CSU ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS

Campus Reports - Summaries
Processes used for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors:

Interview Project: For the General Education Social Science Alignment Project, the Assessment Center staff interviewed faculty teaching social science courses about any changes implemented as a result of their earlier participation in the discussion of specific GE goals and objectives for the social sciences.

Faculty Roundtables: As a follow-up to the social science interviews, Assessment Center staff held a roundtable discussion with social science faculty teaching methodology courses for GE goal 1 (“Understand the basic methodologies...”). To parallel the social science efforts, Assessment Council staff also held a roundtable discussion with natural science (life sciences and physical sciences) faculty teaching methodology courses for GE goal 2 (“Demonstrate an understanding of the scientific method”). The primary purposes of these roundtable discussions were to share pedagogy being used to teach methodology in the social and natural sciences, to discuss strategies for assessing student learning objectives, and to explore “best practices” in instruction and supporting activities that were particularly effective in achieving desired student learning objectives.

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) Workshops: Through the Faculty Teaching and Learning Center, faculty were invited to participate in an all-day WAC workshop to learn how to prepare effective writing assignments for achieving specific student learning objectives, how to give students effective feedback for improving their writing, and how to implement effective assessment and grading procedures. All faculty who participated in the WAC workshop were offered the assignment of an English tutor to their respective classes to work with the students during the following quarter. A follow-up workshop brought the faculty back together to share outcomes, especially the impact of what was learned in the WAC workshops and the use of an English tutor on student achievement of learning objectives through written assignments.

Focus Groups: For the Children, Adolescent, and Family Studies (CA&FS) and the Liberal Studies baccalaureate degree programs, Assessment Center staff conducted focus groups with the respective majors, including CA&FS students funded under a Head Start grant program, to determine academic and personal impact of the programs, values learned, mentoring and tutoring needs, advising experiences, obstacles to successful achievement of goals and objectives, and positive experiences and achievement of learning outcomes.

Group Instructional Feedback Technique (GIFT): The Assessment Center staff worked with individual instructors to obtain systematic student feedback through class interviews to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the class, including student learning outcomes and their assessment, early in each academic quarter so that appropriate changes can be implemented during the term.

Processes used for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree:

Application of “Standardized” Scoring Rubrics: Scoring rubrics were developed in consultation with specifically identified faculty teaching courses for a given area of the General Education program. These rubrics were then applied to student papers to assess student achievement of specific core competencies. To date, we have used this process (1) to assess students’ critical thinking skills in essays written for the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), (2) to assess students’ ability to describe and explain specific biological concepts and to understand and apply the scientific method in an upper-division science GE course, and (3) to assess students’ ability to describe, summarize, and critically analyze information from a historical/cultural perspective in two upper-division GE arts and humanities courses.

Portfolios: Over 50% of the baccalaureate degree programs use some form of portfolio to assess student achievement of core competencies (student learning objectives). Although the composition of student portfolios
vary by program, all require samples of student work from courses as evidence for specific learning objectives, e.g., term papers, lab reports, homework assignments, exam answers, etc., as well as written essays prepared specifically for the portfolio. The program faculty review all portfolios to assess the degree to which each student has achieved the core competencies of the program.

Successful Completion of Core Courses: About 25% of the programs tie some of their core competencies to specific core courses in their major. This approach is always combined with other procedures, especially embedded elements.

Embedded Elements: A few programs use embedded questions in course examinations to assess student achievement of specific learning objectives. Others use embedded paper assignments within courses to assess student achievement. The course instructor grades these embedded elements as part of the course. In addition, the program faculty review the embedded elements to assess the degree to which each student has achieved core competencies of the program. Embedded elements is always combined with other procedures, e.g., portfolio and successful completion of core courses.

Pre-Post Testing: Two programs use pre-tests and post-tests for students to assess specific learning objectives. The pre-tests are administered when the students enroll in the first course of a sequence, and the post-tests are administered when the students complete the last course of the sequence. These sequenced courses usually address a subset of core competencies, and the pre-post tests provide a means for assessing how effective students have been in achieving those specific learning outcomes. Pre-post testing is always combined with other procedures, especially embedded procedures and successful completion of core courses.

Systematic Follow-up Activities: A few programs utilize surveys, interviews, and focus groups to assess both the degree of student satisfaction with the program, as well as achievement of specific core competencies (student learning outcomes). Follow-up activities is always combined with other procedures, especially successful completion of core courses.

Program Review Process: The University Program Review Committee (UPRC) now requires every program to address student learning outcomes in the 5-year program self-study. The UPRC expects programs to provide data regarding student achievement of the core competencies of the program obtained from the above procedures.

Response to Area Number 9 – University Advancement

There was a reduction in voluntary support for CSUB in FY 2000-2001 from that of FY 1999-2000. This is the result of the University completing its capital campaign, the Cornerstone Campaign, in FY 2000. The campaign year was a high payout year for gifts to the campaign. The Bakersfield community responded more favorably to a capital (bricks and mortar) campaign than current operations, special projects, or endowments.
CSU Channel Islands (CSUCI) has been in operation since August 2002 with its first class of students consisting of transfers from CSUN and area community colleges. In fall of 2003, CSUCI will admit its first class of freshmen students, and in the year following, sophomores will be admitted as CSUCI begins to take the form of a four-year institution.

Concurrent to bringing this university on-line, CSUCI is preparing accreditation reports for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). A preparatory report is due to WASC in November and a site team will visit CSUCI in February.

One of the founding principles of this university and an important tenant for WASC accreditation is our accountability effort. CSUCI is committed to informed decision-making and to developing a culture of evidence. WASC is fast-tracking CSUCI’s accreditation based on this premise.

CSUCI has embraced the WASC model for establishing a functionally operational university, and as it prepares materials for WASC review, CSUCI is using the model to identify areas that require further development. CSUCI will develop and implement processes for the establishment of indicators in the nine performance areas noted in the CSU Accountability Process.

Recently, the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA) has been charged with leading the accountability effort for the university. This will involve working with Academic Senate committees such as the newly formed Evaluation Committee as well as the General Education and Curriculum Committees in order to coordinate their efforts and those of program administrators in setting accountability goals as well as in developing accountability processes.

During the present year, OIRA operations will come online and within the year should be able to more fully participate in this important endeavor. For now, the goals that were previously submitted to the CSU Accountability Process will remain in force—and OIRA will actively engage in the accountability process at CSUCI.
California State University, Chico
November 2002 Accountability Report

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
   1.1 In 2002 all academic departments were again surveyed in the following five areas: learning goals established, learning outcomes stated, an assessment plan in operation, results of assessment analyzed and results of assessment being used to improve programs. The results of the survey suggest continued progress toward our stated goal of 100 percent participation in each of the phases.

2. Access to the CSU
   2.1.a CSU, Chico has responded to the objective of ensuring access under the Master Plan. Close to 100 percent of the eligible first-time freshmen are admitted in the fall of each academic year. About 30 percent of admitted students enroll at Chico in the subsequent fall semester. Failure to complete the admission process is the predominant reason for non-admittance.
   2.1.b CSU, Chico has responded to the objective of ensuring access under the Master Plan. One hundred percent of the eligible junior transfer students were admitted in the fall of each academic year. About 65 percent of admitted transfer students enroll at Chico in the subsequent fall semester. All qualified regional students have been accommodated each year.

2.2 The high quality of the CSU, Chico School of Nursing programs is demonstrated by the full accreditation status conferred to them by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC). The program’s quality is further evidenced by the success rate of its graduates on the NCLEX-RN ® exam. Their passing rates exceed state (80%) and national averages (82%). Most recently, 91 percent of the candidates passed the exam.

3. Progression to degree
   3.1.a Chico enjoys consistently high first-year to second-year progression rates. Key components of our success are our special efforts at student integration into the unique academic and social environment of CSU, Chico. The Fall 99 to Fall 2000 progression rate dropped due to mandatory disenrollment for failure to complete one-year remediation requirement. Our traditional progression rate is being rebuilt.
   3.1.b Chico enjoys consistently high first-year to second-year progression rates for transfer students. Individual colleges undertake special efforts at integrating transfer students into their respective unique total learning environments. Recent examples of these efforts include Summer Orientation, and Re-entry Services programs.
   3.2 California Community College transfer students proceed through the upper-division coursework about as efficiently as do students who entered CSU, Chico as first-time freshmen. The units earned by CCC junior transfer students as they make their way to the baccalaureate degree are well within the “30% bench mark to degree,” and reflect campus distribution of degree type and major degree program.

4. Persistence and graduation
   4.1 Chico has among the highest graduation rate of any CSU campus for first-time, full-time freshmen. The accompanying table presents data on the entering classes of Fall 1993 freshmen and Fall 1996 transfers to entering classes of Fall 1995 freshmen and Fall 1998 transfers.

5. Areas of special state need
   5.1 The number of first time / new type of credentials issued by the CCTC to candidates recommended by CSU, Chico continues to increase, from 370 in 1998-99 to 418 in 2000-01, as a result of a number of special and innovative efforts. These efforts include the development of the FLEX Plan, the Integrated Teacher CORE Liberal Studies / Multiple Subject Program, and new initiatives for Special Education. The latter efforts are supported by successful grant writing on the part of our faculty at both State and Federal levels.

6. Relations with K-12
   6.1.a CSU, Chico faculty and students actively support two CSU-funded programs: PAD and CAPI. In addition, we support America Reads, Educational Talent Search, Math Links, MESA, Upward Bound, the Center for Mathematics and Science Education, CAVE, and numerous individual efforts. In 2000-
6.1b CSU, Chico faculty, staff, and students helped improve the academic preparation of students in elementary schools, middle schools and high schools in 12 counties: Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Trinity, and Yuba counties.

6.2 The level of full-preparedness for college mathematics of CSU, Chico’s regularly admitted freshmen increased dramatically to 51 percent in the Fall of 1999 and increased again in the Fall of 2000. The level of preparedness for college English has remained relatively stable at about 63 percent. We continue to be vigilant in these areas and maintain our extensive K-12 outreach efforts in the CSU, Chico service area.

7. Remediation

7.1 CSU, Chico remains strongly committed to helping all students succeed. Between 1999 and 2001, 89 percent of our regularly-admitted first-time freshmen who at entry required remediation, successfully completed all of their remedial English and/or remedial mathematics coursework within two semesters. The remaining 11 percent were disqualified from further enrollment pending completion of their remedial coursework.

8. Facilities Utilization

8.1 Chico’s facilities utilization reflects its unique residential nature as well as its traditional student population that combine to define that special set of educational experiences often referred to as the “Chico Experience.” The campus recently adopted a new course scheduling policy that will improve the percentage of instruction that is non-traditional and have us better utilize increasingly scarce facility resources.

9. University Advancement

9.1 Total voluntary support for CSU, Chico continues to add to its margin of educational excellence. The apparent significant reduction in total voluntary support from 1998-99 to 1999-00 is a function of the new gift reporting standards implemented by the CSU. While we no longer report computer software gifts using the CASE Management Reporting Standards, corporations and organizations continue to be extremely generous to our campus in this area of giving.

9.2 CSU, Chico’s performance in the area of “special revenues” remains strong. While grants and contracts activity remained very high in the 2000-02 period, endowments returns declined along with the stock market and the number of testamentary commitments (bequest intentions) was lower.

9.3.a The CSU, Chico Alumni Association launched a new alumni membership program in 1999/2000. Annual and life memberships initially declined in the face of changes in support systems and marketing strategies. We are pleased to see strong returns following implementation of these new initiatives. We look forward to continued improvement in the future.

9.3.b The total number of addressable former students continues to increase with each graduating class and renewed address tracing efforts. The biggest contributor is the increase produced by the most recent graduating class.

9.3.c The observed 12 percent increase reflects our renewed address tracing efforts as well as the size of the most recent graduating class. These results are rather encouraging.

9.4 While the percentage of Net General Fund Allocations declined slightly, private funding in the form of revenue generated from voluntary support, sponsorships, endowment distribution and other incomes increased from $5,915,540 in 2000-01 to $6,183,426 in 2001-02. We look forward to improvement in this arena following an extensive performance analysis and review.
Performance Area 1: Quality of Baccalaureate Programs.

California State University, Dominguez Hills is currently in its third iteration of a thorough process of program assessment. In 2001-2002, 56 programs (of a total of 64) submitted program assessment materials following a set of guidelines developed by a faculty-administrative team under the leadership of the Learning Outcomes Coordinator. A faculty team of reviewers read and commented upon each of these sets of materials with specific suggestions about ways programs might improve their assessment plans and thus, ultimately, the utility of those plans in identifying ways to strengthen their curriculum and enhance student learning. 2001-2002 was the 2nd year of a 3-year process by which programs identify, collect, and analyze data related to student learning and make modifications as appropriate. A Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee established by the Academic Senate oversees the process and identifies ways to integrate the data collection and analysis into the planning and resource allocation processes. This will facilitate identification of resources to support identified curricular changes (design and implementation of capstone courses, electronic portfolios, senior projects, etc.) that will enable students to demonstrate competence in their major programs.

