California State University, Stanislaus

Institutional Proposal

Prepared for

Western Association of Schools and Colleges
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities

May 2006

Ralph A. Wolff, Executive Director
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Ralph,

As the first year of my presidency concludes, it is evident to me that my early impressions were correct: California State University, Stanislaus has been, and remains, extraordinarily committed to its students and their academic success. This passionate commitment permeates the narrative of the enclosed Institutional Proposal for reaccreditation.

This proposal resulted from a university-wide effort that began more than a year ago. Centered on a core of inquiry questions, the reaccreditation model will provide a dynamic, exciting, and broadly inclusive process for the next two stages of the self-study process. I commend the groups of faculty, staff, and students at CSU Stanislaus who are participating with enthusiasm in this adventure.

The campus reaccreditation process has been led by an eight-member Self Study Team appointed by me and vested with overall leadership responsibility for achieving the highest level of reaccreditation. The team's strength is derived from members who have outstanding interpersonal, organizational, analytical, and communication skills. This same team will continue to lead the campus in the self-study process through the capacity and educational effectiveness phases as we look for ways to improve the quality of student learning and academic excellence. My deepest gratitude is extended to this team of faculty, students, staff, and administrators.

My appreciation is extended also to Dr. Richard Winn, staff liaison to CSU Stanislaus, for his excellent and gracious guidance during the first phase of our reaccreditation process. Through campus visitations and discussions with faculty, staff, and students, Richard has illustrated superbly WASC's genuine desire for the reaccreditation process to be one of value to the campus and one resulting in improved education. I value the opportunity for the campus and external communities to examine our institutional capacity and our achievements relative to educational effectiveness.

I want to express a special appreciation to you, Ralph, for your creativity, energy, and your vision for what WASC could be. You have indeed made WASC into a true partner in the pursuit of excellence in higher education.

In conclusion, I am very proud to send you this Institutional Proposal and want to personally affirm CSU Stanislaus' continued passionate commitment to academic excellence and institutional quality.

With the very best of regards,

Hamid Shirvani
President

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL

CONTENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL

In its *Graduation Rates Outcomes Study* (2005), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) identified twelve state-supported campuses nationwide that demonstrate exceptional performance in retaining and graduating students. California State University, Stanislaus is one of them. Practices that promote and link student engagement and learning form the foundation of the major indicators of success identified by the AASCU study. The AASCU study affirmed a long-held campus perception that student success at CSU Stanislaus is the result of a campus culture that engages faculty with students by creating a sense of community among teachers and learners, complemented by a shared commitment to student success through strong academic support services and an emphasis on learning and personal development. Some of these characteristics emerged during our last self study, *Pathways to Learning* (1998), and helped us to define our campus as a "learning-centered" institution. In the proposed self study, we will explore these characteristics as well as other themes and issues that arose from our last self study, and we will evaluate actions taken as a result of its recommendations. To conduct the self study, campus-wide "Inquiry Circles" will examine our community of learners and our community of teacher-scholars through the prism of *engagement and learning* as reflected in our *Overview of Self-Study Structure* document, 2006 (Appendix A).

SECTION 1 — INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

HISTORY

California State University, Stanislaus is located in Turlock, the heart of the agriculturally rich Central Valley of California, 90 miles east of San Francisco and 80 miles south of Sacramento. The California State University System is the largest public system of higher education in the nation, educating 405,000 and graduating 84,000 students in 2005. The CSU mission is to offer high quality education that is accessible and affordable. Its 23 campuses range from large urban and suburban institutions such as Fullerton, San Jose, Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego to smaller, more regional institutions such as Sonoma, San Marcos, Humboldt, Channel Islands, and Stanislaus. Stanislaus State College was established in 1957 as a small community of 10 faculty and 300 students holding classes in exhibit halls on the Stanislaus County Fairgrounds. The College moved to its current 228-acre site in 1965. In 1985, the renamed California State University, Stanislaus was awarded university status. In 2005, CSU Stanislaus served a student body of 8,137 students (6,254 FTES) in 36 undergraduate majors, 7 post-graduate credentials, and 10 master's programs. CSU Stanislaus is particularly proud of its 10 nationally accredited undergraduate and graduate programs.

Until the mid-nineties, CSU Stanislaus was a commuter campus with no students in residence apart from off-campus apartments (Yosemite Hall). In the early 1990s, CSU Stanislaus made the strategic decision to increase the number of full-time first-year students and to build housing

to accommodate them. Residence Life Village opened for 200 students in 1994 and has grown to a community of more than 600 students in 2005. Fall of 2005 saw the largest first-year student enrollment in CSU Stanislaus' history, in part as a result of the decision to attract a larger percentage of first-year, residential students. This change in the composition of the student body, combined with steadily increased enrollment overall, has produced changes in the way the institution serves students and supports student learning. One example is the increase in the number and variety of co-curricular and student-life activities.

Other changes have been infrastructural: campus facilities have doubled in size in the last decade, with a current building space of approximately one million square feet. New facilities include classrooms, computer laboratories, office space, a recital hall, a center for faculty development, and student support services. New instructional facilities have been built for the unique pedagogy of professional programs, laboratory sciences, and performing arts. Specialized laboratories for music, languages, psychology, and geographic information systems have been created. A major new facility, dedicated in 2002, is the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, a 10,000 square foot center housing a variety of offices that support the faculty. A new science building will open in 2007. To complement this growth, landscaping projects have enhanced a comfortable learning environment that blends utility and aesthetic appeal.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

As it has grown and matured, the campus community has maintained a firm focus on its central mission as a learning-centered institution in service to the communities of the region. The learning-centered theme introduced in the last self study, although open to different interpretations by different constituencies across campus, has become prominent in campus publications and has been adopted by many programs and departments as part of their core identities. The Mission Statement (1996) commits us to "creating a learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative, and social horizons… develop a passion for life-long learning… promote academic excellence in the teaching and learning activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region." In 2005, the Academic Senate added to the campus Mission Statement by adopting a *Vision Statement* and *University Values Statement* (Appendix B). Together, these statements helped to clarify the idea of "learning-centered" and articulate what we mean by "engagement" and "learning."

Our campus consistently receives high marks from students for the quality of interaction and personal contact with faculty, a characteristic facilitated by a low student-faculty ratio, averaging 18 to 1, and a large percentage of full-time faculty (approximately 74% as measured by full-time equivalent faculty). Another factor is a recruiting process that seeks new faculty with demonstrated dedication to teaching and learning in a highly diverse community of learners such as ours. Testimony to the primacy of teaching and learning at CSU Stanislaus is the emphasis placed on excellence in teaching in faculty evaluations for retention, promotion, and tenure. Surveys conducted for the last self study (and since) indicate that CSU Stanislaus students are highly satisfied with the sense of community they feel on campus. They specifically praise the campus atmosphere, small class size, camaraderie of fellow students, and interaction with their professors.

Complementing the primacy of the teaching-learning process, faculty are encouraged to be active teachers-scholars by engaging in research, scholarship, and creative activity. The University averages $10 million in yearly grant revenue, with $14 million in new research grants this past year. The University recently established an annual award that recognizes excellence in research that parallels awards for excellence in teaching and excellence in community service.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY

The size, population, and diversity of the region create a challenge for the University. CSU Stanislaus' six-county service area (Calaveras, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne counties) is slightly larger than the State of Vermont and serves approximately 1.5 million citizens, nearly two and a half times the population of Vermont. In contrast, Vermont has nearly twenty accredited colleges and universities. Our region has only three residential university campuses: CSU Stanislaus, UC Merced, and University of the Pacific.

California State University, Stanislaus serves one of the fastest growing and demographically diverse areas in the country: the San Joaquin Valley. The City of Modesto, seat of Stanislaus County, grew 26% during the 1990s, compared to the State increase of 13.6% over the same period. The three valley counties – San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced – have grown even more explosively since 2000. These three counties have been identified as "permanent residence" for 78% of our current student body. Reflecting the continued growth of the region, enrollment has increased annually since the University's founding – headcounts of 756 in 1965; 3,000 in 1975; 4,300 in 1985; 6,000 in 1995; and more than 8,000 in 2005.

To extend access to students in the Stockton area, 45 miles to the north, the University has been steadily expanding its Stockton campus, established in 1974. California State University, Stanislaus Stockton Center offers upper-division courses and selected programs to transfer and graduate students who reside primarily in San Joaquin County. In Fall 2005, approximately 130 classes were offered and total headcount enrollment reached 1,103, approximately 13% of our total enrollment. On average, about 50% of Stockton students enroll in courses only in Stockton; the other 50% divide their classes between the Stockton and Turlock campuses. Our distance learning program also helps extend access to students throughout the six county area.

UNIVERSITY VALUES

In order to achieve our mission and vision:

❖ We inspire all members of the campus community to demand more of self than we do of others to attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions. We challenge one another to be fully engaged, responsible citizens with the ethics, knowledge, skills, and desire to improve self and community.

❖ We value learning that encompasses lifelong exploration and discovery through intellectual integrity, personal responsibility, global and self-awareness, grounded in individual student-faculty interactions.

❖ We are a student-centered community committed to a diverse, caring, learning-focused environment that fosters collegial, reflective, and open exchange of ideas.

❖ We, as students, create the collegiate experience through initiative, participation, motivation, and continual growth to meet the demands of self and others.

❖ We, as faculty, elicit, nurture, and enhance the different voices of ourselves, students, and communities through deliberate engagement, continual discovery, and ongoing transformation.

❖ We, as staff and administrators, contribute to the learning environment by demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and values that serve and support the University's mission.

A Profile of Our Students

As the surrounding communities have grown larger and more multicultural, the makeup of the student body at CSU Stanislaus has changed accordingly. Consistently over the last decade, more than 50% of Stanislaus graduates have been the first in their families to graduate from college. Many CSU Stanislaus graduates are students returning to higher education after another career or raising a family. The number of students who self-identify as "Caucasian" dropped below 50% in the 1990s, and the number of students of Hispanic origin has steadily increased. In 2003, CSU Stanislaus was recognized as a "Hispanic-Serving Institution" by the U.S. Department of Education. For the past decade, the magazine *U.S. News and World Report* has listed CSU Stanislaus among the top western universities in the country in service to Hispanic students.

Progress since the 1998 Self Study

The theme-based self study of 1996-98 was an inquiry into our identity as a "learning-centered institution." The current self study will address ways in which the University continues its development of "learning-centeredness" by examining how the University increases access, engages students in learning, places a premium on student learning, assesses student learning outcomes, and promotes the development of communities of learners. The WASC Commission letter (1999) commending and endorsing the University's commitment to being "learning-centered" as a core value, drew attention to three areas: the library, faculty roles, and effectiveness strategies.

Library: The Commission commented on the "dated nature of the collection" of the Library, and the impact of that condition on the faculty and students dependent upon it as an essential learning resource. Since the 1998 self study, significant steps have been taken to enhance the collection. Between 1998 and 2001, additional one-time funds were allocated to fill identified gaps in the collection, through targeted book purchasing projects. During the same period, annual base budget and lottery funds for library acquisitions were augmented as well. New library faculty and staff hires since 1998 have abetted this collection development. Since 2003, however, drastic system-wide reductions in the CSU budget have eroded most of those earlier gains. Reductions in the library acquisitions budget have been offset to some degree by increased spending and system-wide support for electronic information resources, as well as by a library faculty and staff that have proved remarkably adept at working within the constraints set by budgetary shortfalls faced by the CSU system over the past three years.

Faculty Roles: Under the broad rubric of faculty roles, the Commission emphasized the need to "develop a clear definition of scholarship and reach some consensus about expectations for faculty research." In 2000, faculty and administration arrived at a broad definition of research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA), and an Academic Senate resolution required each department to elaborate the definition of RSCA more specifically within its own unique disciplinary parameters for retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. The discussion helped promote a new Faculty Workload Agreement (2005), currently being implemented. Because of this agreement, achieved through the work of a task force comprised of administrators and local California Faculty Representatives, the University is able to support scholarship more systematically, as the Commission recommended. The administration has steadily increased support for faculty scholarly activities in many ways, including increased funding for grant and research development, campus grants, faculty professional travel, sabbaticals, supervision of graduate thesis research, and graduate assistantships. The effectiveness of this investment in RSCA will be examined and evaluated as part of our inquiry process.

