I. OVERVIEW OF THE LINES OF INQUIRY.

This document identifies ten lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution's report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR-November 28-29, 2018) that may be pursued during the visit. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section IV.

II. COMMENDATIONS.

The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

- Institutional report and overall approach to accreditation both demonstrate widespread institutional reflection within an awareness of the University's context. The report is well organized, written, and structured.
- There has been good progress addressing issues raised in the last WASC review, especially around student success. Mission, description, and core values are clearly defined.
- The institution is fiscally responsible and financially stable. The budgeting process is transparent (expenditures and budget call), all aided by the establishment of the University Budget and Advisory Committee (UBAC).
- The University has a strong statement on diversity with evident commitment throughout the institution. The workforce is a diverse one, reflecting one of the fundamental tenants of the University Mission.
- The team commends the campus for progress in developing the assessment process. Specifically, we note this in the alignment of core competencies, and the assessment progress in the General Education program and for both curricular and co-curricular programs.
- We also commend the campus for recognizing that student success is more than retention, resulting in new initiatives in support of student success in multiple areas.

III. LINES OF INQUIRY.

The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit. The first four Lines of Inquiry concern previous Commission Recommendations. We will be inquiring on your progress regarding each of these areas.

- Campus Climate
- Shared Governance Effectiveness
- Strategic Planning
- Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policies
- We are particularly interested in your progress regarding student success and achievement. How are student success initiatives integrated and tracked to support improved student achievement. What has been the impact of having an interim VP for student affairs and a new VP of Strategic Planning, Enrollment Management, and Innovation (SPEMI) on student success? How is the search for a permanent VP for Student Affairs progressing? Has the interim status and the search itself affected the development assessment overall?
- How close is CSUS to institutionalizing a culture of assessment (standard 2)? That is, how consistently is the collection of evidence (data) used in decision making resulting in improvement in any area of the institution? Can you show evidence of improvement? Do you have evidence that institutional improvement (in any area) has resulted in improved graduation rates?

- The committee is interested in a series of questions related to financial issues. Are there FTTT, FTNTT, or PTF faculty workload issues related to over enrollment? Has there been any change in tenure density and how might this impact the budget going forward? We would like to explore the sustainability of your reserve funds, your strategic plan for deficits, and whether enrollment growth is challenged by the size of the existing facility. What are the possibilities for professional development at CSUS?
- We are interested in exploring your aspirations in the near, medium, and distant future. How might you define them, and how is the community at large involved in these discussions? How is your Strategic Plan aligned with your aspirations? What is the nature of the Strategic Plan and how does it affect and influence the following offices: SPEMI, IR, Budget Office, UBAC, Provost, faculty, and students?
- How do you evaluate the needs of your community in the broadest sense?
- Has there been any change in tenure density, or do you anticipate any change and how might this impact the budget going forward? Are there FTTT, FTNTT, or PTF faculty workload issues related to over enrollment?

IV.   REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION.

The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit:

- **Assessment Reports**. A sample of assessment reports from the following.
  College of AH&SS: Agriculture, Art, Criminal Justice, Ethnic Studies, Political Science, Sociology
  College of Science: Chemistry, Nursing, Psychology
  College of EK&SW: Liberal Studies, Ed.D, Social Work, Teacher Education.
  Master's Degrees: Criminal Justice, English, Genetic Counseling, Marine Science, Social Work and Social Work hybrid.
  College of Business Administration
  Stockton Center: 2-3 reports
  Student Affairs
  Co-curricular departments: Athletics, Career Services, Disability Services, Diversity Center, Academic Success Center, New Student Orientation, Psychological Counseling, Office of Service Learning (OSL), Student Support Services
  Distance learning report
  All other off-site learning location reports
  Business Office
  Access to all Support Unit Reviews

- Book of Trends (hard copies)
- Access to Dashboard as a guest as if inside CSUS.
- Access to CampusLabs and any other on-line assessment tools.
- List of all student organizations
- Five Year Capital Improvement Program
- 2018-19 Budget by Division
- FTE, PT, Assistant, Associate, Full headcount

- We will be selecting individual faculty member for interviews. We would like to have a list of all teaching faculty (including PTNTT and FTNTT). It is our intention to choose 30 from each College and then we will ask you to arrange interviews with six members from each College.
- Graduation Initiative Plan from 2016-17 and 2017-18.
- Any other Student Success Reports that are relevant to our inquiry.
- Tracking reports for transfers and dropouts.
- Minutes from GREAT and from GE learning outcome meetings.
- Assessment reports and closing the loop actions, (access to annual program assessment reports and feedback via CampusLabs); suggest 3 effective departments that are doing assessments particularly well and 3 that are in the emerging phase; program level assessment rubrics and assessment tools and evidence of progress towards assessing core competencies. Number of assessment cycles that have been completed for each program; curricular/program changes implemented as a result of assessments.
- Schedule of all program reviews along with samples of 6 program reviews and specific outcomes (initial or emerging and developed and highly developed); curriculum maps for all programs.
- Assessments of career long-term outcomes of undergraduate and graduate programs.
- Access to all Support Unit Reviews (SUR).

The only written documents and information the team expects before the visit are listed in this section. The team does not expect or invite a written response to any of the questions posed or issues raised in other sections of this form.

V.   INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS TO MEET DURING THE VISIT.
The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit.
- President
- Provost
- Cabinet
- Provost Advisory Council
- University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC)
- Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC)
- GREAT team
- Library
- Senate Executive Committee
- SPEMI Division Leadership Team
- Faculty groups (see above regarding selection of faculty focus groups)
- Staff Council
- Students (undergraduate and graduate)
- Student Leaders (ASI)
- Student Support Services
- Academic Senate
- Academic Administrative Support
- Human Resources Leadership Team
- Academic Department Chairs and Program Directors

- Director of Career Services
- SUR Review Committee
- Program Review Committees
- Director of Institutional Research
- Alumni

In developing the schedule for the visit, the team may identify additional individuals or groups with whom they wish to speak.