A pilot project for assessment of upper-division General Education courses is being implemented in 2002-2003. This project will provide information for faculty about student competencies in one or more areas (critical thinking/problem-solving, oral communication, writing, information technology) at the upper-division level regardless of where the lower-division coursework was taken. Fall 2002 activities include determining which upper division courses and assignments will be assessed and developing a survey eliciting a “snapshot” of the 4,500 students enrolled. Spring 2003 will see the survey administered and the assignments collected and assessed by faculty reviewers. Information from surveys and assessment activities will be analyzed and used for summaries and recommendations to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, and the WASC preparation team.

Results of the pilot program should identify the strengths and weaknesses in competencies upon completion of the lower-division GE program. Additionally, areas of the upper-division GE curriculum that need strengthening can be identified. Intensive faculty involvement will create a resource for expansion of the pilot and experience in planning for more extensive GE outcomes assessment activities. This pilot project is being supported by funds from the Chancellor’s Office.

Performance Area #3: Progression to the Degree

Continuing concern for strengthening the skills of entering freshmen who need remediation (a percentage remaining at approximately 80% over the past several years) has triggered intensive planning to provide an appropriate “Freshman Experience,” especially necessary in view of increasing enrollment of first-time, full-time freshmen. In Fall 2003, the University will initiate SPARK, “Students Preparing for Academic Rigor and Knowledge.” The program will incorporate a number of different “best practices” proven to be successful with these students, including intensive summer work on English and Critical Thinking Skills and Mathematics, cohort progression through a designed program, faculty and community mentors and role models, sensitivity to ethnic issues, slightly smaller class sizes, and team-building initiatives. Faculty involved in the program will receive special training in identifying student strengths and utilizing those strengths to help the student overcome weaknesses.

SPARK will be carefully assessed and monitored to determine its efficacy and whether and how it might be replicated both for the entire entering freshman class at CSUDH and at other CSU campuses as well. This pilot program will also be supported by funds from the Chancellor’s Office.

Experience has shown that CSUDH upper division students, both transfer and native, also need strengthening in writing, reading, and critical thinking skills. Fortunately, the University’s Enhancing Critical Literacy Project (ECLP) has received a Title V grant of more than $2,000,000 over a period of five years to address this need. The program design involves infusion of intensive writing experiences in a course or courses in each major program, support assessment of incoming upper-division transfers, and improve performance on the required writing exam. 2002-2003 will involve curriculum design and development of the courses. Faculty development will also be supported to allay any concerns the general faculty may have about critiquing student writing.

Both of these special programs are being designed with the long-term goal of increasing the percentage of students progressing to completion of their degree programs and timely graduation.
Performance Area #5: Areas of Special State Need

Teacher education programs, responding to a critical State need and already a major strength of the University, grew at an exceptional rate in Fall 2002. The enrollment “crunch” required the addition of 75 more course sections than in Fall 2001 in the School of Education, as well as additional courses in the College of Arts and Sciences to accommodate Liberal Studies majors preparing for careers in teaching. The growth in Liberal Studies majors has seen a gradual increase totaling more than 20% since 1997, with degrees awarded to Liberal Studies majors increasing by nearly 50% in the same period. Growth in credential enrollments and graduate education majors mirrors the increase in the undergraduate program. CSUDH once again prepared the largest number of African-American and Latino teachers in the State.

The success of the School of Education (SOE) and the Liberal Studies program has not gone unrecognized. This year, the SOE received the state award for best partnership from the California Council on Teacher Education. New grants supporting teacher education include a FIPSE grant with Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for initiation of a new high school Professional Development School in District G and the first ever joint data base collecting data on emergency permit teachers with an intent to move them through to full credentialing much faster. The National Science Foundation awarded a Comprehensive Grant with Lauren Resnick, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Wisconsin, LAUSD, and three other school districts around the nation. The U.S. Department of Education is funding two more special education cohorts in LAUSD Districts I and J. The only School Leadership Grant in California federally-funded from “No Child Left Behind” money has been awarded to the Dominguez Hills SOE. The federal PT3 grant to support technology training for faculty has received additional funding. The teacher education intern and pre-intern programs have received a state grant of approximately $1,500,000. Individual faculty members have received additional, smaller grants, as well. Clearly, this record provides external validation of the quality of teacher preparation provided by the SOE at CSUDH.

Performance Area #6: Relations with K-12

As the grants identified in Performance Area #5 (above) indicate, the University continues its extensive involvement with schools in its region. These relationships rely on collegial cooperation between CSU faculty and their counterparts in the K-12 schools. The CAPI program, in its third year, will expand its operations in the future so as to have an impact on a greater number of schools and students. CSUDH planning is concentrated on reducing the number of students who matriculate unprepared in mathematics, English, or both. The percentage of fully-eligible students from the urban area who enter needing remediation must be reduced if the campus is to achieve its retention goals. The CAPI program and other early intervention programs are designed to achieve this goal, but there are no “quick fixes” for long-term under-preparation of large numbers of students in the immediate area.

Performance Area #7: Facilities Utilization

Unlike other CSU campuses, CSUDH schedules as many courses after 4:00 p.m. as it does during the more traditional daytime hours. In this sense, the University is maximizing its utilization of existing facilities. After 25 years of no new academic buildings, the opening of the first new State-funded building in the Spring of 2003 is of major importance in relieving the pressure on classroom space. In addition, Library space inadequate for the current head count enrollment of 13,500 is of concern. The University also still has a deficit in faculty office space and is in need of additional classrooms able to accommodate larger classes and the growing enrollment. If it continues, the current pattern of growth will mean increasing need for appropriate support for new facilities.

Finally, the excitement and publicity increasingly generated by the construction of the Home Depot National Training Center complex on University land seems to be partly responsible for greater interest of students and others in CSU, Dominguez Hills. The partnerships between our new “neighbors” (presently the Anschutz Entertainment Group and Home Depot) and the University will bring benefits to the University but may also increase our rate of growth (currently at nearly 7%) and the needs associated with that growth, needs to be addressed by the CSU System and the State of California.
Performance Area 1: Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
There are 95 degree programs for which a student outcomes assessment plan is being or has been developed. 96% of those programs have completed a draft with mission, goals, and objectives and an assessment plan based upon them; 79% of the departments have had an external team review (two on-campus faculty and one off-campus representative of the discipline with assessment experience); and 43% have had their plans reviewed and approved by our University Program Review Committee. Most programs are actively engaged in assessment activities. In addition to the degree programs, outcomes assessment is being implemented in both the Smittcamp Family Honors Program and the university General Education Program. Both of these programs have plans in place and assessment activities in are underway this semester.

Performance Area 2: Access to CSU
All eligible applicants, both first-time freshmen and California Community College transfer students continue to be admitted.

Performance Area 3.1 Progression to degree
The decline in continuation rates for both first-time freshmen and CCC transfers has no immediate explanation. The stricter enforcement of the remediation requirements may play a role for the freshmen – in which case the upturn suggested by the goals may be realistic, as word of that enforcement becomes widely understood. A newly formed presidential Task Force on Student Success will be looking carefully at both of these populations and will seek ways of enhancing their progression.

Performance Area 3.2 Upper-division units
3.2 (a) Junior CCC transfers
Implementation of the reduced major size has been fully effective with the 2002-03 catalog, somewhat later than anticipated when the goals were set. The goals for 2002-03 and for 2004-05 are probably realistic in the longer term but appear at this point to be underestimates. A drop toward the goal figures might be expected in 2005-06.

3.2 (b) Native FTF
For the same reasons as state for the Junior CCC transfers, the goals for 2002-03 and for 2004-05 appear now to be underestimates. Realistically, a drop in this number cannot be expected much before 2008-09.

Performance 4 Persistence & graduation
4.1 (a) Estimated total first-time freshmen who eventually will graduate
Performance for the past three years is rather higher than the goal values. Whether the decline seen in Area 3.1 will be reflected in this indicator remains to be seen.

4.1 (b) Estimated total CCC transfers who eventually will graduate
If the drop seen in Area 3.1 for these students will have its impact here will be known very soon. Our goals for this indicator now seem unrealistic. The Task Force on Student Success will, of course, be giving attention to this issue.

Performance Area 5 Areas of special state need – First-time, new-type credentials recommended by the university (excluding interns)
The results of the past three years are consistent with the goals given. The higher 1998-1999 rate of recommendations are the result of the start of our summer YRO operation which has been limited to credential programs. That summer caught many who were waiting. The growth represented by the 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 rate is probably sustainable.

Performance Area 6 Relations with K-12
6.1 Outreach Efforts
At the beginning of the Accountability process, our campus included in its concept of outreach to K-12, many, many activities which bring K-12 students on to campus for educational activities. These include the new Downing Planetarium which hosts 30,000 K-12 students a year as well as such programs as FFA; music, science, and math competitions; music and athletic camps; etc. We now understand that only activities of the
University Office of Outreach Services are included in counts. Assuming this is to continue, we will request that the 2002-03 and 2004-05 goals be revised.

6.2 (a) Fully prepared new freshmen - mathematics
The rising percentage seen here, both for past performance and for goals reflects the results of both a greater emphasis on mathematics by the regional school districts and of the efforts of our CAPI program, working with both students and teachers in the principle feeder high schools.

6.2 (b) Fully prepared new freshmen – English
The decline in the percentage of entering new freshmen fully prepared in English is continuing as anticipated in the goals for 2002-03. For 27% of our entering freshmen, English is not their native language, and 11% hold a green card, rates approximately five times as high as those of comparable universities nationwide (CIRP survey, 2001), presenting a particular challenge. With CAPI and heightened awareness of the importance of this preparation, we expect that trend to reverse in a year or two.

Performance Area 7 Remediation
This area is a real bright spot. The combination of strict enforcement and of new modes of presentation of both remedial mathematics and remedial English, the rate of successful remediation within one year has increased rapidly, indicating that we will very likely exceed our goals by a significant amount.

Performance Area 8.1 Facilities utilization
The percentage on non-traditional instruction has not grown significantly over the past few years. We are seeing a growth in summer instruction with the education summer YRO and we anticipate a significant expansion of distance learning classes. In the other categories there is no discernable trend.

Performance Area 9 University Advancement
Voluntary support has improved to $22.7 million, and is on track to reach the goal of $31.7 in FY 2003. This is due in large measure because the campus has booked over $31 million in multi-year pledges yet to be paid, and because planning has begun on a comprehensive campaign for academic programs. Alumni participation has dropped slightly, but a membership coordinator has been hired and an extensive membership campaign was launched in October of 2002. An aggressive program of finding “lost” alumni has resulted in an addressable alumni population of 135,817, already exceeding the ’05 goal. The number of addressable graduates stands at 86,780, which is good progress towards the ’03 goal. The “ten percent” goal continues to be surpassed each year.
California State University, Fullerton
November 2002 Accountability Report

Performance Area (Indicator)

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs.
   Processes used at Fullerton for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in the majors:
   • Ask college deans to require that chairs lead department faculty in naming clear and assessable goals for the baccalaureate programs. Inform all that program reviews will henceforth include questions about (a) goals, and whether they have been reviewed for completeness and centrality; (b) assessments, focusing on general statements about the data developed in terms of the goals; and (c) program changes [new courses; course modifications; etc.] that have been undertaken in response to the findings.

   Processes used at Fullerton for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education:
   • Ask the general education committee with assistance from Academic Programs to review general education courses in terms of goals already developed and in the Fullerton catalog. Ask the same groups to begin assessments with a view toward program review for general education.

2. Access to the CSU
   2.1 The number of the following who applied to the university and were admitted:
      (a) First-time freshmen
      (b) Upper-division CCC transfers
      As these data indicate, Fullerton continued to serve its region.

3. Progression to degree
   3.1 First-year continuation rates
      (a) First-time freshmen
      (b) CCC transfers
   3.2 Upper-division units
      (a) Junior CCC transfers
      (b) Native FTF
      Fullerton is making good progress vis-à-vis its goals.

4. Persistence & graduation
   4.1 Graduation rates from the campus of origin
      (a) Estimated first-time freshmen who eventually will graduate
      (b) Estimated CCC transfers (juniors) who eventually will graduate
      Fullerton is making good progress vis-à-vis its goals, particularly with respect to CCC transfers. Programmatically, Fullerton’s Advisement Center has undertaken program innovations designed to encourage students to make good and steady progress to the degree. Fullerton reduced many bachelor’s degrees to 120 units in response to the CSU system initiative.