Effective Assessment Strategies: Lastly, the Commission praised our early stages of developing strategies to assess effectiveness and noted exemplary assessment activities underway, but also recognized that these efforts were not universal and not integrated fully into program review processes. Since the last self study, the University has significantly enhanced data management systems. In 1999, the University expanded its institutional research capacity by hiring a permanent, full-time director and several professional support staff for the Office of Institutional Research. A key charge to the director was the integration of institutional research, planning, and assessment functions. That same year, a faculty member was appointed as Coordinator of Assessment of Student Learning, reporting to the Director of Faculty Development. In 2004, an Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance was appointed to oversee institutional accountability and to coordinate assessment of institutional effectiveness. A revised Academic Program Review process was piloted in 1999 and implemented in 2004. It is now more empirically based and more focused on program effectiveness by demonstrating assessment of student learning goals.

Student Profile at a Glance:

- ❖ 91% commuter students
- ❖ 28% Hispanic
- ❖ 75% undergraduate
- ❖ 60% undergraduate transfer students
- ❖ 67% female
- ❖ 43% Caucasian
- ❖ 63% of graduates remain in six-county region

Similarly, a Support Unit Review process was implemented in 2003. Unique to CSU Stanislaus, the Support Unit Review assesses the quality of administrative offices in light of the University's commitment to learning. An evaluation of the effectiveness of both of these review processes is scheduled during 2007-08, coincident with the self study.

Over the last decade, the University has developed a conceptually strong and proactive assessment program with the following characteristics identified in the *University Assessment Plan,* 1995 (updated 2006):

Assessment data are designed and used in positive ways for improving student learning and institutional effectiveness and are not used to make comparisons among University units.

Working definitions of assessment reflect the University's values and are consonant with the University's *Principles of Assessment of Student Learning,* 2004 (Appendix C).

Priorities for assessment are derived from the University's Mission, relate to the University's strategic goals and priorities, and address WASC accreditation standards.

Assessment activities are incorporated into and are integral to the University's processes and structures.

Decisions are based on multiple indicators of effectiveness and consider the results from both quantitative and qualitative methods.

Results of assessment guide institutional decision-making and are used in institutional planning, evaluation, and resource-allocation processes.

Dissemination of assessment efforts and results is planned and implemented.

Appropriate resources are provided in terms of expertise, time, and money to promote assessment activities – both for university-wide activities and unit-specific assessment efforts.

Technology: Not mentioned in the Commission letter, but identified in our 1998 self study and echoed in the Site Visit Report, was the need to develop and implement a comprehensive plan for providing and maintaining adequate computer resources for faculty and students. The Academic Technology Plan (2003), developed with broad campus involvement, was designed to improve technological support. Due to the budget reductions of the past three years, campus resources were not available for full implementation of the plan. Funds from the CSU System office earmarked for technology, grants, and lottery funds have contributed to progress in areas of highest priority described in the technology plan.

The University is expressly committed to improvement in all four of the above areas. All four are addressed in detail in the design of the self study.

THE ACCREDITATION MODEL

What follows is the heart of our self study: the thematic model of the self study that guides our inquiry into educational excellence. The model focuses the self-study through the prism of *engagement and learning* organized around two broad themes of utmost importance to CSU Stanislaus' mission: communities for learning and communities for teaching and scholarship. Each of these two themes is then organized into two inquiry questions. These inquiries are guided by elements identified during the campus development of this model, including a review of the WASC standards. Examples of evidence accompany the inquiry questions. The four inquiry questions will be addressed by Inquiry Circles comprised of members of the campus community who will serve as the principal investigators throughout the self-study process. This model provides a structure for the campus to reflect, collect data, analyze quantitative and qualitative data, draw conclusions, make recommendations, and take action for improvement.

PRISM: ENGAGEMENT AND LEARNING

THEME I: COMMUNITIES FOR LEARNING

1. How effectively does the University engage a highly diverse student population in learning?

2. How effectively does the University infrastructure support learning?

THEME II: COMMUNITIES FOR TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP

3. How effectively does the University create and sustain a community of faculty committed to teaching and learning?

4. How effectively does the University support research, scholarship, and creative activities (RSCA) appropriate to its mission?

The term "community" is used here in a broad sense. Although CSU Stanislaus is not organized by formal "learning communities" – as is the case with some universities (UC Santa Cruz or CSU Monterey Bay, for example) – some curricular, student support, and co-curricular activities on campus have been developed following this model. Nevertheless, within our more traditional organization there has been a serendipitous uniting of teachers and learners formed around disciplines, learning sites (Stockton Center and distance learners, e.g.), group identity, interdisciplinary opportunity, and co-curricular activities. Varying models of community activity will be considered.

By "engagement" we refer to the values, behaviors, and strategies that attract and hold students' attention and motivate them to become involved actively in the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and understanding through educational experiences. We recognize that "engagement" is an abstract quality, one not easily measured; nevertheless, we consider "engagement" to be a key factor in teaching and learning.

By "diverse" we mean not only representation of various ethnic groups (religious, racial, national, or cultural) but also socioeconomic class, gender, age, sexual orientation, and disability. A second dimension of diversity concerns the characteristics of the academic community: respect, collegiality, cooperation among groups, learning environment, and support for diversity. A third dimension of diversity concerns the extent to which group differences are recognized and affirmed by the University (adapted from *WASC Statement on Diversity*, 1994).

1. How effectively does the University engage a highly diverse student population in learning?

One of the distinctive features of CSU Stanislaus – one for which we enjoy a national reputation and in which we take pride – is the "successful engagement" of our constituents in higher education, especially those students from communities that have not traditionally attended college.

This question explores the nature of "engagement," examining the characteristics of best practices for engaging students successfully, achieving learning outcomes, teaching for diverse learners, and applying assessment processes.

The following are examples of topics that will be addressed by the "Student Engagement Inquiry Circle."

  a. How well do we assess the quality of student learning in programs offered on campus, off-campus, and in blended formats? What evidence do we have?

  b. What specific evidence indicates a direct correlation between engagement and learning?

  c. What are some "communities of learners" that have been most effective in engaging our students in learning? What part does "creating a sense of community" play in this engagement?

  d. How has the development of the general education curriculum been informed by the linkage between engagement and student achievement?

  e. Are there differences in collegiate experiences and outcomes for communities of learners if those communities are defined in terms of learning outcomes such as performance-based (fine arts, e.g.), practice-based (education, e.g.), and exploration-based (philosophy, e.g.) learning?

  f. Are there differences in collegiate experiences and outcomes for communities of learners if those communities are defined by ethnicity, affinity, or other identity?

  g. Should CSU Stanislaus be more deliberate in fostering a sense of "community" in our learners, both in the way the curriculum is developed and deployed, as well as in supporting the more spontaneous communities that form?

  h. What are some common characteristics of the "best practices" of successful student engagement in learning?

The following are examples of evidence that will be examined by the Inquiry Circle.

Academic Program Reviews

Aggregate student evaluations of courses

Data on student readiness to learn – Mathematics and English tests/numbers in remedial courses

Data on undergraduates and transfers (graduation rates, writing proficiency scores, time to degree)

Student learning outcomes assessments (by department and program)

Student-faculty ratios

Support Unit Reviews

System, institutional, and department student surveys

2. HOW EFFECTIVELY DOES THE UNIVERSITY INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT LEARNING?

The last self study was an inquiry into CSU Stanislaus as a "learning-centered institution." One commitment made in that self study was to focus all academic and support units on the central goals of facilitating, assessing, and improving the quality of student learning while maximizing student access across the University's region.

This question addresses the key organizations within the University infrastructure that enable, support, and enhance student learning, with special focus on how staff, students, faculty, and administration are engaged in a sense of community dedicated to common goals. In response to the recommendations from the WASC Commission, special focus will be given to the Library and the Office of Information Technology.

The following are examples of topics that will be addressed by the "Learning Support Inquiry Circle."

a. What are the key organizations within the University infrastructure that support teaching and student engagement and success in learning?

b. How do the infrastructure and enabling systems improve the effectiveness of the University?

c. How effective are the processes that assess the quality of support systems?

d. How do staff, students, faculty, and administrators develop and engage in their own sense of community, and how well are support communities integrated into the campus community as a whole?

e. How have staff and faculty hiring patterns responded to the growth and diversity of the campus?

f. How well has the University integrated its academic learning and student development?

g. How well has the University fostered the development of technology in support of the academic mission?

h. How well has the University supported the Library as a resource for teaching and learning?

The following are examples of evidence that will be examined by the Inquiry Circle.

Academic Program Reviews

Academic Technology Plan

Budget

College and program accreditation reports

Faculty development plan

Strategic Plan

Support Unit Reviews

System, University, and WASC surveys

University Assessment Plan

University organization chart

3. HOW EFFECTIVELY DOES THE UNIVERSITY CREATE AND SUSTAIN A COMMUNITY OF FACULTY COMMITTED TO TEACHING AND LEARNING?

CSU Stanislaus, identifying itself as a "learning-centered institution," has a major commitment to foster, support, and reward excellence in teaching. Serving a highly diverse (and in some ways "non-traditional") student body requires teachers who are especially suited and dedicated to the mission.

This question will address how the University attracts, recruits, retains, develops, and rewards those individuals who are successful in engaging students in learning, and how the University establishes a particular academic environment – "a sense of community" – among a diverse assembly of teacher-scholars.

The following are examples of topics that will be addressed by the "Teaching and Learning Inquiry Circle."

   a. How effectively do we monitor and assess the quality of our teaching and learning in programs offered on campus, off-campus, and in blended formats?

   b. How well does the University create a sense of a "teacher-scholar" community among faculty members in six colleges and more than thirty departments?

   c. What are the special characteristics of the Stanislaus faculty? Is diversity of the faculty a positive factor in the teaching-learning process on campus?

   d. How do we attract, recruit, develop, retain, and reward those individuals most dedicated to working within our learning-centered mission?

   e. How is "teaching and learning" placed clearly at the center of the mission? What is the role of the scholarship of teaching and learning?

   f. What are some of the successful strategies regarding teaching and learning that have been most effective in engaging our faculty in student learning? Are some of these related to creating a sense of community among teachers and learners?

   g. How do advances within the disciplines in teaching and learning affect the delivery of the general education curriculum?

   h. How effectively does the faculty engage the diversity of the student population and the region, and how does this diversity enhance engagement?

The following are examples of evidence that will be examined by the Inquiry Circle.

   Academic Program Reviews

   Data on distance-learning faculty

   Data on gender, ethnic identity

   Data on global learning goals

   Department and college accreditation reports

   Faculty development activities focused on learning

   Faculty surveys

   Aggregate student evaluations of courses

   Policies on diversity

   Educational and personnel policies

4. HOW EFFECTIVELY DOES THE UNIVERSITY SUPPORT RESEARCH, SCHOLARSHIP, AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (RSCA) APPROPRIATE TO ITS MISSION?

One of the key questions concerning our community of teachers at CSU Stanislaus is the role of research, scholarship, and creative activities. Our 1998 self study indicated the need for a campus-wide definition of "scholarship." It also, given the learning-centered mission of the University, called for consistent practices in gauging the quality and value of RSCA.

This question addresses our progress toward according the appropriate value, support, and reward for this range of activities. The dynamics of the three traditional areas of faculty activity – teaching, scholarship, and service – are changing within the CSU, and how the University responds to these changes is a key factor in the success of our mission.

The following are examples of topics that will be addressed by the "RSCA Inquiry Circle."

a. How effectively do we self-assess our support for RSCA?

b. How has the University defined research, scholarship, and creative activities within the mission of the university as a learning-centered institution?

c. How effectively do we support RSCA in terms of infrastructure, scheduling, funding, access to materials, the library, and technological support?

d. How effectively do we value, recognize, and reward RSCA?

e. How has the University responded to the changing relationship among teaching, scholarship, and service – the three areas evaluated in the retention, promotion, and tenure process?

f. How do research, scholarship, and creative activities inform and improve the teaching and learning processes (such as curricular changes, or student involvement in faculty research)?

The following are examples of evidence that will be examined by the Inquiry Circle.

Data on faculty research, scholarship, and creative activities

Data on grants and contracts

Department elaborations

Faculty awards

Faculty workload agreement

Number of workshops in Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Money, time invested (direct and indirect) toward faculty RSCA

Retention, promotion, and tenure policies and data

Section 2 — Description of Outcomes and Workplan

Outcomes for the Entire Review Process

California State University, Stanislaus expects to achieve the following verifiable outcomes for the overall self-study process. Also presented in this section are the workplans for the capacity and preparatory and educational effectiveness stages of the reaccreditation process, each accomplished through widespread participation by the campus community.

1. Systematic engagement of the faculty in reflective discussions of university effectiveness, focusing on issues central to teaching and learning. *Verification:* Documentation of participation by Inquiry Circles, by Academic Senate and other faculty governance committees, students, administration, staff, and advisory boards.

2. Increased understanding of the relationship between engagement of students in learning and student learning outcomes and an alignment of faculty support systems to develop and reward effective pedagogy. *Verification:* Documentation through an accreditation model in which the University conducts an inquiry of its effectiveness and implements its findings to improve support systems for faculty.

