Graduation Plan, setting targets and directed actions for improving the already high retention and graduation rates by focusing on sub-groups of higher-risk students.

6. **Relations with K-12.** Strong, sustained relationships with K-12 schools have been a hallmark of CSU Stanislaus. These relationships are evident most visibly by education faculty and are complemented by many examples of collaboration between faculty and their K-12 counterparts in the arts, humanities, sciences, and business. For example, faculty administer several state-wide subject matter projects related to writing, reading, literature, and mathematics. Support is also provided to teachers related to high school exit examinations. Many extramural grants provide direct support to K-12 teachers and students to enhance collegiate preparation in mathematics, sciences, and writing. Two sterling examples of professional development K-12 schools opened in 2006 at the Stockton Center as a result of education faculty's collaboration with local schools. The CSU Stanislaus Early College High School (6-12) results in a high school diploma and up to two years of transferable CSU credit. Similarly, Pittman School, in cooperation with the Aspire College Preparatory Academy, is designed to enhance K-8 curricula, student academic achievement, and

teacher preparation. For both schools, the overarching goal is to increase the number of underrepresented and first-generation students prepared for collegiate work and graduating from the CSU.

7. **Remediation.** Consonant with Cornerstones' commitment to the highest standards of undergraduate education, CSU Stanislaus made steady improvement in successful remediation of students in one year, beginning with the fall 2001 freshman class. Since fall 2002, CSU Stanislaus has had proficiency rates equal to system-wide rates. The class of 2004 achieved a fully proficient rate of 97% within one year for those students returning the following fall.

8. **Facilities.** CSU Stanislaus exceeded the FTE goals set for 2004/05 in evening and overall non-traditional course offerings at both the Turlock and Stockton campuses. Enhanced facilities usage has occurred as a result of improving course scheduling modules at the Turlock campus, increased programs at the Stockton Center and other off-campus instructional delivery sites, and the pilot of on-line learning courses.

9. **University Advancement.** Over the past several years, University Advancement at CSU Stanislaus has increased annually its contributions in support of the academic mission of the University. Measures for all areas in 2005/06 surpassed goals achieved in 2004/05, although goals were not achieved at the level previously established in 2003/04. This slower-than-anticipated growth in charitable gifts and alumni-giving rates are attributable to the period of time for transitioning to new presidential and vice presidential leadership for advancement. As the campus grows under the leadership of President Shirvani and his new cabinet, CSU Stanislaus has begun to provide an invigorated framework for its continuing fiscal health.

Contacts: William Covino, Provost, Vice President
E-mail: wcovino@csustan.edu

Lisa Saucedo, Admin. Coordinator
E-mail: ltristan@csustan.edu