5. Areas of special state need
   5.1 First-time, new-type credentials recommended by the university (excluding interns)
      (a) Multiple-subject
      (b) Single-subject
      (c) Special education
      Fullerton is making good progress vis-à-vis its goals. The increase shown for 2000-01 versus the previous year is substantial. Demand for admission to credential programs continues strong. Programmatically, Fullerton’s Center for Careers in Teaching has proven effective in working both on-campus and at community college sites to encourage and facilitate interested students to move toward careers in K-12 education.

6. Relations with K-12
   6.1 The number of each of the following involved in outreach efforts
      (a) CSU faculty involved
      (b) CSU students involved
(c) K-12 schools involved 
(d) K-12 students involved

6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen

(a) Mathematics 
(b) English

Indicator 6.1: Student involvement, K-12 school involvement, and K-12 student involvement indicators will be reviewed at Fullerton. University Outreach has recently been reconfigured and largely transferred to Academic Affairs.

Fullerton is making progress toward its goals in area 6.2. Outreach efforts continue. Dr. David Pagni of the Fullerton mathematics faculty recently received a $6 million+ grant to strengthen K-12 teachers of mathematics.

7. Remediation

7.1 Remediated within 1 year

Fullerton has made good progress toward its goals in area 7.

8. Facilities utilization

8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus:

(a) Evenings (after 4 pm) 
(b) Fridays 
(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer break) 
(d) Summers 
(e) Distance learning 
(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers) 
(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings 
(h) Overall instruction in the college year 
(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction 
(j) Number of CPEC-approved off-campus centers

At Fullerton, college deans have been given targets for progress toward indicator 8.1. Staff to the Vice President, Academic Affairs have facilitated this process, and will continue to do so. Working with the Academic Senate, Fullerton has revised its template for MWF course offering times, and will monitor schedules to promote Friday and weekend classes. YRO summer demand is strong. Progress toward goals to date is satisfactory.

8.2 StateSupported course annual FTES occurring via CPEC-approved center [Mission Viejo center prior to August 2002]

(a) Evenings (after 4 pm) 
(b) Fridays 
(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer break) 
(d) Summers 
(e) Distance learning 
(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers) 
(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings 
(h) Overall instruction in the college year 
(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction 
(j) Number of CPEC-approved off-campus centers

The new site for the existing CPEC-approved center [in Irvine, at the now-closed U.S. Marine Corps Air Station] allows for programming that will allow Fullerton a good opportunity to meet its goals.

9. University Advancement

9.1 Voluntary support

9.2 Special revenues

9.3 Alumni participation

(a) Formal association membership 
(b) Total addressable alumni 
(c) Total addressable graduates/credentials

9.4 Ten percent private fund goal

As do other campuses, Fullerton experiences volatility in its voluntary support receipts. Indicators (b) and (c) for area 9.3 show progress. The search for a new Vice President for Advancement will conclude with a hire in Fall 2002.
Report on Performance area 1 (Quality of baccalaureate degree programs)

This report focuses on descriptions of the processes being used to establish and assess student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors, and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree.

General Education

The General Education cluster program, begun in 1998, is currently undergoing a comprehensive program review. The review process has included: (a) open forums, both on-line and face-to-face, for faculty and students to comment on their experiences with, and perceptions of, the quality and effectiveness of the program; (b) focus groups with faculty, upper division students who have completed general education requirements, and current freshmen in the general education program, to explore positive and negative experiences with the program and particular experiences related to intended program outcomes; (c) extensive analysis of survey and performance data collected from students in the general education program over the past three years to explore patterns of student experience and learning outcomes as represented in performance measures such as grade point average and scores on the CSUH Writing Skills Test, which satisfies the CSU University Writing Skills Requirement; and (d) a site visit and report from an external reviewer.

The Majors

Processes to establish and assess student learning outcomes in the majors are implemented by the four Schools: the School of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences, the School of Business and Economics, the School of Education and Allied Studies, and the School of Science.

School of Arts, Letters and Social Sciences

By the end of the 2001-2002 academic year, all twenty-three (23) departments and programs in ALSS had submitted assessment plans for the degrees they grant. In ALSS, departments are submitting and implementing assessment plans for both baccalaureate degree programs and masters’ degree programs at the same time. The assessment plans included mission statements, program objectives, intended student learning outcomes, extant and proposed measurable indicators of student achievement of intended outcomes, and extant and proposed methods of assessment of these outcomes. Departments are now in the midst of mapping intended major student learning outcomes to specific instructional and assessment events in core courses for each major, and developing and pilot-testing new assessment methods required to assess major outcomes. The new methods being tested by departments include portfolio assessment, on-line satisfaction and behavioral event surveys, essay and objective tests of core disciplinary content knowledge, and interviews in the context of academic advising. Pilot tests of new methods of assessment, and new ways of embedding assessment of core program learning outcomes for the major in existing classroom instruction and assessment procedures, will be expanded this year, with special attention to the development and refinement of standards and criteria for judging levels of performance expected and appropriate to baccalaureate level education.

School of Business and Economics

As part of the process of delineating expected learning outcomes for the baccalaureate degree in Business, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is taking a fresh look at the core requirements of the undergraduate business degree. The primary objective of revisiting the core requirements is to have a curriculum that focuses on development of skills in students aligned with courses that are designed around learning outcomes and assessment of knowledge and skills.

By the end of the 2001-2002 academic year, the School had: (a) collected inputs from alumni and graduates to identify areas that needed to be part of learning outcomes of the undergraduate curriculum, (b) finished analyzing data from several years of exit interviews of graduates to improve curriculum and other aspects of learning, (c) on a departmental basis, delineated the learning outcomes of most of the options and courses, and begun the process of identifying means of assessing learning outcomes.
In Fall 2002, the School will organize a task force composed of the Associate Dean, Chairs, representatives of curriculum committees, experts in assessment and the Director of Assessment and Testing. This task force will develop policies and procedures for outcomes assessment and supervise implementation of outcomes assessment activities.

The School of Business is also undertaking a major effort to develop a comprehensive assessment plan for its master’s degree programs, and particularly the MBA degree, which is offered both on the CSUH campus, and at several international locations.

School of Education and Allied Studies
During the 2001-2002 academic year, academic programs in the School of Education and Allied Studies developed assessment plans consistent with the rigorous standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). All credential and masters degree programs in the departments of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership adhere to the NCATE standards; all but one program in the department of Educational Psychology is under the auspices of NCATE.

Each program accredited by NCATE developed an assessment system that included a plan with each of the following components: (1) the identification of key transition points in the program; (2) major assessments selected for each of the transition points; (3) a timeline for development and implementation of the assessment system; (4) a process for collecting, analyzing, summarizing, and using data was established; (5) aspects of the system that address SEAS operation have been identified; and (6) an explanation of how technology will be used in the assessment system. All plans were approved by a NCATE accreditation team that visited the campus in late April and early May of 2002. During the 2002-2003 academic year, programs will begin implementing the plan, with a focus on the development precise protocols and scoring systems for all assessment devices.

The departments of Recreation and Community Services and Kinesiology and Physical Education are not governed by the NCATE standards. Each department, however, continued the process of refining learning outcomes and standardizing performance indicators. The focus was on operationalizing plans developed during the previous year, with emphasis on perfecting the alignment between proposed outcomes and their corresponding indicators.

School of Science

By the end of the 2001-2002 academic year, The School of Science had completed the undergraduate assessment plans for all the Bachelor of Science majors except Engineering and Environmental Science. The Environmental Science documents will be available this quarter. The Engineering documents will be available following their accreditation in 03-04. This extension was granted because of the effort needed to engage in the accreditation process, their first. All of the programs are involved in data gathering. The Biology Department is in their second year of data collection. The Psychology department is taking steps to modify their course offering schedule in response to data they collected last year. All departments offering the degree of Masters of Science are preparation their assessment plans during the Fall and Winter quarters. They will be available on the web and delivered to the Provost's office at the beginning of Spring quarter 2003.
1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
Initial learning outcomes and assessment measures are now in place for all majors and for most of the general education program. By the end of this academic year, all of the learning outcomes and associated assessment measures will be in place for general education. Starting next academic year, the results of the outcomes assessment process will be reported for programs that have completed the program review process.

2. Access to the CSU
Data in this section is not applicable for HSU.

3. Progress to degree
Retention rates for first-time freshmen have improved modestly and preliminary results for the 2001 cohort indicate further gains. The implementation of a Freshman Interest Group Program is a likely contributor and more freshmen enroll in this popular program. Retention rates for CCC transfers have improved each of the past two years and preliminary data indicate that the trend continues. The average number of upper division units taken by transfers and native students remain quite similar and have increased slightly.

4. Persistence and graduation
There has been a steady decline over the past two years in the estimate of FTF who will eventually graduate. This decline can be almost entirely explained by the unusually low retention rates for the 1994 and 1995 freshmen classes. Since that time, there has been an increase in the freshmen retention rate and that should translate into an improved graduation rate. The eventual graduation rate for transfers has improved modestly for the past two years.

5. Areas of special state need
The total number of first time, new-type credentials recommended by Humboldt over the past two years has declined by approximately 10% over the past three years. Among the factors effecting that change is the relative difficulty of finding student teacher placements in the local schools as well as the lack of teaching positions vacancies in the local area.

6. Relations with K-12
There has been an increase in the number of CSU students and K-12 students involved in outreach efforts. The marked decline in CSU faculty reported in CY 2000-2001 is due to a change in the mix of outreach programs allowed to be considered in the reporting process and is not reflective of the actual involvement of faculty in the local schools. The combined preparation in mathematics and English for new freshmen has improved substantially over the past two years.

7. Remediation
There has been a decline in the percentage of students that have been completely remediated within one year. This can be at least partially explained by the fact that the number of students starting at the lowest level of remedial classes has increased in recent years. Humboldt allows students who make progress in remediation during the first year one additional semester to complete all remedial work. Consequently, a number of HSU students complete their required remediation after three semesters.

8. Facilities utilization
The percentage of non-traditional instruction at Humboldt has increased from 29% in CY 1998-1999 to 31% in CY 2000-2001.

9. University advancement
Due to reporting irregularities by an individual who is no longer employed by Humboldt State University, the data submitted in FY 1998-1999 and FY 1999-2000 is not accurate and consequently any annual comparisons of FY 2000-2001 with previous years is not possible.
In 2002, California State University Long Beach continues to be one of the most sought-after campuses in the CSU system. A disproportionately large percentage of new applications to the CSU system are directed at the Long Beach campus.

Based on a 2002 visit reaffirming full accreditation, a team from the Western Association for Schools, and Colleges recognized the dramatic improvements evident on the campus in the past decade. For quite a few years, the campus has been focusing on fundamentals of academic quality and services to students. A reformed General Education program has been fully implemented. As part of the reform, CSULB re-sequenced courses to ensure that students acquire fundamental skills early. The campus has allocated resources to ensure that students can get needed courses in a timely manner. Departments have created learning outcome goals and begun the work of assessing student skills and knowledge. The campus has a range of successful learning communities and other support programs for students, especially for first year students. The campus has continued its focus on customer service that catapulted CSULB student ratings or campus services to a lead position in the most recent survey of student Needs and Preferences (SNAPS).

CSULB has a campus wide commitment to a vigorous partnership with surrounding school districts, especially large, diverse Long Beach Unified School District. CSULB’s work with eight key feeder high schools supported by the California Academic Initiative has been vigorous and productive. The partners have focused upon improving student readiness for college and the data show evidence of improving student preparation. The reformed Integrated Teacher Education Program has improved quality while expanding the flow of students through teacher preparation courses so that the campus has significantly exceeded its current goals for teacher preparation.

Rapidly rising enrollment is a mission-critical concern. The campus has implemented all available means of expanding capacity, including a revision to policies on course scheduling to more efficiently utilize facilities, especially Friday classes. In fall 2002, the campus implemented impaction for the freshman class. Despite these measures, enrollment has exceeded the campus physical capacity and California Master Plan maximum size. As a consequence the campus is examining options for limiting enrollment, the campus has a widespread commitment to maintain the student diversity that so invigorates the campus climate.

California State University Long Beach is a healthy, thriving campus that has become a magnet for students. Quality education is the “bottom line” for a university and CSULB is proud of its achievements.
Performance Area 1 (Quality of baccalaureate degree program)
The process by which CSULA evaluates student progress in learning and success in achieving educational goals is faculty driven and is designed for improvement of student learning. Student input shall normally be sought in the development of assessment activities of academic programs and departments. Assessment of each program at CSULA follows a four-stage model. In Stage I, faculty members in each program clearly identify both quantitative and qualitative goals, with broad participation from all faculty members within the program. Stage II requires faculty in each program to devise and explain their measurement tools, which should allow for clear determination of whether or not expectations of student learning have been met for the program. Stage III requires faculty to apply the measurement tools on student performance. Finally, Stage IV requires the faculty to use the results produced in Stage III to make curriculum changes for the purpose of improving the program. In the case of the General Education Program, the entity responsible for assessing the Program is the General Education Subcommittee, with input from units that offer courses in General Education. Over seventy percent of our degree programs have completed the first cycle of assessment by June 2002 with the expectation that all programs would complete the assessment cycle by June 2004.