3. Increased sophistication and precision of assessment of student learning and demonstration of appropriate assessment practices – including direct evidence – for improving programs and institutional practices. *Verification:* Documentation of the use of more, varied, and effective direct methods for assessing student learning.

4. Refinement of a strategic planning process that more effectively identifies priorities and uses indicators to improve institutional quality. *Verification:* Documentation of a strategic plan that identifies, implements, and evaluates University priorities, core indicators of quality, and quality assurance processes.

Outcomes and Workplan for Capacity and Preparatory Review

The Capacity and Preparatory Review site visit is scheduled for fall 2008, with the self-study report due three months prior (July to September 2008). The following identifies outcomes, the workplan, and entities accountable for implementing actions for this stage of review.

1. Demonstration of institutional core commitment to capacity and preparatory review. *Workplan:*

   a. Describe improvements made in response to concerns raised by the WASC Commission in 1999 (Administration and Faculty Governance, depending on issue).

   b. Conduct a formal review of the four WASC standards and criteria for review (Self-Study Team).

   c. Identify any special capacity issues resulting from the review and take actions to address these issues (Administration and Faculty Governance, depending on issue).

2. Refinement of a sustainable institutional research infrastructure and service delivery. *Workplan:*

   a. Conduct Support Unit Review of Office of Institutional Research (Administration).

   b. Implement actions to refine institutional research, especially in support of student learning (Administration).

3. Refinement of institutional capacity and organizational structures and systems for quality assurance. *Workplan:*

   a. Conduct Support Unit Review of Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance (Administration).

   b. Conduct Support Unit Review of Office of Academic Programs (Administration).

   c. Conduct review of the Support Unit Review process (Assessment Leadership Team).

   d. Conduct review of the Academic Program Review process (Administration).

   e. Conduct an external evaluation of the University's assessment processes (Administration).

   f. Implement actions to improve quality as derived from the above reviews (Administration).

4. Refinement of support and systems for enhancing faculty development. *Workplan:*

   a. Conduct Support Unit Review of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and its associated Office of Assessment of Student Learning and the Faculty Development Committee (Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning).

   b. Implement actions to refine and enhance faculty development (Administration).

5. Refinement of critical infrastructural support of teaching and learning by the Library and information technology. *Workplan:*

   a. Conduct Support Unit Review of the Library (Administration).

   b. Conduct Support Unit Review of Office of Information Technology (Administration and Faculty Governance).

   c. Implement instructional technology elements of the Academic Technology Plan (Administration).

   d. Implement actions to enhance the Library and instructional technology as learning resources (Administration).

6. Development of increased capacity in areas identified by the Inquiry Circles. *Workplan:*

   a. Implement actions resulting from the inquiries (Administration and Faculty Governance).

OUTCOMES AND WORKPLAN FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

The Educational Effectiveness site visit is requested for scheduling 18 months after the Capacity and Preparatory Review (spring 2010), with the self-study report due three months prior (November 2009 to February 2010). The following outcomes and workplan are anticipated for this stage of review:

1. Demonstration of institutional core commitment to educational effectiveness. *Workplan:*

   ### Undergraduate and Graduate Programs

   a. Increase the number of faculty participating in development programs related to direct measures of the achievement of student learning (Faculty).

   b. Increase use of effective direct methods of student learning in the major and use of these assessment results for improving student learning in undergraduate and graduate programs (Faculty).

   ### General Education

   c. Create a curriculum matrix that identifies and tracks the introduction and reinforcement of each of the general education learning goals throughout lower and upper division general education coursework (Faculty).

   d. Assess student achievement and levels of attainment within the general education learning goals by increasing use of direct methods (Faculty).

   e. Evaluate the effectiveness of the organizational and support structures for general education and take appropriate actions for improvement (Faculty and Administration).

   ### Co-curricular

   f. Increase sophistication of assessment of student learning goals achieved through co-curricular and student affairs programming (Administration, Faculty, and Students).

   g. Increase use of assessment findings in student affairs to facilitate student success in attaining educational goals (Administration, Faculty, and Students).

2. Improvement of quality in areas identified by the Inquiry Circles. *Workplan:*

   a. Implement actions resulting from the inquiries (Faculty and Administration).

3. Refinement of core indicators of educational quality in support of educational effectiveness. *Workplan:*

   a. Assess use of core indicators for improving educational quality (Faculty and Administration).

   b. Refine, as necessary, core indicators of educational quality (Faculty and Administration).

Section 3 — Constituency Involvement

The New WASC Standards and Process

Preparation for the self study (2004-2010) process began in fall 2004 with discussions among campus leaders, department chairs, and governance groups of the new WASC Standards and reaccreditation process. This was followed by 17 campus leaders attending the WASC Workshop in January 2005. Also, as a means to begin constituency involvement at the outset of the process, the University organized two campus visits for Dr. Richard Winn, the WASC staff liaison, during 2004 and 2005.

A preliminary review was used by various faculty, students, staff, and administrative groups on campus to make a holistic assessment of perceptions within the context of the WASC Standards. The highest overall ratings appeared in Standards One and Three. Opinion was consistent that the areas most urgent for attention included:

CFR 1.2   (recognition of educational objectives and indicators)

CFR 2.8   (promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity)

CFR 3.3   (faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation)

CFR 3.6   (library and information resources)

CFR 3.7   (information technology resources)

CFR 4.3   (planning processes informed by evidence)

As part of the University's normal structures, and as part of the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the University will investigate any areas of critical divergence among faculty, administration, and student groups, and identify further action necessary to address these areas of greatest challenge.

Leadership for Reaccreditation

The President and Provost are leading the University to the highest level of quality and are fully committed to the reaccreditation process. The President organized a self-study leadership team that will work through existing campus infrastructures for strategic planning and faculty governance. The only new entities to be created for preparation of the report will be the Self-Study Team and the Inquiry Circles, formed to address specific inquiry questions in the self study. The analysis, conclusions, and recommendations derived from the work of the Inquiry Circles will be sent to existing governance committees and administration for appropriate action.

The Self-Study Team is comprised of eight dedicated campus leaders: the Accreditation Liaison Officer (Vice Provost), Faculty Coordinator and Senior Editor (English faculty), Assessment Coordinator (Psychology faculty), Faculty Development Coordinator (Teacher Education faculty), Non-Instructional Leader for Campus Conversations (Director of the Educational Opportunity Program and Retention Services), Student Leader for Campus Conversations named by Associated Students, Inc. (Political Science, undergraduate), Principal Writer (English faculty), and Reaccreditation Coordinator (Office of Academic Programs).

Constituency Involvement in Institutional Proposal

Campus consultation was widespread for preparing the Institutional Proposal. Members of the Self-Study Team visited twenty campus committees in Spring 2005 to listen to the observations and suggestions of faculty, staff, students, administration, and advisory groups regarding the self-study process, themes, and topics. The Team examined documents refining and elaborating the University mission, vision, and values that had been developed through campus strategic planning during 2003-2005 and administered the WASC Preliminary Self-Review between Fall 2004 and Spring 2006.

In the Summer of 2005, the Self-Study Team, considering responses from the committees, from mission and strategic planning documents, from the 1998 self study, and from WASC standards and Self-Review, created a menu of themes and inquiry questions. This draft was distributed to faculty, staff, administration, and student officers through electronic and print media. Team members revisited campus governance committees, totalling more than 200 people, in Fall 2005 for reactions and suggestions.

During Winter and Spring 2006, the draft of the Institutional Proposal was shared with the faculty, students, staff, and administration at large. Input from campus constituencies was sought concerning the content and process of the self study. This extensive consultation resulted in the selection of an overriding prism, two themes, the four inquiry questions, and the inquiry circle organization as presented in Section 1, to create campus Inquiry Circles to address the four inquiry questions.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Coincident with the development of this Institutional Proposal, the University embarked on a new phase of strategic planning. Building on a decade of success in strategic planning at California State University, Stanislaus, President Hamid Shirvani invited the campus community to join together in commitment and action for moving the University to the next level of accomplishment and excellence.

As a means to assess the University's current strategic position, a Strategic Planning Forum examined institutional research data, the results of environmental scans, and college academic program plans. The draft *Strategic Plan: Framing the Future*, 2006 (Appendix D) identifies institutional priorities, supported by specific strategic actions and methods for demonstrating effectiveness and quality. Broad categories for priorities include creating a center for intellectual pursuit, developing a university known for student access and academic achievement, and joining the community in building the region. The document frames the future of California State University, Stanislaus in ways that preserve its traditions and essential character as a learning centered institution.

The Plan will be implemented in 2006/07, led by the Provost, and monitored by the President and the President's Executive Cabinet. The budgetary process will be redesigned to ensure a direct link to the strategic plan and the allocation of specific revenue sources to support the stated priorities. The Office of Institutional Research will provide ongoing assessment of the strategic actions, and campus leaders will provide annual reports to the President about the effectiveness of the actions and the quality of outcomes. The Provost will summarize accomplishments and assessment outcomes for presentation to the campus community.

The WASC self-review process and the implementation of the Strategic Plan are complementary; indeed, several members of the Self-Study Team are integral to the development of the Strategic Plan.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN THE SELF STUDY

The campus Assessment Plan states that "students are partners with the faculty, staff, and administration in the learning process." The University systematically conducts assessments in which students' participation is central; for example, measuring student learning outcomes in the major and general education, submitting course and program evaluations, and conducting student satisfaction surveys. Recently, student government has been an active partner in the drafting of *principles and values* for campus assessment documents and in increasing the use of direct methods for evaluating student work, such as capstone courses, portfolios, and performance-based exams.

Students will participate in the self-study process in the following ways:

A student representative serves as a permanent member of the Self-Study Team.

Two students will serve on each of the four Inquiry Circles (eight in all).

Student representatives (undergraduate and graduate) who serve on the Assessment Leadership Team will help to develop and conduct surveys in support of the Inquiry Circles.

Students will participate actively in each of the academic program and support unit reviews conducted during the self-study process.

Graduate students in selected disciplinary courses on assessment will help to develop and conduct direct methods of assessment.

CONSTITUENCY INVOLVEMENT IN THE SELF STUDY

The following groups will be involved in the development and internal review of the implementation of the self study and share accountability for ensuring the effectiveness of the process and the achievement of outcomes:

❖ President and Executive Cabinet

❖ Provost and Academic Deans

❖ Self-Study Team

❖ Inquiry Circles

❖ Department Chairs and faculty at large

❖ Academic Senate and governance committees

❖ Staff Council and staff at large

❖ Associated Students, Inc. and students at large

❖ Alumni

❖ President's Advisory Boards

INQUIRY CIRCLES

The Self-Study Team has created Inquiry Circles as a method to organize discussions and actions for its self study during the next two stages. Inquiry Circles superficially resemble "quality circles," a method in corporate settings utilizing employee participation to improve the organization's processes, quality, and profit. Inquiry Circles retain the focus on improvement of quality and processes, employee creativity and participation, and institutional accountability. However, Inquiry Circles shift from an emphasis on business productivity as a measure of quality to an emphasis on the University's ability to evaluate the quality of teaching and learning.

Inquiry Circles will begin meeting in fall 2006 and continue through the completion of the self study and campus site visits. Composed of cross-division membership (approximately 5 faculty, 2 staff, 2 students, and 1 administrator), Inquiry Circles rely on their members' creativity and differing perspectives to analyze our current status and recommend improvements. A member of the Self-Study Team will work in an advisory and resource capacity for each of the four Inquiry Circles, and the Self-Study Team has drafted a *Manual*, 2006, to guide the Inquiry Circles in their work, the Table of Contents for which has been appended (Appendix E). Included in Appendix E is a chart showing how the WASC CFRs are organized by inquiry themes. The work of the Inquiry Circles will be disseminated widely in order that the broader campus community may inform discussions, respond to drafts, and participate in actions resulting from the assessment of institutional quality.

Section 4 — Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review

Inquiry Circles will address the University's core commitment to capacity, answering the inquiry questions in light of the WASC standards. The structure and work of the Inquiry Circles will ensure documented outcomes within prescribed timelines. Each Inquiry Circle will be provided possible sites of inquiry and evidence; these necessarily will evolve as the Inquiry Circles elaborate their work and prepare for the review of educational effectiveness. The Inquiry Circles will document and disseminate their deliberations and prepare draft reflective essays. Reflection, honest appraisal, and creativity are essential for Inquiry Circles to succeed.

For the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the Inquiry Circles will complete the following tasks:

1. Determine how to approach the Inquiry Question and whether sufficient institutional data exist to answer it.

2. Review the self-review of the standards data for areas of concurrence, discrepancy, and priority.

3. Review the inquiry question in light of the WASC standards and determine which of the Criteria for Review are most urgent and applicable.

4. Focus discussion and inquiry on 4 to 6 Criteria for Review specific to the inquiry question as part of the Capacity Review and for transition to the Educational Effectiveness Review.

5. Review pertinent elements of the Strategic Plan as related to the inquiry question and report on progress.

6. Review existing data and exhibits related to the standards.

7. Identify additional data and exhibits necessary for evaluating institutional capacity.

8. Work with Institutional Research to secure these data and exhibits.

9. Identify the actions necessary to address key areas of concern for capacity improvement based on a review of evidence.

10. Draft reflective essays that become part of the narrative for the self-study document.

Governance committees and administrative leadership will receive the work of the Inquiry Circles and take appropriate action to enhance institutional capacity as related to the outcomes identified for the capacity and preparatory review. Faculty and student governance committees and administrative leadership work in concert to achieve the stated outcomes.

Structure of the Self Study for the Capacity Review

The self study will be organized by reflective essays. The self study will include essays of introduction, previous WASC Commission areas for development, the four inquiry questions, and integration. The introductory essay will describe the process and parameters related to the investigation of the inquiry question by defining terms, placing the inquiry within the CSU Stanislaus context, and describing the multiple assessment methods for demonstrating core commitment. The essays for the four inquiry questions will summarize findings, illustrate what has been learned about the capacity to support learning, and describe actions to be taken for improvement.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review self study as a whole will include what we have learned, and what we intend to do, in the following areas:

✦ organizational structures and decision making processes

✦ mission, purposes, and policies

✦ capacity/infrastructure to support teaching linked to student learning

✦ support for academic programs, library, and instructional technology

✦ direct methods for assessing student learning

✦ use of assessment to improve learning and the university

✦ core resources for students, faculty, staff, and administration

✦ resources and support for diversity

✦ data gathering and quality assurance systems

The Integrative Essay for Capacity and Preparatory Review will integrate the inquiries and outcomes of the four Inquiry Circles, feature student learning through "spotlights" on excellence, summarize our accomplishments of stated intended outcomes, and conclude with any modifications anticipated for the educational effectiveness review.

Section 5 — Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

The work of the Inquiry Circles will continue and intensify through the Educational Effectiveness Review, moving from an examination of capacity and process to one of evaluation of educational quality. The Capacity and Preparatory Review is designed to allow the Inquiry Circles to narrow the trajectory of their inquiries for a more in-depth focus for the Educational Effectiveness Review. For the Educational Effectiveness Review, the Inquiry Circles will complete the tasks described above in Section 4, as appropriate, and will document their deliberations and accomplishments in draft essays.

Faculty Program Assessment Coordinators will oversee the assessment of actual student work in their respective departments with general oversight by the Assessment Council. Data provided by the Assessment Council will be provided to the Inquiry Circles to gauge student achievement through undergraduate and graduate programs and general education.

As was the case for the Capacity Review, governance committees and administrative leadership will receive the work of the Inquiry Circles and take appropriate action to evaluate and improve educational quality and institutional effectiveness. Faculty and student governance committees and administrative leadership work in concert to achieve the stated outcomes.

The Educational Effectiveness self study as a whole will include what we have learned about quality, and what we intend to do, in the following areas:

- ✦ student learning
- ✦ educational objectives
- ✦ core indicators
- ✦ diversity
- ✦ quality assurance processes
- ✦ co-curricular learning
- ✦ teaching and learning
- ✦ research, scholarship, and creative activity
- ✦ resources to support learning
- ✦ learning environment

Section 6 — Workplan and Milestones

The workplan for each of the outcomes is identified in Section 2, Description of Outcomes and Workplan.

Section 7 — Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

This section briefly describes the University's assessment efforts; a more detailed narrative is provided in *Overview of Assessment at CSU Stanislaus*, 2006 (Appendix F). Over the past decade, California State University, Stanislaus evaluated its data gathering and analysis systems, its institutional research capacity, and its quality assurance processes. A more formal plan for periodic assessment of our processes was initiated in 2003. These periodic reviews include both internal and external evaluations. Internal evaluations include the Academic Program Review and the Support Unit Review, and those resulting from disciplinary accreditation. External reviews include those conducted by invited experts in the field, the next of which is scheduled for 2007.

These internal and external reviews examine the University's structures and resources in support of assessment, progress in enhancing the number and quality of assessment methods, documented uses of assessment information for improving student learning and institutional quality, campus values related to assessment, and perceptions of the quality of the assessment program. The Assessment Leadership Team will examine recommendations from these reviews, report findings to the campus community, and initiate actions as appropriate.

The process of educating the campus community about assessment and using this information to improve the University's assessment systems and outcomes began more formally in the mid-1990s by sending teams of faculty, students, administrators, and staff to workshops and conferences concerned with assessment. Several structural changes occurred as a result of the last self study and the University's recognition of its own needs for evidence-based decision making. The most fundamental of these changes occurred in 2002 as the result of a series of meetings organized by the Provost to find broad consensus among faculty and administration on two critically important issues: clarifying methods used to assess institutional quality, and delegating responsibility – from the individual instructor of a course to the President – for activities encompassed by these methods. This agreement led to two documents: *Ten Methods to Examine Institutional Effectiveness*, 2005 (Appendix G), and *Who's Responsible for What*, 2005 (Appendix H).

Through the discussions leading to the creation of these documents and the *Principles of Assessment of Student Learning* (2004), the University (a) affirmed the importance of assessment practices in effective education,

(b) recognized the primary role of faculty in developing and implementing assessment measures, (c) distinguished assessment of student learning from faculty evaluation, and (d) privileged the formative aspect of assessment for learning and for enhancement of teaching and learning.

STRUCTURES FOR SUPPORTING STUDENT LEARNING

In 2004, an assessment of organizational outcomes in the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment revealed that the myriad and complex functions associated with these areas were being diluted. As a result, the University restructured the office into two separate offices: The Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance and the Office of Institutional Research. Connections among research, planning, and assessment remain fundamental to the University's effectiveness, and the two restructured offices work closely to support assessment activities throughout the University. This structure has increased institutional capacity for assessment by increasing support staff and revenue in support of the assessment of student learning at the departmental level.

Similarly, the University has increased its institutional research capacity, especially in support of the faculty's assessment of student learning. The Office of Institutional Research has redefined institutional research at CSU Stanislaus as an analytical process and distinguishes it from mere data collection.

Complementing these offices, the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning gathers together support offices in service learning, mediated instruction and distance learning, and the Office of Assessment of Student Learning. The Office supports faculty development in the assessment of student learning, building the quality of indirect methods traditionally used, and promoting a wider variety of direct methods to assess student learning. Aided by the faculty director for the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning and the faculty coordinator for assessment, the Assessment of Student Learning subcommittee develops faculty driven policies and procedures for the promotion and support of assessment at the classroom and program level.

The University established an Assessment Leadership Team to engage the campus community in discussions on assessment topics and suggest appropriate actions in Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Business and Finance, and University Advancement.

ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING

At CSU Stanislaus, faculty assess student learning with the department as the primary focus, a primacy reflected in Academic Senate actions over the past decade. The administrative offices noted above assist in the design and logistical support of faculty efforts in this area and help correlate and make meaningful the process and its outcomes.

The core mechanism for evaluating the quality of academic programs and student learning is the Academic Program Review, revised in 2004. The reviews now require systematic, evidence-based reporting by programs on the following aspects of assessment: mission, program goals, student learning outcomes, curriculum map, use of findings to improve student learning, and program effectiveness. As programs pass through the seven-year review cycle, these elements of program assessment are updated and reviewed, and current versions will be published on the university's website.

Each academic program has identified student learning goals. Some programs already are adept at complementing indirect measures with direct examination of student work, such as portfolios and performances in capstone courses and departmental examinations of student work outside the context of individual courses. The priority for program assessment of student learning is to employ a wider variety of direct methods.

Recently, Program Assessment Coordinators (PAC) were designated by their department chairs and deans to work closely with departmental faculty to incubate and refine assessment practices. These coordinators come together as an Assessment Council to share information on effective assessment practices, to exchange techniques for direct assessment methods, to review the scholarship of teaching and assessment, and to support the improvement of departmental assessment.

In addition to student learning goals in the programs, achievement in seven General Education goals is required for graduation. The faculty effectively conduct periodic assessment of the program goals and structures of the general education program. The faculty initiated the Summit General Education program in 2001, built around upper-division clusters, and incorporated assessment into its three-year pilot phase. Faculty are committed to a General Education program cultivating knowledge, skills, and values that are characteristic of a learned person; however, assessment of student learning goals through General Education requires substantial development and greater specificity. The faculty recognize this need and have begun to consider an organizational structure to oversee and assess General Education.

Similarly, the University has established six learning goals for graduate students. The program faculty and the Graduate Council continually assess the effectiveness of student achievement of these goals.

In summary, CSU Stanislaus has responded to WASC's recommendation to develop "modes of assessing progress" by increasing institutional capacity to gather evidence for its commitment to learning.

SECTION 8 — INSTITUTIONAL DATA PORTFOLIO

The *Institutional Data Portfolio*, 2006, is attached (Appendix I) and will be available through the University website. Data are presented in three general areas: WASC-prescribed elements, CSU Accountability Report Quality Indicators, and CSU Stanislaus Core Indicators of Educational Quality.

Knowledge gained during the collection and analysis of these data will be disseminated widely, discussed in normal venues of campus governance, and used to improve institutional and educational quality.

SECTION 9 — OFF-CAMPUS AND DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREE PROGRAMS

Distance learning at California State University, Stanislaus consists of courses broadcast by ITFS (one-way visual; two-way audio) and cable television from Turlock and received at the Stockton Center, the Merced Tri-College Center, and the Tuolumne County Office of Education in Sonora. Additionally, courses are offered by CODEC videoconferencing (two-way audio and visual) originating from Turlock or the Stockton Center. Televised courses represent one of the strategies that the University uses to extend accessibility to students in the six-county region. The University offers only a few courses online.

Currently, only one department offers 50% or more of its baccalaureate program through instructional television, approved pre-1989: History.

Departments with 50% or more of their baccalaureate programs available on-site through the Stockton Center, each approved pre-1989, include Child Development, Criminal Justice, History, Liberal Studies, Psychology, and Social Sciences. Graduate programs are Master of Arts in Education (concentrations in Administration and Supervision, Multilingual Education, and Reading), Master of Public Administration, and Master of Social Work.

Departments with 50% or more of their baccalaureate programs available through instructional television and on-site through the Stockton Center, each approved pre-1989, are Communication Studies and Nursing.

Assessment of the Stockton Center and distance education programs are conducted every five years through the University's Support Unit Review. A Support Unit Review of the Stockton Center occurred in 2004-05, and the Office of Information Technology, including Mediated and Distance Learning, is scheduled for 2006-07. The quality of student learning for programs offered through instructional television and on site at the Stockton Center is assessed through the Academic Program Review by each participating department. The findings of these reviews will be incorporated into the institutional self study as part of the deliberations of the Inquiry Circles.

INSTITUTIONAL STIPULATION STATEMENT
TO THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

California State University, Stanislaus will use the review process to demonstrate our fulfillment of the two Core Commitments, that it will engage in the process with seriousness and candor, that data presented are accurate, and that the Institutional Presentation will fairly present our institution.

California State University, Stanislaus has published and made publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission. Such policies will be available for review upon request throughout the period of accreditation. Special attention will be paid to policies and recordkeeping regarding complaints and appeals.

California State University, Stanislaus will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education (USDE) procedural requirements.

California State University, Stanislaus will submit all required data, and any other data specifically requested by the Commission, during the period of accreditation.

California State University, Stanislaus has reviewed our off-campus programs and distance education degree programs to ensure that they have been approved in accordance with WASC requirements.