Performance Area 3 (Progression to the degree)
CSULA has been successful in retaining a greater number of new students from the first year of enrollment to the second year. In an effort to continue to improve continuation rates, effective Fall 1997, all first-time freshmen were required to complete an INTRODUCTION TO HIGHER EDUCATION course. Realizing within the first two quarters that transfer students also often need orientation to an urban-comprehensive campus like CSULA, this requirement (Transition to CSULA course) was implemented, effective Fall 1999, for transfer students. Through its strategic planning process, CSULA has begun to reduce the number of specially admitted students, while continuing to provide already specially admitted students with additional support services. Due to these on-going and expanded efforts, we are projecting an increase to 82.5% in 2002-03 and 83% in 2004-05 for first-time freshmen and expect to continue to maintain our level of progression to degree over 80% for the Community College transfers to CSULA in the future.

Performance Area 4 (Persistence & graduation)
CSULA is working vigorously to continue to show improvements in its graduation rates. However, it is important to note that graduation rates at CSULA are within range of expectations for regularly admitted college entry students with ACT \( \leq 19.4 \) or SAT \( \leq 880 \), according to a University of Oklahoma study. Furthermore, CSULA has a large number of part-time students, an older than average student body, large numbers of students working full or part-time during the day and many female head of household and first-generation college students. In addition, many of our students are the first in their families to attend college, with family income below the federal low-income level, which may be reflecting the true situation for many CSULA students who are choosing to move at a slower pace due to other life responsibilities.

Performance Area 5 (Areas of special state need)
Due to other life responsibilities, many students are choosing to move at a slower pace to complete their credential programs (averaging less than 8 units per term). As a matter of fact, it takes CSULA students a minimum of 2.5 to 5 years to complete their credential programs. Furthermore, over 85% of CSULA credential students are on Emergency Permits. CSULA is working vigorously to continue to show improvements. As a result, we are projecting significant increases in multiple-subject, single-subject and special education areas for 2002-03 and 2004-05.

Performance Area 6.2 (Fully prepared new freshmen)
CSULA has one of the most diverse student bodies in the nation and is perhaps the most ethnically and linguistically diverse campus in the continental United States. Having said that, it is
imperative to note that our catchment area has more than its share of students whose primary language is not English. Both the Mathematics and English composition preparedness of students, obviously, depend a great deal on the ability to understand written English, and the primary language of pedagogy that is also English. As a result, we continue to partner with K-12 and community colleges in our catchment area to devote special attention to the needs of non-English speaking students who are nevertheless, regularly admissible to CSU.

Performance Area 7 (Remediation)
CSULA catchment area has more than its share of students whose primary language is not English. Both the Mathematics and English composition preparedness of students, obviously, depend a great deal on the ability to understand written English, and the primary language of pedagogy that is also English. As a result, we continue to partner with K-12 and community colleges in our catchment area to devote special attention to the needs of non-English speaking students in an effort to continue to increase the number of students who complete remediation within one year.

Performance Area 8 (Facilities Utilization)
The pattern of course offerings is in response to CSULA students’ needs, who tend to be older than the average student body, with large numbers working full or part-time during the day and enrolled as part-time students.
Leadership is a key element of our Mission Statement, however, it has not been integrated as well as it should be throughout the Academy. The new Faculty Assessment Council will be working to facilitate this integration and to implement the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Leadership Committee report.

An important step in reaching a fully implemented outcomes assessment plan was the requirement that all new course proposals submitted to the Curriculum Committee contain an assessment plan. Individual departments have made considerable progress in the development of outcomes assessment plans. In particular, the Mechanical Engineering department, in preparation for an ABET accreditation visit, developed an excellent plan. This plan is being used as a model by other departments.

The General Studies faculty reviewed the Library Fluency Program core outcomes while at a summer retreat. There has been some success in the development of an assessment instrument, but we still have more work to do.

The Academy’s assessment plan will be fully implemented for the 2004 report, and we will be able to describe how some of the results have been used to improve our programs. Certainly the establishment of a Faculty Assessment Council will facilitate this, however, we need to establish a link between the assessment results and the budget. Our plan is to establish a pathway to the Academy Budget Advisory Committee, via mutual faculty membership, thus facilitating the use of assessment data in budgetary decisions.

In the past, most of our students have been in majors that also receive a U.S. Coast Guard license and are unsuitable for transfer. However, we expect the number of upper division transfers from community colleges to increase as we develop articulation agreements for our non-license programs in Business Administration, Facilities Engineering Technology, and our new BA degree in Global Studies & Maritime Affairs (which will accept students starting in fall 2003).

Our time and persistence to graduation are fine, however, we need to spend more effort on retention of students. We are starting to lose a few more students than we have in the past and, consequently, have established a campus task force that will investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of enrollment management including retention.

There has been increased interest by the faculty to integrate “service learning” components into their courses. Some of these activities have and will involve our faculty and students in K-12 schools. In addition, we are starting a program called “Follow the Voyage,” along with three other maritime academies. This program allows children to follow the voyage of the academy training ships. Information such as location, weather and oceanography is sent from the ships and posted to the academy websites. Children will be able to access this information as well as communicate with staff and students on the training ship. A curriculum has been developed for children in Massachusetts that utilizes this data and we are in the process of converting this curriculum to meet the California standards. This project has the potential to dramatically increase our exposure in K-12 schools, both in California and elsewhere.
1. **Quality of baccalaureate degree programs**

   Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels.

   The model of outcomes-based education at CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB) has the following components:
   - All academic programs, including both the general education program and each of the majors or degree programs, are to stipulate the learning outcomes for that program. These represent the definition of “what students should learn” in that program.
   - These learning outcomes are to serve to focus and guide program curricular design, course design, instructional pedagogy, student learning, and learning assessment.
   - All programs are to assess student learning in relation to their prescribed learning outcomes.
   - Evidence of student achievement of outcomes will consist of representative samples of student work.

   This outcomes-based education framework is implemented in the General Education program in a direct way. While the California Education Code stipulates a distribution of units or credits that students are expected to earn within a set of disciplinary domains, CSUMB has articulated a set of 13 University Learning Requirements (ULRs) that approximately cover in breadth and depth the same academic terrain contained in the state code. To gain and demonstrate knowledge and skills contained in each of the ULRs, students can either register for a course, or, if they believe they already possess the knowledge, they can register to be independently assessed by a faculty committee responsible for each of the ULRs. Please visit the following website to learn more about CSUMB’s ULRs: http://csumb.edu/academic/ulr/.

2. **Access to the CSU**

   Eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campus.

   CSUMB continues to admit all eligible students.

3. **Progression to the degree**

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

   These data describe regularly-admitted CSU students. For the last three years, one-year continuation rates have ranged between 70 and 81 percent for first-time freshmen, 74 and 78 percent for Upper Division CCC transfers. Although continuation rates for both groups have been in flux for the past few years, we are confident that future rates will begin to stabilize around 80 percent. For the last three years, the number of upper-division units transferred by students ranges between 73 and 79 units. In comparison, the number of units held by native freshman students upon reaching Upper Division status ranges between 74 and 81 units. Thus, little difference can be seen between transfer students and native freshmen in terms of Upper Division units. Both appear to progress towards their degree at a similar rate.

4. **Persistence and graduation**

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

   CSUMB began enrolling students in Fall 1995. The first-time freshmen graduation rate for the Fall 1995 cohort was 43 percent. For CCC transfers, the graduation rate was 66 percent. The decline in graduation rates over the past three years for CCC transfers may most likely be due to an anomaly in the graduation rate for the baseline year (Fall 1996 CCC Transfer cohort). Although the current (2000-01) graduation rates for both groups are lower than desired, efforts are underway to increase the graduation rates for both first-time and transfer students, as CSUMB implements new strategies to further assist students to achieve their degree objectives.

5. **Areas of special need**

   There is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers.
The numbers of first-time/new-type multiple subject credentials recommended by CSUMB were 59 in 1998-99, 74 in 1999-00, and 72 in 2000-01. CSUMB did not recommend any single subject or special education credentials. CSUMB continues to aid the state in reducing the need for credentialed teachers, and will play an even greater role in the future as the CalState TEACH program is fully implemented at CSUMB.

6. Relations with K-12

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

In mathematics, the percentage of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen fully prepared was 28 percent in Fall 1998, 38 percent in Fall 1999 and Fall 2000. In English, the percentage of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen fully prepared was 54 percent in Fall 1998, 55 percent in Fall 1999, and 57 percent in Fall 2000. Although English preparation levels continue to increase for entering students, further efforts are needed to influence increased levels of preparation in math. Goals for CY 2002-03 reflect this need, and reflect the current upward trend in freshmen preparation in math and English.

Further efforts to prepare students for college can been seen in CSUMB’s relations with K-12 schools. Although the data for CY 2000-01 would appear to show a decline in our overall relations with K-12 over the past three years, it should be noted that much of the difference we see in the CY 2000-01 data from previous years (CY 1998-99 and CY 1999-00) can be accounted for by the centralization and uniform data collection methodology implemented by the Chancellor’s Office beginning with the CY 2000-01 reporting year. The impact of this new reporting methodology on CSUMB’s CY 2000-01 data has led to greater focus and clarity on what CSUMB should and should not be counting. As such, goals set for the CY 2000-02 and CY 2004-05 need to be revisited.

7. Remediation

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

Regularly-admitted first-time freshmen requiring some remediation who were successfully remediated and re-enrolled one year later totaled 87 percent for CY 1998-99, 73 percent for CY 1999-00, and 85 percent for CY 2000-01. Although remediation rates dipped during the CY 1998-99, we are confident that the increase from 73 percent in 1998-99 to 85 percent in 1999-00 will continue towards our expected goal of 90 percent for CY 2002-03, as CSUMB increases its efforts to remediate students in mathematics and English.

8. Facilities Utilization

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

9. University Advancement

To support educational excellence, CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions

CSU Monterey Bay continues to exceed its 10% goal, reaching 13% in FY 2000-01, even when accounting for fluctuations in both voluntary support and special revenue. The upward trend in Alumni Association memberships predominantly reflects the addition of new graduates. As we implement new recruitment techniques and tracking programs, we hope to significantly enhance our ability to reconnect and maintain relationships with this valuable resource.
California State University, Northridge  
November 2002 Accountability Report

Indicator 1:  
Every department/program at CSUN is required to have an assessment plan which includes goals and measurable objectives for student learning outcomes and core competencies. As part of the assessment plan, the recently revised self-study (program review) policy requires a statement of mission, goals, and objectives of the program for both graduate and undergraduate programs. At this time, nearly all of the 55 departments have defined their missions and goals.

Program review is typically conducted on a five-year cycle except in the case of departments evaluated through an external accrediting body. In addition, departments are required to show which courses meet the student learning objectives and report what changes were made in their programs, based on assessments. According to the CSUN Policy on Assessment, results of the assessment are to be reported as part of the program review.

The CSUN Policy on Assessment also established an assessment process for General Education. Student learning outcomes were developed and approved for all sections of GE. Section A, Basic Skills, has been assessed using tests and interviews of a random sample of the CSUN student population. Section B, Natural Sciences, was assessed using an online test developed by the departments and given to a random sample of students. In both cases, results were reported to the academic departments to aid them in determining whether to make changes and, if so, what they would be. We are planning to assess Section C, Humanities, in the near future using an online test which is under development.

The Educational Policies Committee has approved new curriculum forms for GE re-certification and certification. At least 25% of all GE courses will be re-certified by 2003.

Indicator 2:  
CSUN continues to admit all eligible students.

Indicator 3.1:  
There is some fluctuation in this indicator from year to year but no specific cause has been found except variation among the cohorts. The CSUN Graduation Rate Task Force has completed a two-year review and consultation process and will issue its final report in December. The report will provide recommendations aimed at improving retention and graduation rates.

Indicator 3.2:  
Beginning in 1998, the number of upper-division units for both junior transfers from community colleges and for native students has consistently decreased. 2002-03 goals have already been exceeded. With nearly all our majors reduced to 120-unit degree programs, CSUN expects to continue to make progress in this area.

Indicator 4:  
The 2002-03 goals for both first-time freshmen and transfers have been exceeded. CSUN continues to move toward an improvement in the graduation rates of all students through such efforts as those of the Graduation Rate Task Force which identifies specific recommendations related to programmatic and procedural areas, advisement, and pedagogy.

Indicator 5:  
At the request of the Chancellor’s Office, goals for this indicator were revised this year to eliminate interns from the total count. Even with interns removed, historical data shows an upward trend in credentials recommended.