_____

Ham Shirvani, President

April 19, 2006
_____

Date

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION
INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL

APPENDICES

WASC REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
OVERVIEW OF SELF-STUDY STRUCTURE
2006

THE PRISM
ENGAGEMENT AND LEARNING

Themes and Four Inquiry Questions
Communities for Learning
Engage a Diverse Student Population in Learning
Infrastructure Support for Learning

Communities for Teaching and Scholarship
Community of Faculty Committed to Teaching and Learning
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

Definitions
Learning, Engagement, Learning Community, Communities

Spotlights
Examples of Outstanding People, Programs, and Accomplishments

Relationship of Model and Themes to University
Mission, Vision, Values, Strategic Priorities

Constituency Involvement and Participation
Inquiry Circles, Strategic Planning, Governance Structures, Campus and External Community

Sustainable Organizational Structure and Processes
Strategic Planning, Enrollment Management, Faculty Development,
Library, Assessment, Institutional Research, Governance, Technology

Evidence
Student Learning Outcomes for Programs, General Education, Co-Curriculum
Institutional Data Portfolio
Core Quality Indicators
Academic Program Reviews
Support Unit Reviews

WASC Standards, Criteria for Review, and Core Commitments
Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity
Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness
Statement on Diversity
Central Role of Evidence in Accreditation Process
Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives
Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions
Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability
Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Commission Recommendations from Previous Self Study
Library
Faculty Roles
Effective Assessment Strategies

A1

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
MISSION (1996)
VISION STATEMENT AND UNIVERSITY VALUES (2005)

MISSION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The faculty, staff, administrators, and students of California State University, Stanislaus are committed to creating a learning environment which encourages all members of the campus community to expand their intellectual, creative, and social horizons. We challenge one another to realize our potential, to appreciate and contribute to the enrichment of our diverse community, and to develop a passion for lifelong learning.

To facilitate this mission, we promote academic excellence in the teaching and scholarly activities of our faculty, encourage personalized student learning, foster interactions and partnerships with surrounding communities, and provide opportunities for the intellectual, cultural, and artistic enrichment of the region.

VISION STATEMENT

CSU Stanislaus strives to become a major center of learning, intellectual pursuit, artistic excellence, and cultural engagement for California's greater Central Valley and beyond. We will serve our diverse student body, communities, and state by creating programs, partnerships, and leaders that respond effectively to an evolving and interconnected world.

UNIVERSITY VALUES

In order to achieve our mission and vision:

❖ We inspire all members of the campus community to demand more of self than we do of others to attain new knowledge and challenge assumptions. We challenge one another to be fully engaged, responsible citizens with the ethics, knowledge, skills, and desire to improve self and community.

❖ We value learning that encompasses lifelong exploration and discovery through intellectual integrity, personal responsibility, global and self-awareness, grounded in individual student-faculty interactions.

❖ We are a student-centered community committed to a diverse, caring, learning-focused environment that fosters collegial, reflective, and open exchange of ideas.

❖ We, as students, create the collegiate experience through initiative, participation, motivation, and continual growth to meet the demands of self and others.

❖ We, as faculty, elicit, nurture, and enhance the different voices of our selves, students, and communities through deliberate engagement, continual discovery, and ongoing transformation.

❖ We, as staff and administrators, contribute to the learning environment by demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and values that serve and support the University's mission.

<div align="center">
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING
2004
</div>

PRINCIPLE 1

The primary purpose of assessment at California State University, Stanislaus is improving student learning.

This is accomplished by the use of assessment information to improve program structure, course content, and pedagogy. Assessment should be primarily formative in nature. Formative assessment is often described as assessment for learning rather than assessment of learning and refers to all those activities undertaken by faculty that provide information used by faculty to modify teaching and learning activities.

PRINCIPLE 2

Assessment of student learning is based on goals reflected in the University's mission.

The faculty, given their curricular roles and responsibilities, have primary responsibility for the development, implementation, and ongoing use of academic assessment activities. Assessment is a process for educational improvement. The practice of assessment begins with a vision of the kinds of learning that faculty value most for students. The goals that faculty value determine what is selected for assessment as well as the assessment methods used.

PRINCIPLE 3

Assessment of student learning must have course and program significance.

Assessment strategies will be integrated into the curriculum and will be integral to the learning process. Faculty have primary responsibility for the development and maintenance of academic assessment activities and will identify the critical knowledge and skills that students need to master. Assessment activities are goal-oriented and involve comparing educational performance with the purposes and expectations of the faculty as expressed in program and course design. Assessment goals, objectives, and strategies should reflect the most important outcomes. Assessment processes are ongoing and open to modification and improvement.

PRINCIPLE 4

Assessment of student learning depends on clear and explicit learning goals.

Assessment is a continuous process aimed at understanding and improving curriculum, instruction, and services. It requires clearly defined objectives against which educational outcomes can be measured. Assessment goals at the course, program, or university level should be stated in terms that are clear and amenable to observation and measurement. Expectations are made explicit, appropriate criteria determined, and information gathered and interpreted to determine how well performance matches those expectations and criteria. The resulting information is used to document and improve performance.

PRINCIPLE 5

Assessment involves a multi-method approach.

Assessment is most effective when it reflects an understanding that learning is a complex process. Assessment plans use multiple measures to assess student learning and multiple indicators of effectiveness reflecting the complexity of the goals of higher education. Assessment activities include a diverse array of methods and techniques, and faculty should choose those that are best suited to the program goals and student needs. In addition, faculty are encouraged to create innovative approaches to assessment that meet the needs of the students and programs.

PRINCIPLE 6

Assessment results will be used for decision making in planning and improvement processes.

Formative assessment involves using assessment information to feed back into the teaching/learning process. For assessment to function formatively, the results are used to adjust teaching, learning, and curriculum planning. To be effective, assessment results must be used appropriately to provide direction and guidance for improving curricula and related student experiences.

PRINCIPLE 7

The results of assessment activities will not be used for the evaluation of individual faculty.

Assessment activities are conducted solely for the purpose of program improvement. Distinguishing between faculty evaluation and the assessment of student learning is crucial to the success of any assessment program. Assessment is concerned with group level analysis rather than individual level analysis. Assessment must be understood as an evaluation of how the curriculum as a whole has affected student learning. Assessment data should be summarized to reflect programs, not to identify particular faculty. Assessment data will not be used for individual faculty evaluation or as a part of personnel decisions. At the same time, faculty should know that their participation in assessment activities is valued when they are considered for retention, promotion, and tenure.

PRINCIPLE 8

Assessment data will not be used to make comparison across programs, departments, or colleges.

Assessment data will be used only for the facilitation of student, program, college, and university development, and are not intended for comparative judgments. Assessment data will be made available to those most closely involved in and responsible for the learning that is related to the data.

PRINCIPLE 9

Successful assessment requires University support.

Assessment works best when undertaken in an environment that is receptive and supportive. Development of sustainable assessment efforts by faculty and programs require additional faculty time and departmental resources. California State University, Stanislaus is committed to the development of an ongoing program of assessment and will provide the necessary resources for assessment activities, including professional development for faculty. Innovation, alterations, and activities undertaken by departments and programs as a result of the assessment process must be seriously considered in the allocation of resources.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

April 2006

FRAMING THE FUTURE
A WORLD-CLASS ACADEMIC CENTER

HIGH ASPIRATIONS, HIGH EXPECTATIONS

In moving forward into the next decade, California State University, Stanislaus commits itself to an ambitious program: sustaining the qualities that have served us so well, while adapting to current challenges and preparing ourselves to grasp new opportunities. This Strategic Plan, ***Framing the Future***, capitalizes on the development over the past decade of the University Mission and the Vision and Values statement, documents created through extensive intramural collaboration. The Plan concludes with an overview of the processes used to develop it.

As a campus community, California State University Stanislaus reaffirms and recommits itself to its core academic mission: the labor of teaching and learning. We commit ourselves to engaging and providing access to a diverse student body in a developing region. At the same time, the opportunities and challenges provoked by the economic and social transformation of our service area – the counties of Calaveras, Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tuolumne – prompt us to augment this commitment by realizing our potential as an agent for positive change.

This Strategic Plan frames our future as a world-class academic center through three key initiatives:

1. Create a center for intellectual pursuit
2. Combine student access and academic achievement
3. Join the community in building the region

A "world-class regional comprehensive university" appears at first glance to be oxymoronic. CSU Stanislaus has built a solid foundation through patient growth, determined adherence to principles of collegial academic exploration, and above all, to the idea that close collaboration between and among faculty and students creates engaged and responsive citizens. We commit ourselves to augmenting our strengths in teaching and learning by advancing support for scholarship and intellectual pursuits. CSU Stanislaus has since its inception taken our commitment to student access seriously; this renewed commitment to learning supports the pursuit of academic achievement in our students, faculty, and community. In creating this center, in effecting the work of this transformation, our engagement with the community is invaluable to the success of any mission we might envision. Our ties with our service area allow us to respond to the needs of the area and to work with our communities to have a transformative impact on it. As we develop, then, we commit ourselves to growing with the region, in tandem, linked symbiotically.

This Plan depends upon faculty creativity, development and innovation to create and continue to deliver high quality academic programs. We will create a university culture that takes pride in the intellectual achievement and pedagogy of our faculty by investing in the professoriate and supporting the development and continuous improvement of individual faculty members. The Plan supports the recruitment and retention of a high-quality, diverse professoriate, while allowing for entrepreneurial initiative in research, scholarship, and creative activities and in developing academic programs. The Plan provides for the necessary infrastructure – informational, technological, human, and material – to enable that support.

The University's organizational structures should reflect its high level of expectations for effectiveness, efficiency, productivity, accountability, and quality. As California State University, Stanislaus becomes increasingly larger and more complex, greater autonomy for decision making and innovation at the college level is imperative. At the same time, the University should make every effort to preserve interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. Thus the implementation of college restructuring must be the product of careful deliberations. Organizational effectiveness depends upon the quality of its staff and their commitment to the highest level of delivery of services to students and faculty. Investment in its human resources, particularly in the professional growth and achievement of staff, is essential for the University to achieve excellence of operations and to fulfill its mission as a learning organization.

This Plan identifies programmatic initiatives consonant with the University's mission, gives a framework and direction to colleges for program development during the next decade, and establishes criteria for investing in its current programs. Providing high quality academic programs for a diverse student body is central to planning for the future development of CSU Stanislaus. These academic priorities honor the University's traditional core commitment to liberal arts, complemented by professional programs in service to the region – at the undergraduate and graduate levels – while encouraging an entrepreneurial and technological approach to program development, where appropriate. The University will continue to seek accreditation and reaccreditation by national professional accrediting agencies to underscore our commitment to demonstrating the University as a learning organization, one that is dynamic and responsive to its internal and external environment.

The University is committed to serving a growing freshman class, continuing to serve transfer students, our graduate and post-baccalaureate students, and expanding service to out-of-state and international students. We are one University with multiple sites: our main Turlock campus, the Stockton Center, the Merced Tri-College Center, and other distance learning centers. We have a continuing interest in maintaining access and program quality at all of our instructional sites. In recognition of student demographics, the percentage of college eligible students in the region and a large percentage of first generation students, the University will create partnerships with schools and provide services designed to encourage college preparation and facilitate college entrance. The University will prepare our graduates to lead their communities, promoting student development in literacy and numeracy, communication, information competence, critical thinking skills, and social and community engagement, and global awareness to give our graduates the flexibility and habits of mind necessary for an engaged and responsive citizenry with a love for lifelong learning.

Building on our commitment to academic achievement, we will continue to develop a campus infrastructure that anticipates and facilitates the intellectual growth and service delivery needs of students, faculty and staff. We are committed to ensuring that campus culture continues to support a nurturing, learning-oriented environment, a vigorous student-life presence, and an aesthetically pleasing environment. Campus grounds will be identifiable as a distinguishing feature for the City of Turlock and the Central Valley. As California State University, Stanislaus becomes synonymous with quality education at an outstanding value, we will invigorate our relations with the communities of Turlock as we develop our University with our home town.

We are the preeminent educational value in the Central Valley, building a world class academic center. Let us frame our future.

1.
CREATE A CENTER FOR INTELLECTUAL PURSUIT

1.1 Strategic Action: Provide excellent undergraduate and graduate programs.

Results: develop a process for investing in current programs based on quality indicators resulting from the academic program review process and a refined cost/benefit analysis; increased support for current programs as justified by academic quality, data elements, budget, and assessment of student learning outcomes and program goals; community enlisted to help develop existing and new programs.

Effectiveness Indicators: program quality; enrollment data (Turlock, Stockton, Merced); student, alumni, and faculty surveys; alignment of the mission with regional needs and student demand; current program offerings; decisions consistent with core academic mission.

1.2 Strategic Action: Develop new programs that demonstrate the greatest centrality to the University's mission, the highest quality of academic rigor, and expectations for student learning.

Results: developed Academic Master Plan for prioritizing direction; coordinated restructuring implementation; community enlisted to help develop new program direction; cost/benefit analysis; program development emanating from the colleges, priorities for which currently include sciences, environmental conservation and sustainability, allied health sciences, and education.

Effectiveness Indicators: enrollment data and program quality and vitality through academic program review, external evaluation, and disciplinary accreditation (as appropriate); student learning outcomes.

1.3 Strategic Action: Strengthen the general education program.

Results: appointed a faculty director to provide leadership for development and assessment of the general education program; assessed student achievement in general education learning goals; coordinated implementation of college restructuring by reexamining general education course offerings and schedules; assessed the design and delivery of the general education program, including factors such as global awareness, civic engagement, and sustainability.