Indicator 6.1:  
CSUN maintains a very strong presence in a number of elementary, middle and high schools through a variety of outreach programs such as CAPI (Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative), PAD (Pre-collegiate Academic Development) and others. In order to ensure more precise figures, the 2000-01 year-end report reflected only the number of students who actually received services such as one-on-one tutoring. In prior years, the figures reflected
all students who had the opportunity to receive tutoring. In addition, the number of schools served by the University decreased because an anticipated increase in grant funding did not occur. Because of these changes, Northridge will seek to revise the goals set for 2002-03 and 2004-05 for this indicator.

Indicator 6.2:  
Northridge continues to work toward helping entering freshmen become fully prepared in English and mathematics. Summer remediation programs were instituted in 2000 and have helped a portion of the new freshmen. However, with the increase in the size of the freshman class, a smaller percentage of the students can be assisted during the summer. Summer programs will continue to show only small increases until there is full implementation of YRO.

Indicator 7:  
Data from both Fall 1999 and Fall 2000 show that we exceed the goals for 2002-03. The University expects to continue to improve in this area. This area will also be favorably impacted by full implementation of YRO.

Indicator 8.1:  
CSUN is making progress toward the goals in nearly all of the parts of this indicator. In particular, use of facilities after 4 pm and on Fridays and weekends has increased. Academic Affairs administration works actively with all colleges to continually improve the efficiency of space utilization.

Indicator 9:  
Cal State Northridge continues to increase the amount of voluntary support and special revenues generated each year. The private fund goal of 2002-03 was met in 2000-01. We believe that the total addressable alumni was high in 1999-00 due to the inclusion of all alumni earning 12 or more units. That has been replaced by degreeed alumni only. It is expected that the campus will continue to move smoothly toward its goals for 2002-03 and 2004-05.
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
November 2002 Accountability Report

Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) has a history of internal and external accountability. The President’s annual report, which has been published for the last several years, 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.

This summary addresses the nine system-defined bi-annual accountability areas offering data analysis, remarks and conclusions about campus performance in each area.

**Area 1 - Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs**

CPP has ample evidence of progress toward developing and implementing processes to assess student-learning outcomes in general education and the majors.

**Area 2 - Access to the CSU**

All eligible students, who completed their applications in a timely manner, have been admitted to CPP with the exception of three impacted programs – Architecture, Computer Science (CS), and Computer Information Systems (CIS). Architecture was impacted over the whole period from fall 1997 to fall 2002, whereas CIS became impacted as did CS effective fall 2000 and fall 2001, respectively.

**Area 3 - Progression to the Degree**

Compared to the national average for public universities, first-year continuation rates at CPP for regularly admitted students were good (83-84%) until fall 1998. Following the implementation of EO665, the continuation rate from fall 98 to 99 dropped to 75% for freshmen due to disqualification of those who did not complete remediation within one year (16%). The fact that there was only an 8% drop indicates an improvement of the retention rate for fully prepared freshmen and those who successfully completed remediation. The continuation rate from fall 99 to fall 2000 dropped further to 73.9% for freshmen, perhaps due to a decline in English language proficiency. Analysis of data over the last few years indicates that students who needed remediation in both English and mathematics were most at risk not to complete remediation within one year. The retention rate for transfer students increased slightly, possibly because most of them in fall 1998 were upper-division transfers and, thus, were not subject to EO665.

The average number of units-to-degree completed in upper-division by students, who graduated during CY 98-99 through CY 00-01 was slightly higher for CCC transfers (136) as compared to freshmen (130). Reasons that contribute to this 6-quarter units difference include the fact that community colleges do not offer some lower division courses required by a number of CPP majors. In addition, some majors do not have free electives, which does not allow counting excess transfer units toward the degree.

**Area 4 - Persistence and Graduation**

More than 81% of “traditional” fall 93-95 regularly admitted freshmen graduated or would eventually graduate from campus. Out of them 75.1%-79.5% graduated in 6 years or less. To complete a 196-quarter-unit major in four years, a “traditional” student would have to take 16-17 quarter units per term for 12 quarters. A “typical full-time” student on financial aid takes, on average, 12 quarter units per term for 16 - 17 quarters or 5.5 – 6 years to graduate. 45%-49% of these “typical financial aid” freshmen graduated or would eventually graduate from campus. The most at-risk for not graduating are freshmen whose pace to degree is more erratic than the first two categories of students. Only 14.3%-24.7% of these students complete their degrees. About 80% on average of “traditional” fall 96-98 UD transfer students (from 79.1% for fall 98 to 80.8% for fall 96) graduated or would eventually graduate with a likely total time-to-degree of less than 6 years. Even transfer students carrying partial course loads achieve healthy graduation rates averaging 43.8%. The overall graduation rate at CPP for first time freshmen is around 51% on
average for fall 93-95 admits. The fall 96-98 overall graduation rate for transfer students is a little below 69%. These are very good graduation rates for a public university given the polytechnic nature of our campus majors.

**Area 5 - Areas of Special State Need**

The first time/new type credential data reflect our immediate contributions to the state’s need for teachers. In all categories of credentials, there was a dramatic increase in numbers through 1997-98, followed by a gradual decline through 2000-01. This can be attributed to credential candidates’ response to RICA — an assessment designed to measure reading instruction competency. Candidates were more eager to complete their credential requirements to avoid having to take this assessment that was both expensive and risky.

The pattern of awarding credentials appears to reflect a decline since 1998-99. The reality is that the number of credential candidates is increasing. At this time, it is premature to determine when candidates will advance to credential award.

**Area 6 - Relations with K-12**

CPP outreach efforts to K-12 schools are numerous. These include the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI), Precollegiate Academic Development (PAD), and a number of student support and outreach programs including Upward Bound, the Math Camp, America Reads, and Summer Bridge. Thanks to K-12 partnerships as well as university and college-based outreach efforts, CPP has had a sustained improvement in the percentage of regularly admitted first-time freshmen fully prepared in mathematics. The percentage of recent immigrant students (for whom English is a second language) has been increasing on campus during the last few years. Without the K-12 partnerships and programs as well as university and college-based outreach efforts, CPP would have had a drastic drop in the level of freshmen preparedness in English literacy skills.

**Area 7 – Remediation**

The percentage of regularly admitted first-time freshmen fully prepared and enrolled one year later at Cal Poly Pomona is approximately 98% over the first three years (1998-2001) following the implementation of EO665. A positive effect of remediation observed over the last four academic years is the increased enrollment and successful completion of GE mathematics and English courses.

**Area 8 – Facilities Utilization**

Cal Poly Pomona has been using existing facilities effectively while meeting students’ educational needs in terms of the time, place, and mode of instruction. The campus has been seriously preparing for the projected increase in demand. CPP has initiated a comprehensive study of student demand that promises to play an important role in facilities planning.

**Area 9 – University Advancement**

The university has focused on attracting an increasing percentage of cash gifts while encouraging donations of technology and equipment with specific and immediate application. In 2000-2001, these efforts paid off dramatically with over 80% of the voluntary support gifts received coming in the form of cash or equivalent instruments. The campus met and slightly exceeded the 10% private fund goal (10.3%). Voluntary support ($10,427,970), sponsorships ($740,989), and endowment/trust distribution ($421,202) are all counted toward the 10% goal. Thousands of alumni, friends, retirees, and community supporters were once again connected to the university through an aggressive and successful data refresh project, which resulted in an increase in Alumni Association membership to an all-time high of 3,670.
1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

**Academic Program Assessment**  All departments have developed assessment plans and are currently expected to have completed the following four phases of assessment process:

1. Determine (by faculty consensus) learning objectives for students in the major. These objectives must include writing in the major.
2. Assume that students either have none of the skills or knowledge inherent to the objectives when they enter CSUS or determine their level of acquisition when they enter through an entry level assessment.
3. Establish an assessment mechanism for evaluating student acquisition of the objectives during their careers at CSUS.
4. Reflect on the results and decide if changes should be made in the program.

Based on the annual reports, we have determined that:

- 5 departments have completed all four steps and have a fully functioning assessment cycle in place.
- 25 departments have completed steps 1 through 3 and are making good progress toward step 4.
- 14 departments have completed steps 1 and 2, but have either not drawn or not analyzed student outcomes assessment data.

In order to secure full six-year approval on program review after the 2002-2003 Academic Year, departments will be required to address each of the four areas noted above in their self-studies.

**General Education Assessment**  In 2000-2001 the Faculty Senate approved the creation of a task force to develop expected outcomes for each GE area. A General Education Area Coordinator Task force was convened by the Faculty Coordinator of Assessment. The General Education Area Coordinator Task Force worked to develop outcomes for each of the General Education areas and for the graduation requirements. Faculty were widely consulted for acceptance of the draft outcomes and pilot studies were conducted in each area to test the assessment of area outcomes. In spring, 2002, the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee and the Faculty Senate approved the outcomes. Departments must submit a course syllabus and an assessment plan which describes the strategies used to assess each outcome or group of outcomes for the GE Area to the Director of General Education. Assessment summary reports will be reviewed by the General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee. The Committee will aggregate information about the outcomes reported across areas and make recommendations for change or modifications to courses/programs to the Director of GE. Any concerns about assessment results will be referred to the GEP/GRC.

2. Access to the CSU

2.1 

2.2 and 2.3 Impacted Programs  CSUS is not an impacted campus, and we have no record of applicants not admitted to Clinical Nursing at the upper division, our only impacted program.

3. Progression to Degree

3.1 First-year continuation rates  Continuation rates for CCC transfers in 2001-02 exceed goals for both 2002-03 and 2004-05, but rates for first-time freshmen will probably fall slightly short of the goal for 2002-03.

3.2 Upper-division units  Upper division units for junior CCC transfers in 2001-02 have dropped enough to exceed the goal for 2002-03, but units for native first-time freshmen remain slightly above the goal.

4. Persistence and Graduation
4.1 Graduation rates from campus of origin. Estimated graduation rates for both first-time freshmen and CCC transfers in 2000-01 exceed the goals for both 2002-03 and 2004-05.

5. Areas of Special Need

5.1 First-time, new type credentials. The numbers for multiple subject and special education credentials in 2001-02 are estimated to exceed not only the goals for 2002-03, but also for 2004-05. We appear to be on track to meeting our goals for single subject credentials.

6. Relations with K-12

6.1 The numbers involved in outreach efforts. CSU, Sacramento has a number of programs working collaboratively with schools to provide students and teachers with the information and skills necessary to improve academic achievement. The 2002/03 numbers for CSU students, K-12 schools and K-12 students all exceed not only our goals for 2002-03, but also for 2004-05. With the large number of tenure-track hires anticipated over the next two years, we expect that the number of CSU faculty involved in K-12 outreach will reach our goal for 2004-05.

6.2 Fully-prepared new freshmen. Based on current data for fall 2002, we have far exceeded both goals for mathematics, but this is probably because of the higher pass rates on the revised ELM. It appears that we will fall somewhat below our 2002-03 goal for English.

7. Remediation

7.1 Remediated within one year. Efforts in tracking and advising EO-665 students have increased the 2001-02 percentage remediated within one year to 85%, so that we have already achieved our goal for 2002-03. We expect continued progress in this area, so that we should reach our goal of 86% for 2004-05.

8. Facilities Utilization

8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus. Based on current data from fall, 2002, we have exceeded our 2002-03 goals for Friday and summer enrollment. The former achievement was the result of a change in our scheduling policy to require MWF classes. Weekend/term break enrollment in 2000-01 was already above the goals for both 2002-03 and 2004-05. We will probably be somewhat below our 2002-03 goal for evening enrollment, but saturation of daytime capacity may lead to our achieving the goal for 2004-05, as enrollments in general increase and shift into the evening hours. Although data on off-site enrollment more recent than 2000-01 are unavailable, the number for that year indicates that we are on track to meet our goal for 2002-03.

8.2 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via CPEC-approved centers. Not applicable.

9. University Advancement

9.1 Voluntary support. Funds received in this category have declined somewhat during the past two years. However, the CSUS advancement unit has just completed a two-year administrative realignment and restructuring, which should yield significantly elevated levels of performance and results over the next several years.

9.2 Special revenues. In 2001/02 CSUS received almost $75 million in special revenues, which is well above our goals for both 2002/03 ($56 million) and 2004/05 ($61.7 million).

9.3 Alumni Participation. Data on numbers of addressable alumni and graduates/credentials for 2001/02 both exceed our goals for 2002/03. The number of formal members of the Alumni Association has lagged somewhat, but the recent hiring of a marketing director and implementation of a marketing plan should reverse this trend.

9.3 Ten percent private fund goal. The percentage of private funds declined somewhat during the past two years. However, we expect significant improvement in the near future because of the reorganization noted above.
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Performance Criteria No. 1 Student Learning Outcomes. Under the direction of the Associate Vice President for Assessment and Planning, the university has set up a multi-tiered assessment structure, including a university assessment committee, a general education assessment committees, and college and departmental assessment representatives and committees. The structure involves the participation of more than a hundred faculty across all colleges and departments in the implementation and administration of the assessment process. As of Spring 2002, 81% of the undergraduate and graduate programs at CSUSB (excluding Interdisciplinary programs) have submitted outcomes assessment plans to the University Outcomes Assessment Committee and of the plans submitted, and 67% have been approved for implementation. Overall, more than half of the undergraduate and graduate programs at CSUSB have university-approved outcomes assessment plans, and have begun implementation, data collection and reporting. (See [http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/index.html](http://gradstudies.csusb.edu/outcome/index.html) for chart showing the progress of each degree program.)

The university established accountability goals, and revised our program review policy to call for reporting on findings and use of student learning-outcomes assessment. Each fall, every department submits an annual report on progress in assessing students, findings made, and how the information gained has been used to improve both student learning and the curriculum. Some departments have already started to revise their curricula, course syllabi, and teaching methods and expectations. Meanwhile, the university has (1) provided incentive funding in the form of grants for the development of departmental assessment plans, (2) provided consultants and training, (3) sent faculty to national and CSU system-wide workshops on assessment, and (4) provided on-going baseline funding to programs which have had their assessment plans approved by the University Assessment Committee.

For the past two years substantial emphasis has been placed on the development of outcomes assessment for the General Education basic skills areas (written communication, oral communication, mathematics, and critical thinking) and the subject matter breadth areas in humanities, natural sciences and social and behavioral sciences. Faculty committees have developed goals and objectives for each of the general education categories and have solicited input from faculty campus-wide. Based on the feedback received, these committees have revised the G.E. learning goals and are currently developing assessment methodology that will be piloted in the Fall 2002 and Winter 2003 quarters. The General Education Committee also piloted the ETS Academic Profile test of GE knowledge and faculty committees are utilizing the results in the development of assessment tools specific to our campus. In addition, we have administered the National Survey of Student Engagement and developed a cohort of 12 other CSU campuses to provide benchmarking data and comparisons with other comprehensive institutions nationally.

Performance Criteria No. 2 Access to CSU. The campus continues to accept all qualified freshmen and transfers who apply the established deadlines. Applications continue to grow nonetheless. CSUSB is committed to serving the growing number of high school graduates and transfer students in our service region who are seeking a college degree. Our early outreach efforts with elementary, middle and secondary schools which have been in operation for over a decade are having a good impact on Hispanic and African-American enrollments and the percentage of H.S. grads attending college, and the number and percentage of students taking the required college preparatory course sequence required for admission to the CSU.

Performance Criteria No. 3 Progression to degree. While the trend toward a higher continuation rate is not always going to be linear, the data and projections still look favorable. There may be some negative impact because of an unexpected decline in the number of freshmen in the Fall 2002 cohort. We are down 8.6% in first-time freshmen from Fall 2001. If the students who did not come were among the stronger students academically, we might see some decline in the continuation rate.

Performance Indicator No. 4 Persistence & graduation: The projected improvements are predicated on having no more than 13 to 16% part-time students. If this continues to hold steady, the predicted persistence and graduation rates should be fairly accurate. The projection for 2004-2005 is a high but attainable number given some new initiatives that should increase the graduation rate of our lowest performing group.

Performance Criteria No. 5 Areas of Special State need. The campus accommodated a very rapid enrollment growth in the College of Education since 1997, both in basic teaching credentials and in advanced and master’s
degree programs, which are also needed and highly demanded by our area’s school districts. We have also developed off-campus sites and internship programs to serve credential students and to assist beginning teachers. Our BA in Nursing continues to be impacted despite expansion of the number of new students accepted, primarily due to the high cost of the program and lack of available faculty.

Performance Indicator No. 6.1 Relations with K-12: Assuming continuing support for PAD and CAPI, our Goals for “K-12 students involved” for 2002-03 and 2003-04 should be adjusted upward. Funding for those two programs, which account for the majority of the students served, has not increased. For that reason, more reasonable goals would be 14,800 and 15,000 respectively. When the Goals for 2002-03 and 2004-05 were developed, we did not have accurate numbers for America Reads/America Counts, so we did not include counts for those programs. Conservative estimates that include those programs could increase the number of K-12 students involved by 4,000 to 8,000. We do not anticipate the number of faculty involved to double, so that goal should adjusted downward to reflect a more accurate picture. If we have a growth of 8 faculty for a total of 40 in 2002-03 and another 10 by 2004-05, that would be a more realistic projection.

No. 6.2 Fully Prepared new freshmen: We expect small, generally linear, gains in the percentage of freshmen fully prepared in mathematics. 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 declines in some years. The percentage of non-native speakers of English has increased in our service area, and that will continue 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.

Performance Indicator No. 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. We have set ambitious targets for 2002-03 and again for 2004-05 which in light of the trends may need to be scaled back modestly to 75% and 78% respectively.

Performance Criteria No. 8.1 Facilities Utilization. This campus has always encouraged non-traditional and part-time students by offering many degree programs and a high percentage of its FTES during the evening. Weekend, off-campus and distance learning enrollments are a growing part of that mix. With establishment of an Office of Distance Education, substantial federal funding for development of the infrastructure to support distance learning, and completion of telecommunication projects, the campus is poised to make steady growth in off-campus and media-assisted instruction.

Performance Criteria No. 8.2 Enrollment at approved Off-campus Centers. Built on land donated by the city and constructed with over $20,000,000 in private funding, in summer 2002 our Palm Desert branch campus moved to a permanent site. Enrollment grew by 13% this fall and the PD campus is expected to grow more even rapidly due to the visibility of the new facilities, expansion of offerings, and provision of more student services. A strategic plan has been developed for marketing and sustaining the growth of this off-campus center. With the aid of a federal Title V grant the institution also is developing programs and providing outreach and student support services at other community college sites in San Bernardino and Riverside counties.

Performance Criteria No. 9 Advancement. CSUSB continues to excel in fundraising with $4,483,103 in gifts in 2001/02, a 47 percent increase over the previous year. The Annual Fund doubled the number of new donors and increased Alumni participation and pledges. Scholarship contributions exceeded $200,000 and a scholarship campaign was launched to commemorate the Alumni Association's 35th anniversary. The University Advancement division plans to raise $9 million in external funds during 2002-03 for completion of the Palm Desert Campus, increase Alumni membership by 18%, recruit more friends and supporters, and increase recognition of CSUSB in the region.
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This report describes current and planned efforts in the assessment of student learning in baccalaureate degree programs and the General Education program. The report highlights progress made in assessment since the 2000 Accountability report.

**Division of Undergraduate Studies (DUS)**
A new Dean of DUS was hired effective spring semester 2002. The Dean has responsibility for a number of programs and activities on campus, including student learning assessment. The Academic Plan for DUS for 2002-03 lists five division goals, one of which is to “extend and develop our capacity for research and assessment”. In support of this goal, the Dean has already secured additional resources for the Division that will be directed toward campus assessment efforts. These include hiring a full-time Associate Dean in DUS, an increase from the former half-time position.

**WASC**
SDSU is scheduled for site visits from WASC re-accreditation teams in spring 2004 and fall 2005. Student learning assessment and evidence of how assessment results are being integrated into program improvement to enhance student learning will play a large role in re-accreditation. A WASC coordinating committee of 20 faculty, staff, administrators, and students met for a 1 1/2 day retreat on August 26 and 27, 2002 to begin the dialogue focused on the issues that SDSU must address as it continues to work to improve student learning. This committee will meet bi-weekly throughout the 2002-03 year while a smaller planning committee will meet weekly to ensure progress toward our goals.

**University Committee on Assessment**
The University Committee on Assessment (UCA), an SDSU Senate-sanctioned subcommittee of the University Committee on Academic Policy and Planning, is the primary resource for assisting departments and programs in the development of student learning objectives and methods of assessment. Departments submit their assessment plans to the UCA, which in turn reviews the plans and provides feedback to the departments. Materials developed this summer provide additional guidance to departments and programs regarding student learning and assessment and create a more systematic accounting of progress being made. These materials include Departmental Guidelines for Student Learning Assessment, a structured feedback sheet that indicates whether an assessment plan meets the guidelines or must be revised and resubmitted, establishment of review dates for departments for submitting plans, and guidelines for establishing competitive funding opportunities for assessment activities. Discussion of these suggested changes in the responsibilities of the UCA will take place at the first meeting of fall 2002.

**General Education Committee**
The General Education Committee is the primary means of assuring that students achieve the goals and objectives of the GE program. To develop SDSU General Education student learning outcomes, a taskforce was established, including members of the GE Committee and members of the University Committee on Assessment. This taskforce appointed “cluster groups”, comprised of faculty members, to assess the five General Education areas: Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning, and Communication and Critical Thinking. The task force developed student learning goals for the overall GE program.

The General Education Committee has the responsibility of reviewing current and proposed courses in the GE program to ensure that student learning goals are listed for each course and that they are in alignment with the newly developed goals and objectives for the GE program. A GE curriculum matrix will be developed during the academic year 2002-03 that specifies in which courses the learning goals are being taught. This step will facilitate discussions regarding the need for changes/adjustments to the curriculum.

The mission statement and overall learning goals for the GE program are included in the General Catalog, effective fall 2002. A draft document for the Curriculum Guide has been developed that calls for documentation of goals/objectives for GE course proposals. Work will continue on this document during fall 2002 as well as continued discussions of the most appropriate ways to assess the GE program.
Assessment Activities in Academic Programs
San Diego State University is making continued progress toward the assessment of student learning. This report includes examples of assessment activities and how results are being used to modify curricula and improve student learning. Departments highlighted include: psychology, geography, biology, economics, political science, social work, sociology, English and comparative literature, geology, anthropology, and educational technology.

Summary
San Diego State University is continuing to make progress in assessing student learning and using the results to make appropriate changes in curricula and/or other experiences that will enhance students’ knowledge, skills, and abilities. The majority of departments have launched their efforts utilizing student surveys, an indirect measure of student learning. This is not surprising, given the simplicity and efficiency associated with this method. However, a comprehensive assessment plan must employ multiple methods of assessment, using both direct (performance-based) and indirect methods. Therefore, our goals for the next year include the following: 1) revise the role of the University Assessment Committee to provide more directed support to faculty and departments regarding assessment; 2) develop and provide explicit but easy-to-understand departmental guidelines for assessment plans; 3) establish review dates for department student learning assessment plans; and 4) consult with departments to develop direct methods of assessing student learning.
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Indicator 1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs

San Francisco State University engages in an array of assessment activities on campus focusing on its General Education program, its undergraduate and graduate degree programs, and its attempt to measure overall student perceptions, expectations, and levels of satisfaction. What follows here is a summary of only those activities that enhance General Education competencies and student learning within the undergraduate major.

In 1999, the General Education Council (GEC) began developing a process to implement a comprehensive assessment plan for the university’s three-segment General Education program. As a result, courses in Segment II [arts and sciences core] and Segment III [relationships of knowledge] have undergone an approval process over the last two years that has resulted in university-wide adoption of a matrix correlating overall General Education learning objectives with specific objectives in each course. In addition, course-embedded evaluation strategies have been developed. The next phase will involve data collection and analysis.

In Segment I [basic skills], the university funded a number of assessment endeavors: In oral communication classes, students’ first and last speeches have been compared and evaluated. Written communication courses in the Colleges of Humanities and Ethnic Studies used rubrics to assess student analysis of various texts. Faculty teaching critical thinking and quantitative reasoning courses identified key competencies in their respective skill areas. The quantitative reasoning faculty then embedded common assessment questions in selected sections of relevant classes. The critical thinking faculty are pursuing a common assessment instrument.

At the level of the academic major, a three-step process was established: (1) Each academic unit (department or program) was asked to submit a plan for assessing student learning to its respective dean and, through the dean, to the Office of Academic Affairs; (2) these plans were reviewed within Academic Affairs in order to begin a round of consultation regarding the appropriateness of each plan; (3) the academic units were then requested to implement those plans and to report annually on strategies, findings, and the use of those findings for program improvement. Most of the university’s academic programs have already completed three or four years of assessment plan implementation; and a number are making curricular and/or pedagogical changes to improve the program and student performance within it based on those findings.

Indicator 2. Access to the CSU

Except in the impacted undergraduate Nursing Program, SFSU admits all eligible first-time freshmen and upper-division CCC transfers who apply during the open enrollment period. However, if the increase in the number of new students enrolling in fall 2002 becomes a sustained trend, SFSU may have to utilize some enrollment management strategies to control the number of students admitted in the future.