Effectiveness Indicators: a coherent, quality general education program that prepares students for academic challenges and lifelong learning, evidence of student achievement in general education learning goals.

1.4 Strategic Action: Recruit a diverse and engaged professoriate.

Results: increased and sufficient pay, benefits, and support; reduced workload first year for new faculty hires; entry pay consistently at median for comparable size/situation; enhanced reputation as a vibrant place to work and live; enhanced community engagement.

Effectiveness Indicators: faculty demographics; compensation data; retention rates at mid-career; publication index; student surveys; faculty survey.

1.5 Strategic Action: Retain quality faculty members.

Results: implemented workload agreement; regularized individual workloads of faculty members throughout each college; supported pedagogical development; mentored research, scholarship and creative activity and supported research agendae; provided seed funding for extramural support; increased faculty salary through ranks; elaborated clearly department and college expectations; publicized achievements; mentored part-time faculty; increased support for faculty development; increased opportunities for participation of lecturers and other contingent faculty.

Effectiveness Indicators: faculty demographics; compensation data; time to promotion median; scholarship and creative activity; publications; student surveys.

1.6 Strategic Action: Reward faculty for leadership, service, and achievements.

Results: acknowledged superiority in teaching and learning; increased support for senior faculty as the public intellectuals of the region; articulated expectations for all levels of the professoriate; increased level of knowledge shared with the community; defined opportunities for Emeritus faculty; decreased salary compression/inversion.

Effectiveness Indicators: faculty demographics; compensation data; scholarship and creative activity; publications; student surveys; community surveys.

1.7 Strategic Action: Support the professional development, growth, and achievement of the University's staff.

Results: increased staff opportunities to enhance skills in their current position responsibilities, for advancement, and to acquire additional education; enhanced staff satisfaction and efficiency; appropriate staff levels.

Effectiveness Indicators: funding levels for staff development; staff participation rates in on-campus and external staff development; staff educational attainment; staff demographics, staff satisfaction surveys.

1.8 Strategic Action: Provide accessible, comprehensive library resources and services to support the research and scholarship of students, faculty and staff.

Results: increased comprehensive and accessible learning resources (both human and material) in the library to facilitate high quality scholarship; increased support at the University level, in the colleges, and in the library for faculty pursuing grant and research opportunities.

Effectiveness Indicators: library unit review process; size and scope of the library collection; library users surveys; grant productivity measures.

1.9 Strategic Action: Provide appropriate campus technology services to all members of the campus community, while maintaining the primacy of technological support for academic programs.

Results: agile, robust, and ubiquitous technological services; improved service delivery through accessibility and expanded communication; improved student access to campus information and appropriate technology tools.

Effectiveness Indicators: faculty survey; student satisfaction survey; graduating seniors' survey; technological support measures; technology assessment through support unit review process.

1.10   Strategic Action: Increase organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Results: restructured and streamlined governance structures (committees, functions, membership, and timeline) that maintain focus on academic mission; increased governance and curricular processing at college level and decreased processing at university level; accelerated curricular approving processes; increased integrity of institutional research and data systems; increased efficiency of administrative operations while maintaining quality; issues delineated appropriate to faculty and administration; coordinated decision making.

Effectiveness Indicators: evidence-based decision making; faculty and staff satisfaction survey; implementation of strategic plan.

2.

COMBINE ACCESS, ENGAGEMENT, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

2.1 Strategic Action: Continue the tradition of engagement to enhance the overall success of a diverse body of students.

Results: improved retention and persistence to degree; increased student-faculty engagement through informal contact, service learning opportunities, meaningful co-curricular programming, community engagement, student participation in professional societies and activities, study abroad, and campus celebration of scholarly achievement; enhanced scholarships and financial aid to attract high achieving students to the campus and to ensure continued access for students of promise.

Effectiveness Indicators: student satisfaction and engagement surveys; program specific retention studies; scholarship funding levels; student research productivity; student participation levels in programs.

2.2 Strategic Action: Achieve growth of 3% Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES) per year.

Results: moderated growth of 3% per year (average), maintaining 75/25% undergraduate/graduate student headcount percentages; effective schedule and classroom utilization; increased number of transfer students from Delta, Modesto, Merced, and Columbia Colleges; increased number of out-of-region students; increased percentage of regional high school students who go to college and select CSU Stanislaus; increased number of international students who attend CSU Stanislaus. Revaluated capacity needs.

Effectiveness Indicators: enrollment numbers and percentage of freshmen, transfer, graduate and international students annually against targeted growth rates; Stockton enrollments; distance education enrollments; percentage of regional high school graduates attending college and selecting California State University Stanislaus.

2.3 Strategic Action: Implement an enrollment management plan to increase admission, retention, and progress to degree in graduate programs.

Results: increased enrollments in selected graduate programs to meet student, educational and professional demand for qualified graduate students; developed new programs in response to local needs; streamlined admission process for graduate students.

Effectiveness Indicators: application yield, enrollments, and percentage of graduate to undergraduate students; retention and mean time to degree data; academic program review.

2.4 Strategic Action: Ensure a comprehensive and accurate student advising program to articulate clear degree pathways and emphasize student accountability.

Results: implemented efficient and easily-understood advising processes, including new student orientation; degree audits a
in evaluating their academic progress, managing their academic portfolios, and abiding by University regulations.

Effectiveness Indicators: student satisfaction and engagement surveys; retention and graduation data; graduation rates and time to degree; exit interviews.

2.5 Strategic Action: Support innovative curricular and co-curricular opportunities to instill in students the pride of scholarship.

Results: sustained retention and increased persistence rates, consistent with student goals; increased availability of learning communities and learning support programs that support our student body; increased opportunities for student research, scholarly, and creative activities; increased critical thinking skills.

Effectiveness Indicators: retention of students and graduation rates against targets and in comparison with peer institutions; evaluate outcome achievements in organized learning communities; participation in honor societies, academic presentations and competitions; students continuing to further graduate and post-baccalaureate study.

2.6 Strategic Action: Emphasize internships, workshops, and career skills development to provide strong preparation for career success after graduation.

Results: increased opportunities for students to explore career opportunities; career options and opportunities linked to majors; enhanced level of service learning and community engagement; increased placement rates in chosen field; enhanced professional perception of CSU Stanislaus students as highly competitive and successful professionals.

Effectiveness Indicators: graduating seniors' survey; employer survey; alumni survey; placement rates.

2.7 Strategic Action: Facilitate access to post-baccalaureate programs and develop nontraditional delivery models appropriate for the unique needs of professional and paraprofessional segments of the community.

Results: increased number of new and restructured programs designed for these constituencies, with specific program development emanating from the colleges; increased number of certificate, credential, and executive programs; increased number of students entering and completing these programs; improved workforce placement in high demand professional areas.

Effectiveness Indicators: enrollment data and program quality and vitality through academic program review, external evaluation, and disciplinary accreditation (as appropriate); program quality and continuing accreditation; placement data from business, education, healthcare, and industry.

2.8 Strategic Action: Design selected programs to employ technological, asynchronous delivery via on-line instruction.

Results: program driven design process; increased delivered courses and partial and full degree programs through on-line instruction; established priority to programs that are entrepreneurial and provide increased access to new populations of students.

Effectiveness Indicators: Number of on-line courses; number of on-line programs; student enrollment; cost of program delivery; academic program review; student and faculty satisfaction; student learning outcomes.

3.
JOIN THE COMMUNITY IN BUILDING THE REGION

3.1   Strategic Action: Expand high school and community college partnerships.

Results: increased high school program and community college partnerships; increased student preparation for college entry; increased use of national and international exchange programs to attract students; increased international student enrollments and exchange agreements; better and increased use of the University web process for recruitment.

Effectiveness Indicators: application yield and percentage of students in partnership programs; percentage of students requiring remediation at entrance; web users survey; percentage of students eligible for CSU in six-county area.

3.2   Strategic Action: Enhance our stature within the academy nationally and in the CSU system.

Results: enhanced CSU Stanislaus profile; updated website and print media; achieved reaccreditation by WASC and disciplinary accrediting agencies.

Effectiveness Indicators: WASC reaccreditation; disciplinary reaccreditation; Princeton Review listing; US News and World Report listing; CSU Accountability Report; Chancellor's office reports.

3.3   Strategic Action: Enhance our stature locally.

Results: implemented marketing and communications plan; positioned the University as the reliable intellectual resource for the service area; improved signage and "faces" of University; enhanced relationships to government agencies and elected officials; increased use of campus radio, television, and student newspaper.

Effectiveness Indicators: media coverage; survey of alumni, employers, superintendents, and community college presidents; partnerships and philanthropic activities.

3.4   Strategic Action: Build with the City of Turlock

Results: created a Turlock downtown office and delivery site for extended education and degree programs; increased interrelations between City of Turlock and the University; enhanced engagement between the campus and community; sustainable North Turlock development; increased number of local students attending CSU Stanislaus.

Effectiveness Indicators: student, staff, and faculty involvement in service activities; campus involvement in service learning and local community internships; foot traffic in University business area; local high school graduation index; extended education programs and enrollments; faculty and staff participation in city organizations; city participation in campus organizations.

3.5   Strategic Action: Maintain an aesthetically pleasing campus environment that supports opportunities for students, faculty, staff and community members to engage.

Results: enhanced campus climate and usability of grounds through campus master planning activities; increased opportunities for students to use campus facilities and grounds for informal and formal activities; increased perception of campus as a cultural and intellectual center.

Effectiveness Indicators: student satisfaction and engagement surveys; facilities use and assessment through support unit review process; completion of campus master planning; community surveys.

3.6 Strategic Action: Create a vibrant campus student life culture through increased, high-quality residential living opportunities.

Results: increased campus residential population through the construction of a variety of new student housing units; enhanced the student experience by facilitating a wholesome campus life; improved food service, recreation and activities, safety service, and appropriate administrative service hours.

Effectiveness Indicators: student satisfaction and engagement surveys; Housing, Food Service and other support assessment through support unit review process; occupancy reports for housing; campus crime statistics; alcohol and other benchmarking surveys related to student behavior and health.

PROCESS AND PARTICIPATION

Building on a decade of success in strategic planning at California State University, Stanislaus, President Hamid Shirvani invited the campus community to join together in commitment and action for moving the University to the next level of accomplishment and excellence. A strategic planning forum assembled 28 faculty, staff, students, administrators, and community members for a two-day strategic planning session, February 2-3, 2006.

As a means to assess the University's current strategic position, the strategic planning forum began with an examination of institutional research data, the results of environmental scans, and college academic program plans, followed by a frank discussion of University's strengths and weaknesses, threats and opportunities. The focus then shifted to the future. A conceptual framework emerged from the strategic planning forum, a thematic unity that framed the future of California State University, Stanislaus in ways that preserve its traditions and essential character—a historic devotion to students through strong faculty-student interaction, access, first generation, regional service, and above all, a commitment to excellence in teaching and learning.

After the forum, a small writing group, comprised of faculty and administration, drafted the Plan consistent with the

supported by twenty-four strategic actions and methods for demonstrating effectiveness and quality.

PROCESS FROM DRAFT TO IMPLEMENTATION

The draft plan was presented to the campus for discussion in February. Feedback from open fora and other venues was crucial in formulating the revised draft presented to the campus in mid-April. This (present) draft is submitted for deliberation and endorsement by Academic Senate and approval by the President. The Plan will guide the University's actions for the next 5 years. University and college divisions will be expected to align their own priorities and plans with it. Under the leadership of the Provost, and with monitoring by the President and the President's Cabinet, implementation should begin with the 2006-07 academic year. The budgetary process will be redesigned to ensure a direct link to the strategic plan and the allocation of specific revenue sources to support the stated priorities. Similarly, the Office of Institutional Research will provide ongoing assessment of the strategic actions. Campus leaders will include assessment of strategic actions in regular annual reporting documents. We recognize that the plan must be dynamic and agile, with the University ready to move forcefully in directions not envisioned at the time of adoption. Through our commitment to these focused strategic actions and collegial processes, we ensure our future as a world-class academic center.

Forum Participants

The following campus and community members participated in the strategic planning forum:

Bill Ahlem, Member, Foundation Board of Trustees

June Boffman, Interim Dean, College of Arts Letters and Sciences

Wanda Bonnell, Academic Advisor, Educational Opportunity Program

David Dauwalder, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Scott Davis, Assistant Professor, Department of English

Diana Demetrulias, Vice Provost

Amin Elmallah, Dean, College of Business Administration

Dianne Gagos, Vice President, Foundation Board of Trustees

Randall Harris, Associate Professor, Management, Operations, and Marketing

Jennifer Helzer, Associate Professor, Anthropology and Geography

Kathleen Hidalgo, Administrative Support Coordinator, Advanced Studies in Education

James Koelewyn, Consultant, Information Technology

Andrew LaFlamme, Student, Vice President-External of the Associated Students, Inc.

Timothy Mahoney, Assistant Professor, Teacher Education

Ken McCall, Alumnus

Chelsea Minor, Student, President of the Associated Students, Inc.

Cynthia Morgan, Dean, Stockton Center

Stacey Morgan-Foster, Vice President for Student Affairs

Mildred Murray-Ward, Dean, College of Education

Gary Novak, Professor, Psychology and Child Development

Paul O'Brien, Professor, Sociology

Al Petrosky, Speaker of the Faculty, Associate Professor, Management, Operations, and Marketing

Roger Pugh, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Management Services

Bill Ruud, Vice President, Development and University Relations

John Sarraillé, Professor, Computer Science

Ham Shirvani, President

Mary Stephens, Vice President, Business and Finance

My Lo Thao, Assistant Professor, Biological Sciences

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
MANUAL FOR INQUIRY CIRCLES
TABLE OF CONTENTS
Draft, 2006

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC CRITERIA FOR REVIEW ORGANIZED BY INQUIRY THEMES
2006

Standard and Criteria for Review	Inquiry 1: Student Learning and Engagement	Inquiry 2: Support Learning	Inquiry 3: Teaching and Learning	Inquiry 4: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives				
1.1	X	X	X	X
1.2	X	X		
1.3	X	X		
1.4	X			X
1.5	X	X	X	X
1.6	X		X	X
1.7	X			
1.8	X	X	X	
Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions				
2.1	X		X	
2.2.	X		X	
2.3	X	X	X	X
2.4	X		X	
2.5	X		X	
2.6	X		X	
2.7	X		X	
2.8			X	X
2.9			X	X
2.10	X	X	X	
2.11		X	X	
2.12	X	X	X	
2.13		X	X	
2.14	X	X	X	
Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability				
3.1		X	X	X
3.2		X	X	X
3.3		X	X	X
3.4			X	X
3.5		X		
3.6	X	X	X	X
3.7	X	X	X	X
3.8	X	X	X	X
3.9	X	X	X	X
3.10	X	X	X	X
3.11	X	X	X	X
Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement				
4.1		X		
4.2		X		
4.3		X		
4.4	X	X	X	X
4.5			X	X
4.6			X	X
4.7			X	
4.8			X	

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
OVERVIEW OF ASSESSMENT AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
2006

The purpose of this document is to provide a brief overview of assessment at California State University, Stanislaus.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

While CSU Stanislaus has engaged in assessment activities for many decades, a more formalized, coherent approach toward assessment began in earnest in the mid-1990's. In 1998, CSU Stanislaus completed its regional accreditation self-study document built upon an inquiry as to the ways in which CSU Stanislaus is—and wishes to be—a learning-centered university. This critical investigation allowed the campus to move beyond theoretical discussions to the beginning phases of transformation in which teaching and learning more systemically focused on learning goals and in which assessment of student learning became more directly linked to institutional decision-making, strategic planning, and budgetary allocations.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ASSESSMENT AT CSU STANISLAUS

Since that time, the University has continued to develop a conceptually strong assessment program that has the following characteristics in design and execution.

Processes for developing and implementing the assessment program result from widespread participation of faculty, administrators, staff, students, and the external community.

1. Assessment data are designed and used in positive ways for improving student learning and institutional effectiveness. Program or departmental assessment data are not used to make comparisons among university units or between individual faculty.

2. Working definitions of assessment reflect the University's values and are consonant with the University's principles of assessment of student learning.

3. Priorities for assessment are derived from the University's mission, relate to the University's strategic goals and priorities, and address WASC accreditation standards.

4. Assessment activities are incorporated into and are integral to the University's processes and structures.

5. Decisions are based on multiple indicators of effectiveness and consider the results from both qualitative and quantitative methods.

6. Results of assessment guide institutional decision-making and are used in institutional planning, evaluation, and resource allocation processes.

7. Dissemination of assessment efforts and results is planned and implemented.

8. Appropriate resources are provided in terms of expertise, time, and money to promote assessment activities –both for centralized university-wide activities and unit-specific assessment efforts.

PRINCIPLES OF ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The University's commitment to assessment honors a positive learning environment and the preeminent role of faculty in the fostering and assessment of student learning. Through the document *Principles of Assessment of Student Learning* (2004), the University affirms the compelling need for meaningful assessment practices in effective education, emphasizes the primary role of faculty in developing and implementing assessment measures, asserts the importance of separating assessment of student learning from faculty evaluation, privileges formative over summative assessment, and values assessment for the enhancement of teaching and learning.

INSTITUTIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE FOR ASSESSMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

In fall 2004, CSU Stanislaus restructured its organizational approach for assessment of institutional quality. The Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance, led by the Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance, was created to provide vigorous leadership and coordination for university-wide assessment and quality assurance. In addition, a university-wide assessment leadership team, comprised of assessment coordinators from academic and administrative units, has been formed and is under review.

This new structure allowed the Office of Institutional Research to focus on enhancing the amount and sophistication of its institutional research capacity, especially in support of the assessment of student learning. Institutional research is conducted by
throughout the University define and illustrate the myriad of methods and information used to evaluate and improve quality. Of key importance is the review and approval of institutional research by the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB) when data are collected from human subjects (including surveys, interviews, and focus groups).

RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT INITIATIVES TO THE UNIVERSITY'S MISSION

Working definitions of assessment at CSU Stanislaus were developed, and assessment initiatives were implemented within the context of the CSU Stanislaus mission, vision, and values statements. Each of these documents provides the philosophical underpinning in which learning is preeminent. For example, the mission makes clear the University's commitment to creating a learning environment, fostering diversity, and promoting lifelong learning. The vision proclaims the University's efforts to become a major center of learning for the Central Valley and beyond. The values reinforce the University's belief in the centrality of learning and its on-going commitment to a genuinely learning-centered university. It is the University's strategic plan that displays the University's mission, vision, and values in action and serves as the basis for the University's assessment initiatives.

RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT INITIATIVES TO STRATEGIC PLANNING

Under the leadership of a new president, the University revisited strategic planning in 2005-06. The Strategic Plan, *Framing the Future* (draft, March 2006), displays the University's commitment to the principles articulated in the mission, vision, and values statements, and commits the University to action in three areas: creating a world-class center for intellectual and academic pursuits, developing a university known for student access and academic achievement, and building with the region. Under the leadership of the Provost, and with monitoring by the President and the President's Executive Cabinet, implementation should begin with the 2006-07 academic year. The budgetary process will be redesigned to ensure a direct link to the strategic plan and the allocation of specific revenue sources to support the stated priorities. Similarly, the Office of Institutional Research will provide ongoing assessment of the strategic actions, and campus leaders will provide annual reports to the President about the effectiveness of the actions and the quality of outcomes.

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The document *Ten Methods to Examine Institutional Effectiveness* (2002; updated 2005) describes the ten methods used at the University to examine institutional effectiveness: assessment of student learning at the classroom, program, and university levels; evaluation of instruction; academic program review; support unit review; specialized program accreditation; institutional accreditation; examination of institutional issues; and accountability/external reports. Also identified is the primary purpose for each method and three goals (assessment of student learning, evaluation/review, accountability).

ASSESSMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT UNITS

The University conducts comprehensive periodic reviews of each of its academic and administrative support units through its Support Unit Review Policy and Procedures (2004). Support Unit Review provides a vehicle to integrate rigorous assessment with ongoing strategic planning and resource allocation. Important functions of the Support Unit Review are (1) to meet the requirements of administrators for comprehensive information concerning the effectiveness of their units; (2) to determine if resources are being utilized as effectively and efficiently as possible; (3) to determine if the unit is effectively supporting the mission of the University, particularly as related to student learning; and (4) to make improvements as a result of this assessment of unit effectiveness.

Additionally, *Quality Improvement Initiative* on-line surveys are used by CSU Stanislaus and throughout the CSU system to promote continuous quality and productivity improvement in academic and administrative support units. Supported by the CSU Chancellor's Office, the Quality Improvement Initiative offers strategies for quality enhancement through outcomes assessment and performance measures.

ASSESSMENT IN THE DIVISIONS

The following methods are used to examine institutional effectiveness unique to each of the four major divisions of the University:

Assessment within the Division of Academic Affairs

Within the Division of Academic Affairs, the document, *Who's Responsible for What* (2002; updated 2005) describes the roles and responsibilities for assessment for each of the ten methods used at CSU Stanislaus to examine institutional effectiveness. The development of this document has resulted in a common understanding of assessment and alleviated much of the concerns of the faculty with regard to the uses of assessment information.

Assessment within the Division of Business and Finance

The Division of Business and Finance has employed the methodology of Balanced Scorecard, a performance management system, to assess individual processes and procedures, customer services, and employee relations. The Balanced Scorecard was selected as the method to provide assessment information for verifying the division's support of and contribution to the University's mission and strategic plan. The information is used to align vision and mission with customer requirements and day-to-day work, manage and evaluate business strategy, monitor operation efficiency improvements, build organization capacity, and communicate progress to all employees. The unit uses critical success factors to chart the path to successful outcomes and performance measures to track both strategic and operational progress.

Assessment within the Division of University Advancement

The Division of University Advancement employs the Support Unit Review process previously described for evaluating its achievement of goals related to fundraising, university relations, public affairs, alumni affairs, and athletics.

Assessment within the Division of Student Affairs

The Division of Student Affairs conducts audits of its effectiveness by employing standards from the Council of Assessment Standards as part of its Support Unit Review. As a result of the unit's self study and external review, action plans are formulated for enhancing quality of administrative units, student affairs programming, and student learning through co-curricular activities. In addition, the Student Affairs annual retreat focuses on program enhancement through assessment, including an evaluation of the WASC standards with regard to support for student learning through co-curricular programs.

UNIVERSITY-WIDE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The Inventory of University-Wide Assessment Methods (2006) describes university-wide assessment initiatives (indirect, direct, and core indicators), and specifies the purposes of the methods, types of data, and uses of information. The University uses local, system, and national surveys for providing assessment data. These surveys are employed as a means to secure helpful information about our students' learning inside and outside of the classroom, to understand better the profile of our student body as they engage in both curricular and co-curricular activities, and to secure information that helps make informed decisions regarding the University's effectiveness. For example, local surveys of undergraduate (Graduating Senior Survey) and graduate students (Graduate School Program Survey) at time of graduation and of alumni (baccalaureate and master's) are administered by the Office of Institutional Research.

The University identified peer institutions as a method for placing institutional data in an external context and for making comparisons to similar universities. CSU Stanislaus identified peer institutions most similar in mission and relevant characteristics such as classification, student enrollments, fees, faculty, and accreditation.

In addition, the CSU system periodically administers student surveys. One example is the Student Needs and Priorities Survey (SNAPS), last administered in 1999. Students were asked to rate their satisfaction level in the following areas: instruction and learning environment, campus services, advising, reasons for enrolling, obstacles to obtaining educational goals, desired learning opportunities, transition to university, and diversity. The University added questions about general education and the data were analyzed in both aggregate and disaggregate (by demographic and characteristics) forms.

National surveys administered at CSU Stanislaus include the National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE), first administered in 2003 and every three years thereafter. This instrument is designed to measure the degree of student engagement in college activities that research studies have shown are positively correlated to student learning and personal development. Using comparative data from other similar universities, CSU Stanislaus is able to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the students.

In conjunction with the NSSE, CSU Stanislaus will be administering the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) which parallels the NSSE. The FSSE, scheduled to be administered in 2007, is designed to measure faculty expectations for student engagement in educational practices. The results of this survey will be used as comparative data to assess the alignment of faculty and student perceptions.

Also administered is the national Student Satisfaction Inventory (Noel-Levitz), a standardized national instrument designed to collect information ("early warning information") to support University efforts to increase student success and the retention of students. This survey, introduced at CSU Stanislaus in 1997, is administered every five years. This survey provides national norms for comparison of our student responses with those at other similar universities. This inventory elicits student responses on both importance and satisfaction for the following areas: academic advising, campus climate and life, support services, instruction, financial aid, safety, student centeredness, and general education.

The Institutional Priorities Survey (Noel-Levitz) will be used in combination with the Student Satisfaction Survey in 2007. This standardized instrument will allow our campus to discover similarities and differences among the priorities of our students, faculty, and staff.