Indicator 3.1 Progression to Degree: First-Year Continuation Rates

For the three years identified, a higher percentage of California Community College (CCC) transfer students progressed from their first to their second year than did first-time freshmen. On average, 74% of first-time freshmen returned while 81% of CCC transfers did. Retention rates for CCC transfer students have remained relatively stable over the past three years, while those for freshmen have varied. The percentage of freshmen who continued into their second year declined in 1999-2000 but rose again (by 3.8 percentage points) in 2000-2001. In fall 2002, the university piloted a number of freshman-cohort “learning communities.” It is hoped that these course clusters and the extra attention provided to students within them will increase continuation rates. Progress toward projected goals is reasonable in regard to both groups.

Indicator 3.2 Progression to Degree: Units Taken as Upper-Division Students

Students who enter as upper-division California Community College transfers, and who graduate, typically have done so by completing fewer credits in the upper division than students who enter as first-time freshmen. However, this difference in units has decreased from 1998-1999 to 2000-2001, so as to be practically negligible. The goal of decreasing the units taken by transfer students may be unrealistic, as the figure has gone up rather than down.

Indicator 4: Persistence and Graduation
The JCAR graduation rates for first-time freshmen and transfer students have remained relatively stable for the entering classes identified. On the average, 52% of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen and 71% of CCC transfers graduated. However, since graduation rates for first-time freshmen have dropped slightly (one percentage point for each of two classes since the fall 1993 entering class) rather than increasing, SFSU may fall short of its projected goals by 3-5%. On the other hand, the projected graduation rates for CCC transfers may be realized. The university is making the increase in graduation rates a major focus of discussion during the 2002-2003 academic year.

**Indicator 5. Areas of Special State Need: Credential Candidates**

Over the three years identified, a total of 1,920 SFSU students were recommended for teaching credentials. A majority were in the multiple subject credential area (52.8%). Single subject credentials accounted for 31.9%. Credentials in special education comprised 15.3%. There has been much variability in credential candidates recommended between 1998-1999 and 2000-2001. Nevertheless, there has been increased enrollment in SFSU credential programs since 2000-2001. Thus, progress toward the goals projected is reasonable.

**Indicator 6.1 Relations with K-12: Outreach Efforts**

The number of both CSU faculty and students involved in outreach has remained stable. However, in 2000-2001, the data indicate that outreach efforts reached over 200 additional schools and over 70% more high school students than was the case in 1999-2000. In this regard, it should be mentioned that the number of students reported was the result of the multiple counting of individual students. While the data accurately report the cumulative total of the numbers individually submitted by each program, there was no way to accurately determine which students were involved in more than one program. For the past year, we have attempted to look at overlapping programs within individual schools. Future data submissions should therefore be more accurate. Goal projections are conservative estimates based on increasing partnership efforts, particularly with the San Francisco Unified School District, and apparent trends in educational funding.

**Indicator 6.2 Relations with K-12: Fully-Prepared New Freshmen**

Freshman preparation in Mathematics and English has improved since 1998-1999, though more significantly in English than in Mathematics. Campus outreach endeavors with the schools, especially the Pre-Collegiate Academic Development Program and the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative, are working to improve preparation even further. Therefore, meeting projected goals for 2002-2003 and 2004-2005 is not unreasonable.

**Indicator 7. Remediation of Regularly-Admitted First-Time Freshmen**

Eighty-one percent of first-time freshmen who required remediation when they enrolled at SFSU in Fall 2000 completed the necessary remediation within one year. The university’s remediation programs, especially the Intensive Learning Program and the Community Access and Retention Program, should enhance our remediation efforts, ensuring that the university continues to meet its projected goals.

**Indicator 8. Facilities Utilization**

SFSU is increasing its non-traditional instruction through weekend classes, YRO classes, courses offered at community colleges, and on-line offerings. In 2000-2001, 39% of overall main-campus instruction was offered at a non-traditional time or in a non-traditional format. We are progressing toward our projected goal of 45%.

**Indicator 9. University Advancement**

In the first five years since the inception of SFSU's advancement program, total voluntary support to the University increased by over 146%. For three years, beginning in FY 1998-99, SFSU exceeded the CSU voluntary support goal of 10% of its net general fund allocation. In FY 2001-02, however, reflective of the nation's, state's, and Bay Area's economic downturn, total support fell below the 10% goal. Based on the current economic outlook and short-term expectations, development goals for the next two years may need to be revised to more accurately reflect expected giving levels. Nevertheless, the institution continues its endeavors in all support areas, with special efforts to increase its alumni rolls and levels of voluntary support. Its endeavors in the “special revenue” area are especially noteworthy, with actual dollar amounts significantly outpacing projections.
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1. Quality of Undergraduate Programs

The 1998 revision of the General Education requirements at SJSU instituted a process of course review, assessment of student learning, and subsequent course modification and continuing certification. One third of the GE courses have now completed the full cycle and the other two thirds are either in the phase of summarizing the assessment data of student learning or in the decision phase for continuing certification. This has been a tremendously successful change in our GE program that has provided documentation of program quality while providing the data and faculty discussion of the data that has fostered ongoing improvement in the GE courses. The sharing of our experiences during the first four years of implementing the new policy has led some other CSU campuses to begin emulating our program and has elicited very positive responses from universities outside our system when the program outcomes have been presented at national conferences.

The quality of Academic Degree Programs is monitored by a Program Planning 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. By the time the final 12 programs that have started the Program Planning process this fall are complete, all programs will have at least the learning goals and assessment plan in place. Several programs, particularly those with outside accrediting agencies, have already completed the full process including assessment and program modification. Progress has been slower than with the GE program because Program Planning is on a 5-year cycle rather than 4, it requires broader campus buy in, there are more levels of input and review, and there is more variation in the issues faced by the different degree programs. However, the change in focus to emphasize learning goals and assessment of student learning is already paying off in quality improvement. By the end of the next Program Planning cycle, all programs should have at least 4 years of assessment data to guide them in quality improvement.

2. Access to SJSU

SJSU no longer has any impacted programs, although Management Information Systems was impacted until S02. We currently have four programs that are very close to impaction: Management Information Systems, Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, and Computer Science. Hiring faculty to teach in these programs is difficult because of more lucrative employment opportunities in the private sector, and this limits SJSU’s ability to increase capacity in these programs. Nevertheless, all eligible applicants to SJSU are currently being admitted. A point of concern is that the number of EOP students enrolling has decreased, perhaps because the cost of living in Silicon Valley makes it very difficult for a student qualifying for EOP to afford to live and go to school in the area.

3. Progression to the degree

In the last three years first year continuation rates for first-time freshmen have ranged from 75% to 77%, and for CCC transfers from 80 to 82%. To increase these rates the campus has developed a variety of “First Year Experiences.” These include orientation and mandated advisement/registration days. The College of Science has implemented an orientation course for all freshmen, and other colleges and/or departments are developing such courses. This fall, 1/3 of all entering freshmen are in freshmen seminars with 16 or fewer students, and the plan is to expand this program to transfers and make this mandatory for all entering students.

In the last three years the average number of upper division units taken prior to graduation has declined for CCC transfers from 75 to 71 units and for native FTF from 78 to 73. This is a product of improved advisement and the reduction to 120 unit majors for many programs, but this trend is not likely to continue because of professional programs such as Engineering that require more than 120 units.

4. Persistence and Graduation

The data for the three years reported reveal a slight improvement in the proportion of first-time freshmen that will ultimately graduate from 51.9% to 52.7%, and a more dramatic increase for CCC transfers from 64.9% to 69.8%. Campus analyses indicate a comparable improvement in 6-year graduation rates, and, although the actual rates are low, there has been a recent substantial improvement in the 4-year graduation rate to 7%. Although encouraging, we believe that some of the recent dramatic change is a consequence of the economic downturn in Silicon Valley and may reverse as the economy improves. The gradual increase over a longer time span is, in part, attributable to an increasing proportion of students who self-classify as Asian. These students graduate at a substantially higher rate than all other groups at
SJSU. However, a particularly encouraging phenomenon is that the graduation rate of Hispanic students, particularly transfers, continues to improve.

5. Areas of Special Need

Teacher preparation continues to have high priority at SJSU, and the 45% increase in multiple subject credentials during the three-year period reflects this priority. The problem that resulted in a decrease in special education credentials has been overcome. In 2002 a total of 932 students were recommended for credentials. In response to new CTC standards, the campus is currently revising its credential programs. Despite the current budget constraints, the campus has decided to continue to permit growth in teacher preparation programs despite their relatively high cost.

6. Relations with K – 12

The proportion of first-time freshmen that were fully prepared in mathematics increased from 52% to 60%, while those prepared in English declined from 50% to 46%. Both trends are primarily explained by the increasing proportion of students who self-identify as Asian. However, 22% of current freshmen need remediation in both mathematics and English. SJSU has an ongoing and effective set of pre-college programs and has been experimenting with a variety of new programs to help facilitate the K-12 systems ability to prepare students for college instruction.

7. Remediation

The reported remediation rate of about 80% is consistent with the first year persistence rate, reported under 4 above, of about 77%. Most of the first year attrition is among students who fail to remediate.

8. Facilities Utilization

In order better to serve working adults in Silicon Valley, SJSU has moved toward a higher proportion of evening and weekend classes, and an increased number of on-line and hybrid classes. 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 slight decline in utilization on Fridays. We anticipate that the acquisition of new scheduling software in conjunction with being an early adopter of CMS will produce efficiencies in scheduling that will help the current facilities meet the needs of our growing enrollment.

9. University Advancement

SJSU continues to exceed the 10% private fund goal although the economic downturn has made this more challenging than it was at the beginning of the three-year period. Because the Silicon Valley has taken a particularly hard hit in the current economic downturn, the modest decline in the three-year period is predictable. For the 01/02 period voluntary support continued to exceed $10 million, which we view as very good in these times.
California State University, San Marcos
November 2002 Accountability Report

Indicator 1: Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Program

The program review procedures at Cal State San Marcos focus on the three key aspects of student learning: desired student outcomes (e.g., specific learning outcomes expected, means of assessing outcomes and use of resulting data for program improvement), quality of student achievement (e.g., readiness of incoming students for coursework, preparation of graduates for future careers), and teaching effectiveness (e.g., active learning, coordination of multiple sections).

Statements of learning outcomes have been developed for all undergraduate degree programs. As these majors undergo periodic program review, the initial outcomes will be re-examined and refined. In addition, the program review procedures mandate that programs develop assessment instruments to measure learning outcomes and use the resulting assessment data for continuous improvement of academic degree programs.

Program review is faculty-driven, with oversight exercised by the Program Assessment Committee of the Academic Senate. The Office of Academic Programs provides administrative assistance and the Office of Analytic Studies supplies relevant data. At present, site visits by one or more external reviewers are integral to reviews. There are feedback loops between the program, the college deans, the Program Assessment Committee, and other units/offices on campus.

Statements of basic learning objectives for all General Education courses are now published in the General Catalog. A two-year review of all upper-division General Education (UDGE) courses is currently underway; it requires departments to identify the learning outcomes most central to their approach to UDGE and to provide the Academic Senate’s General Education Committee with examples of assignments, examinations, and projects that assess these outcomes.

Indicator 3: Progression to the Degree

The campus’s first Accountability Report in August 2000 highlighted the relatively low continuation rate among our first time freshmen. A rise in the rate the following fall (i.e., for Fall 1999 entrants) suggested that the newness of the campus’s lower-division program might account for the initial low rates. When the rate fell to its lowest point for the cohort entering in Fall 2000, however, it became clear that this was not the explanation. After extensive discussion during Fall 2001, the cross-divisional Enrollment Planning Administrative Advisory Group (EPAAG) recommended to the Provost that a committee be formed to develop an action plan to improve first year retention. In June 2002, the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs met jointly with EPAAG and asked its members to spend the summer developing a five-year plan designed to significantly increase the one-year continuation rate of future cohorts of first time freshmen.

EPAAG began its work by reviewing the preliminary findings from a telephone survey of 181 randomly chosen first time freshmen entering CSUSM in Fall 2001. These students, interviewed in Spring 2002, reported on their plans for the next academic year and various aspects of their college experience thus far. In addition, EPAAG members reviewed key literature on freshmen retention and investigated how a number of universities with high retention rates organize their services to beginning students.

Aided by the insights emerging from this preliminary work, EPAAG developed a multi-faceted proposal for a coordinated and proactive approach to dealing more effectively with the particular needs of our entering freshmen. The proposal outlines multiple initiatives, two of which were in the process of being implemented by late summer: establishment of an office of first-year programs responsible for promoting the academic and social integration of first time freshmen into the University community and a program for contacting incoming first time freshmen on a regular basis to offer them needed assistance. In addition, the Academic Senate’s General Education Committee set up a subcommittee focused on freshmen retention early in the Fall term.
A final report to the Provost and Vice President for Student Affairs detailing the needed initiatives was submitted on 1 October 2002. It is our hope that implementation of the full range of proposed initiatives during the next few years will lead to a significant increase in the percentage of first time freshmen returning to CSUSM for their second year.

In addition, retention of first time freshmen should be enhanced by an aggressive plan for expanding the campus’s academic programs. During the past year, a committee co-chaired by the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate developed an Academic Blueprint detailing the substantial number of new degree programs scheduled to be launched by 2010. The Blueprint also calls for a new College of Health and Human Services to house some of the newly developed academic programs.

**Indicator 4: Persistence and Graduation**

Since the campus has been admitting first time freshmen for a relatively short period, only one long-term graduation rate for these students is available. It is not as high as we would like, but our current aggressive efforts to improve the one-year continuation rates of our newly admitted first time freshmen may well lead to a rise in the graduation rates of these students; of the Fall 1995 entrants returning at the beginning of their second year, 57% appear likely to graduate.

**Indicator 7: Remediation**

Although the proportion of entering CSUSM first time freshmen needing remediation during their first year of college has decreased during the period under consideration (see Indicator 6.2), the percentage completing such remediation has declined. As a result, one feature of the retention initiative described above is a summer enrichment program designed to give entering first-year students an opportunity to strengthen their writing, quantitative, and study skills. This program, which will be in place by Summer 2003, should significantly enhance students’ ability to complete any necessary remediation within one year of entry.

**Indicator 9: University Advancement**

During the three-year period under consideration, the amount of money raised from outside sources and alumni support of the university increased in all categories, but one: voluntary support. As a result, the private fund goal temporarily fell below the 10% minimum in 2000-01. This one-time shortfall was the result of the timing of some gifts; voluntary support for 2001-2002 far exceeds the 10% goal. In addition, the 2000-01 drop-off in voluntary support was more than compensated for by the substantial special revenues raised during that year.
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
November 2002 Accountability Report

Performance Areas: Summary Sheet

1. Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs
   During the last two years, many academic programs at Cal Poly have engaged in an assessment plan development process that is discipline-based, encourages self-reflection and generates useful outcomes. Each program, including General Education, has designated a member of the faculty as the Program Assessment Coordinator with responsibility for leading the assessment development discussions in their program. A university-wide Assessment Council will provide oversight and coordination of all institutional assessment activities and ensuring the use of "best practices and principles" in assessment methodologies.

2. Access to Cal Poly
   Admission to Cal Poly is selective. Undergraduate applications numbered 23,225 for Fall 2001, the most applications processed in the past fourteen years; 10,673 undergraduate applicants were selected and 4,590 enrolled. First-time freshmen represented 73.4% of new undergraduates who enrolled, with an average High School GPA of 3.64 and an average SAT of 1169.

3. Progression to the Degree
   Cal Poly's first to second year retention rates for first-time freshmen has been consistent over the past three years at about 89%, and transfer student retention is at 92%.

4. Persistence and Graduation
   Cal Poly's six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen, at 64%, is consistently the highest in the CSU system. The percentage of the latest cohort of upper division transfer student cohort graduating after fours years is 69%.

5. Areas of Special State Need
   As a polytechnic university, Cal Poly not only emphasizes science and technology-based major programs but also emphasizes science and mathematics education in its teacher education programs with initiatives to increase enrollment, recruitment and outreach efforts; particularly from underrepresented groups.

6. Relations with K-12
   With the support of a FIPSE grant, the Admissions Office expanded its relations with schools through the establishment of a Partners Program between Cal Poly and high schools throughout the state of California that have lower than average numbers of graduates attending college. Combined with broader outreach efforts, the Admissions Office touched 109,133 prospective students, 16,070 actually applied, 7,056 were accommodated, and 2,916 submitted statements of intent to enroll.

Percentage of Eligible FTF Students Math & English Proficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 97</th>
<th>Fall 98</th>
<th>Fall 99</th>
<th>Fall 00</th>
<th>Fall 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Remediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepariedness for College Level English and Mathematics of Freshmen Enrolled One Year Later</th>
<th>Fall 98 to Fall 99</th>
<th>Fall 99 to Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 00-01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTFS fully prepared at entry</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>2,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTFS completing remediation within one year</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTFS prepared</td>
<td>2027</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTFS admitted</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>3,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. **Facilities Utilization**  
One-third of our instruction occurs on a non-traditional schedule. Significant components of this are evenings, Fridays and summer.

9. **University Advancement**  
Cal Poly has marked another record year of support, raising $43,162,232 in donations of cash, property, securities and in-kind gifts from alumni, individuals, foundations and corporations. During the fiscal year, 13 gifts and pledges of $1 million or greater were received. The 2000-2001 contributions top the goal that was set in 1999-2000 and represents more than 25 percent of Cal Poly’s net general fund allocation for the year. The university, in the third year of its Centennial Campaign, is well within reach of its campaign goal of $225 million. As of June 2001, the mid-point of the Campaign, $135 million – or 60 percent – has been raised toward that goal. The campaign’s mission is to raise vital funds for five areas: supporting students, supporting faculty and staff, enhancing learning, enhancing and developing campus facilities and developing state-of-the-art instructional technology and improving the Library.

10. **Quality of Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Programs**  
Cal Poly offers 25 separate programs, 3 joint degree programs and several blended programs that provide for a seamless transition from the baccalaureate to the Master’s program and accelerated progress toward the Master’s degree. Cal Poly’s professional Master's programs have emphasized applied research and preparation for employment, but in some programs a significant number of Master’s graduates continue on to doctoral studies. The average duration of a Master's program is two years. Many programs require completion of a traditional thesis; others offer the alternative of a comprehensive examination or a research project.

11. **Faculty Scholarship and Creative Achievement**  
Cal Poly's commitment to serve as a "Center of Learning" is best demonstrated in the various ways in which our faculty embody the teacher-scholar model. Active engagement in the of scholarship teaching, discovery, integration, and application allows our faculty to maintain currency in their disciplines, infuse their teaching with relevant and professional examples, provide opportunities for students to engage in sustained work on demanding, multifaceted problems in which they learn to define and communicate their own solutions, to develop critical thinking and analytical skills, and to acquire core competencies that are valued by employers.

12. **Service Contributions to Community and Society**  
Approximately twenty-six faculty are formally involved in teaching thirty designated community-based learning courses. Student Community Services engaged twenty-seven student directors in 12,150 hours of volunteer work and leadership of 650 active volunteers and participation with approximately 999 Cal Poly students. The Americorps program involved twenty-seven students in service in partnership with non-profit organizations throughout San Luis Obispo. Many activities were part of student senior projects and enlisted the efforts of classmates as volunteers.

13. **Educational (Institutional) Effectiveness**  
To be defined by 2004.

14. **Cal Poly's Distinctive Identity**  
Characteristics that make Cal Poly distinctive include: polytechnic mission, leadership in preparing students for the workforce needs of a high-tech economy, a “learn-by-doing” educational philosophy that is evidenced by a major-at-entrance, senior projects, extensive internship and co-op programs and applied undergraduate research, residential campus culture and living/learning environment, and an integrated learning culture connecting the liberal arts and sciences with the University’s professional and polytechnic programs.
The School of Education has made every possible effort to meet the special needs of the State of California for teachers. We consistently recommend first time, new-type Multiple-subject, Single-subject, and Special education credentials. We will be able to meet our 2002-03 goals of 125 Multiple-subject, 75 Single-subject, and 45 Special education credentials.

6.1 Relations with K-12

SSU’s faculty and staff from the School of Education are deeply involved in outreach efforts to K-12 schools and students. We currently have around 40 SSU faculty, 400 SSU students, 300 K-12 schools, and 6000 K-12 students involved in programs. We expect these efforts to expand greatly in 2002-03 due to new grant funded programs.

6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen

SSU consistently has slightly over half of our new freshmen fully prepared in Mathematics and between 65% and 75% of our new-freshmen fully prepared in English. Given that the ELM and EPT are given after students are admitted, it is difficult to control for these factors. With continued efforts working with the K-12 sector to reduce the need for remediation, we do hope to meet our 2002-03 goals of 52% fully prepared in Mathematics and 75% fully prepared in English.

7. Remediation

Our goal for 2002-03 is to have 98% of our first-time freshmen fully remediated within one year. Currently that percentage has ranged between 82% and 87%. 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 37%, which is our goal for 2002-03. 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, 37% 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 from the private sector, 20% of university’s state appropriations for the next two fiscal years ($30 million in 2002-03; $34 million in 2003-04). We believe this goal is achievable. The economic conditions of the region, combined with significant changes in staffing within the office, will require our best efforts. Nevertheless, we remain optimistic that we will continue to meet the 20% goal for private funds for this fiscal year and for 2003-04.

---

¹ First-time freshmen that enrolled as full time students during their first semester, fall 1995.
California State University, Stanislaus
November 2002 Accountability Report

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs
   Each campus will provide evidence of progress toward the identification of learning outcomes and the development of a process to assess student learning outcomes at the general education and program levels.

   CSU Stanislaus has been active in addressing assessment of student learning issues since the early 1990s. These efforts have increased over the last five years.
   
   • A revised academic program review pilot has been approved which incorporates assessment and planning into the review process.
   • General education competencies have been developed and the institution is in the process of developing assessments and integrating those measures throughout the curriculum.
   • An inventory of assessment practices of all undergraduate degree programs was undertaken in September 2002. The results of this inventory show that programs have been developing student learning goals. Some of the programs have also developed assessment plans and others are ready to advance to the next stage of implementation, specifically developing specific indicators for the general goal statements as well as plans to collect and analyze data which will be meaningful to faculty in future curriculum development and enhancement. It is anticipated that the programs in the Colleges of Education and Business will successfully meet professional association accreditation standards related to assessment of student learning. In addition, several of the programs in the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences are also preparing for, or already meet, professional accreditation standards in this area.

2. Access to the CSU
   Eligible applicants are guaranteed admission to some CSU campuses.

   All eligible students who applied to CSU Stanislaus over the past three years were admitted.

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

   These data describe regularly-admitted CSU students. For the last three years, one-year continuation rates have averaged 80 percent for first-time freshmen and 82 percent for California Community College transfers. For the last three years, as upper-division students progress toward the degree, junior transfer students averaged 67 semester units, and native freshmen averaged 67 units.

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

   For the past three years, graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen have steadily increased from 47 to 55 percent. The persistence to graduation for California Community College transfer students has also increased from 75 to 79 percent over the same period.

5. Areas of special need
   There is great need in many regions of California for credentialed teachers.

   The numbers of first-time/new type multiple, single subject, and special education credentials issued from CCTC, recommended by CSU Stanislaus (excluding interns), increased from 215 in 1998-99 to 382 in 2000-01. Multiple-subject credentials experienced the largest increase from 144 in 1998-99 to 321 in 2000-01.

6. Relations with K-12
   Although the CSU cannot assume full control of the academic preparation of entering students, our universities can influence the level of preparation.
In mathematics, the percentage of regularly-admitted, first-time freshmen fully prepared was 42 percent in fall 1998, 46 percent in fall 1999, and 44 percent in fall 2000. In English, the percentage of regularly-admitted first-time freshmen fully prepared was 57 percent in fall 1998, 49 percent in fall 1999, and 46 percent in fall 2000.

- The College of Education works in 50 school districts for the Alternative Certification Program.
- Central California Math Project – courses offered through Extended Education for credentialed teachers in the six-county area to improve math-teaching strategies involving 127 teachers from 12 school sites.
- High School Math Access Program that prepares students in mathematics involves 322 students and 12 public school teachers.

7. **Remediation**

_The CSU successfully remediated, within one year, students who are not fully prepared to begin college-level mathematics and English._

Fall 2000 regularly-admitted first-time freshmen requiring some remediation who were successfully remediated one year later totaled 58 percent.

8. **Facilities Utilization**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY 2000-2001</th>
<th>State Supported Course Annual FTES via main campus</th>
<th>State Supported Course Annual FTES via CPEC-approved center at Stockton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Evenings (after 4 p.m.)</td>
<td>1,252.80</td>
<td>281.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Fridays</td>
<td>553.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer breaks)</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Summers</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Distance Learning*</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off-campus centers)</td>
<td>141.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings (add a-f)</td>
<td>2,042.10</td>
<td>319.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Overall instruction in the college year</td>
<td>5,078.60</td>
<td>563.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction (g/h)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These data will first be available in 2001/2002.

9. **University Advancement**

_To support educational excellence, CSU will continue to seek funding through private contributions._

As of June 30, 2001, CSU Stanislaus’ advancement efforts have resulted in raising more than $21.7 million. For fiscal year 2000-2001, projected voluntary support ($1,650,632), pledge commitments ($5,753,924), and additional special revenue ($6,860,237), totaled approximately $14,264,793.

As of June 30, 2002, CSU Stanislaus’ vigorous advancement efforts have resulted in the completion of its first-ever comprehensive campaign, raising more than $25 million. For fiscal year 2001-2002, projected voluntary support ($3,538,161), pledge and testamentary commitments ($2,865,753), and additional special revenue ($7,181,307), totaled approximately $13,585,221.