The University also gathers university-wide data which is published in an annual report called the Fact Book and an Institutional Data Portfolio. Other university-wide data that illustrate program quality include professional accreditation – the number of programs accredited and reaccredited by disciplinary accreditation agencies for which accreditation is available; employability – the number of students who are employed in their chosen fields/profession; and post-graduate study – the number of students completing master's and doctoral degrees.

In addition, the CSU system's Accountability Report contains such data as enrollment management information (applications, admissions, retention, graduation, and time to degree), facilities utilization, university advancement, and community and school partnerships.

DIRECT ASSESSMENT METHODS AND MEASURES

The overall goal for the assessment programs at CSU Stanislaus is to build on the traditional indirect methods for assessing quality (surveys, focus groups, and interviews) and to employ a wider variety of methods to assess student learning and institutional quality, including direct measures of student learning. Leadership for this effort is provided by the Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning and the Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee.

As a means of direct assessment, CSU Stanislaus has piloted and plans to administer the *Information and Communication Technology Literacy Assessment* (Educational Testing Service) in late 2006. This assessment is a direct measure of students' cognitive and technical skills through engagement in real-time, scenario-based tasks. The test specifically measures higher-order student achievement of information retrieval and competency, one of the seven student learning goals of general education.

The University will administer the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), an instrument which allows for a direct measure of student learning by combining two types of testing instruments, real-life performance tasks and writing prompts. These are used to measure student learning in the areas of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication.

CSU Stanislaus also administers a locally developed writing assessment to measure student achievement in written communication. The Writing Proficiency Screening Test (WPST) is administered to all students before their junior year. In this

in a junior-level writing proficiency course (Writing Across the Curriculum).

ASSESSMENT OF DISCIPLINES AND PROGRAMS

In its 1998 application for reaccreditation to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, CSU Stanislaus' major theme was the development of a learning-centered environment. In its reaffirmation of accreditation, WASC indicated a need for increased efforts at measuring and improving student learning. Since the report was issued in 1998, academic departments have substantially increased efforts at measuring student learning and using the feedback from those efforts to improve learning, teaching effectiveness, curricula, and student progress in major programs.

Each academic department has employed assessment directly related to the department's learning goals. Departments' descriptions of requirements for graduation are available in the CSU Stanislaus catalog as well as the individual department websites.

In academic programs, faculty are beginning to complement indirect program assessment with the direct assessment of student work embedded in coursework. For example, some programs have added capstone courses in which faculty construct assignments that allow faculty to observe directly students' demonstration of the course and program learning goals. Other programs use capstone courses to provide settings for students to demonstrate their cognitive, affective, and performance achievement through course simulations or field-based settings. Service-learning courses are another vehicle for examining student learning through field applications and reflective analysis.

Some departments have designed assessment methods at prescribed points in the major that allows graded course assignments to be used simultaneously by the program faculty to evaluate students' collective performance. The use of scoring, templates, and rubrics for evaluating students' individual and collective learning is also evidenced in the departments' assessment practices, as is the increased use of student portfolios. Some departments have built into their periodic reviews faculty discussions of achievement levels for successful demonstration of student learning outcomes. This collective and collaborative review of student learning by departmental faculty is essential for ensuring the highest level of student learning.

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Along with their work in the major field of study, undergraduate students are required to demonstrate achievement in seven General Education Goals prior to graduation. The *General Education Goals Matrix* (draft, 2005) illustrates the alignment between core competency areas and established goals.

General education is central to the mission of CSU Stanislaus and its explicit commitment to a quality liberal education. The purpose of general education is to provide a common educational experience for students, regardless of major field of study. The faculty are committed to ensuring that the general education program cultivates the knowledge, skills, and values characteristic of a learned person.

The General Education Program at CSU Stanislaus is comprised of the traditional General Education Program and the Summit Program. The traditional program has been offered in its current overall design since the early 1970's (although the number of units and specific courses has changed over the decades). Currently, the General Education Program requires students to complete 51 semester units, including nine upper division units, of selected courses within seven broad disciplinary categories. The Summit Program, approved in May 2004, after three years of pilot, provides an upper division general education alternative to the traditional general education menu built around a cluster model.

The document *Leadership and Administrative Support of the General Education Program* (2000) displays the structure in support of general education, with duties for assessment specified for governance committees and administrative officers. *Assessment of General Education* (2005) provides a chronological overview since 1999 of the growth in number and the maturity of the assessment measures undertaken to demonstrate the quality of the general education program and student learning.

Assessment results for general education are communicated through meeting minutes and annual reports of the General Education Subcommittee. In addition, the University Educational Policies Committee, the General Education subcommittee, the Assessment of Student Learning subcommittee, and the academic administration review the results of general education assessments and recommend appropriate actions for improvement to the Academic Senate and the President.

OVERSIGHT OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The University accomplishes the systematic review of program quality and student learning through a variety of processes.

Academic Program Review

Every seven years, academic departments and programs conduct academic program reviews in accordance with university policy. Revised in 2004, this review process establishes the centrality of the evaluation of student learning goals, uses the results from assessment of program quality and student learning goals to plan future program development, provides greater responsibility for assessment at the college level, adds a mandatory meeting with the provost at the conclusion of the process to review findings, and links program review with strategic planning and budgetary decisions. An assessment of the effectiveness of this revised academic program review is scheduled for 2008/09, three years after its implementation and the completion of two cycles of review.

As the CSU Stanislaus campus community has come to realize, the establishment of specific student learning goals has allowed students to better understand faculty's expectations, and simultaneously allowed faculty to align curricula with their stated learning outcomes, evaluate the results, and adjust course material and instruction.

Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement

An overall assessment of the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) is undertaken every five years to ensure students are developing the core learning competency with respect to written communication. GWAR is based on a model of writing-across-the curriculum.

Assessment of Graduate Student Learning Goals

Graduate programs have developed and subscribe to overall graduate learning goals. To ensure the quality of the advanced programs and student learning experiences, the Graduate Council has established six learning goals that are to be achieved by each graduate student. *Assessment of Graduate Student Learning Goals* (1997) provides an overview of the methods, results, and uses of assessment data for graduate programs.

STUDENT ROLE IN ASSESSMENT

The campus Assessment Plan states that "students are partners with the faculty, staff, and administration in the learning process." The University systematically conducts assessments in which students' participation is central; for example, measuring student learning outcomes in the major and general education, submitting course and program evaluations, and conducting student satisfaction surveys. Recently, student government has been an active partner in the drafting of *principles and values* for campus assessment documents and in increasing the use of direct methods for evaluating student work, such as capstone courses, portfolios, and performance-based exams.

DISSEMINATION AND DOCUMENTATION OF INSTITUTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

For ease of locating information, the website for the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance and the Office of Institutional Research provide information and summary of assessment results, as well as examples of how results were used for improvement.

Assessment results are of most concern to faculty and staff involved in program design and delivery. They are reviewed by other faculty and staff as well through formal governance committees, administrative officers, students, alumni, system administration, and accrediting agencies.

ASSESSING THE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

The University employs periodic review of its assessment program, both internally and externally. The reviews examine the University's structures and resources in support of assessment, progress in enhancing the number and quality of assessment methods, documented uses of assessment information for improving student learning and institutional quality, campus values related to assessment, and perceptions of the quality of the assessment program. The President's Cabinet, the Provost's Deans Council, and governance committees review the recommendations resulting from these reviews and take appropriate actions to enhance quality and efficiency. The recommendations and actions are posted on the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance website.

ACTIONS – ASSESSMENT PLAN

This action plan for assessment was developed in 2003/04 through extensive consultation with university governance groups with implementation beginning fall 2005. The overall goal of the plan is to implement a strong, integrated university-wide assessment program that contributes to quality of teaching and learning, as well as institutional effectiveness in units outside of academic affairs. The most essential element of this action plan is assessment of student learning and support of faculty development.

Academic Program Review

1. Implement and assess the effectiveness of the newly revised academic program review process. (Vice Provost) *scheduled for assessment 3 years after implementation – 2008/09*

2. Refine graduating senior surveys, alumni surveys, and graduate student (master's) surveys. (Institutional Research and AVP of Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed fall 2005*

3. Conduct academic program review workshops (Vice Provost and College Deans) *completed spring 2005 and 2006; will continue every spring*

Budget and Resources

4. Evaluate effectiveness of budget infrastructure and allocation processes. (VP Business and Finance and Provost) *completed fall 2005*

5. Evaluate sufficiency, renewal, and deployment of finances in support of teaching and learning. (VP Business and Finance and Provost)

6. Evaluate effectiveness of budget allocations to support assessment activities. (Provost) *completed fall 2005*

7. Evaluate extent to which use of student/learning assessment information is basis for allocating resources to academic units. (Provost)

Co-Curricular and Student Support Services

8. Develop and evaluate strategies to integrate and connect co-curricular programming and activities to the curriculum and faculty activity. (VP Student Affairs and College Deans)

9. Evaluate effectiveness of student services in accordance with national standards and take appropriate action for improvement. (VP Student Affairs) *Collegiate Assessment Standards self-study completed spring 2003*

Communication and Dissemination

10. Formulate and implement a communication plan to disseminate information related to assessment efforts (within university and to external community). (Vice Provost and VP University Advancement)

11. Implement and evaluate methods for encouraging and accomplishing a culture of evidence. (President's Cabinet)

12. Increase support of assessment efforts by enlisting governance groups in action phases of the assessment process. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning with Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee, University Educational Policies Committee, General Education Subcommittee, Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, Senate Executive Committee, and Graduate Council) *began fall 2005; ongoing*

13. Include presentations on assessment in meetings of President's advisory boards. (President) *began fall 2004; ongoing*

Core Quality Indicators

14. Identify critical core indicators of quality that transcend annual goals and priorities, monitor progress, and take appropriate actions for quality improvement. (Provost with President, President's Cabinet and Deans Council) *completed spring 2006*

Definitions and Goals for Assessment

15. Create a glossary of assessment terms for CSU Stanislaus. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *completed spring 2005*

16. Define goals of assessment program at CSU Stanislaus. (AVP for Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed fall 2004*

17. Identify and respond to critical questions about faculty concerns regarding learning and learning-centered university. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning with Faculty Speaker) *in process*

18. Engage faculty in discussions of "culture of evidence" and increase understanding and support. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *began fall 2004; ongoing*

Development/Fundraising

19. Evaluate sufficiency of process and outcomes of development/fundraising in support of teaching and learning. (VP University Advancement and Provost) *process, completed spring 2005; outcomes, ongoing*

Diversity

20. Evaluate success in attaining diversity goals for students, faculty, staff, and administration. (Director of Human Resources, AVP Faculty Affairs, VP Student Affairs, and AVP Enrollment Management)

Enrollment Services

21. Evaluate effectiveness of enrollment management—targets/accomplishments, profile, and services. (AVP Enrollment Management) *support unit review occurring in 2005/06*

22. Evaluate strategies and programs to identify, prevent, and remedy student-warning signs for students whose academic progress is in jeopardy. (AVP Enrollment Management and VP Student Affairs)

23. Evaluate student admissions criteria (student selectivity). (AVP Enrollment Management)

24. Collect information on students' academic progress and basic college-readiness skills. (AVP Enrollment Management) *ongoing*

Facilities

25. Evaluate quality, sufficiency, renewal, and deployment of facilities in support of teaching and learning. (VP Business and Finance) *support unit review occurring in 2005/06*

Faculty Development

26. Develop assessment-related learning opportunities for faculty. (Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning with Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *provided in fall 2005 and spring 2006; ongoing*

27. Increase participation by a broad range of faculty in assessment development opportunities. (Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning with Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *began winter 2006; ongoing*

28. Recognize faculty members' assessment accomplishments. (President, Provost, College Deans, and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning)

Information Technology

29. Develop and implement assessment of the quality of information technology in support of teaching and learning. (AVP Information Technology) *support unit review occurring in 2005/06*

Library

30. Develop and implement assessment of the quality of the library in support of student learning. (Dean, Library) *support unit review in progress*

31. Identify and secure books and newsletters related to assessment for use by campus community. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *occurred in spring 2005 and fall 2005; ongoing*

Organization

32. Develop and document organizational infrastructure, and roles and responsibilities for university-wide assessment. (AVP for Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed fall 2005*

33. Create leadership groups for assessment (AVP for Assessment and Quality Assurance with Faculty Speaker and Deans Council) *completed winter 2006*

Planning

34. Develop and implement coherent action plan for assessment/quality assurance related to institutional effectiveness. (AVP for Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed spring 2005*

35. Conduct an inventory, document assessment accomplishments, and initiate actions for assessment goals not yet realized. (AVP for Assessment and Quality Assurance) *underway*

36. Evaluate achievements under existing Academic Assessment Plan. (University Educational Policies Committee)

Staff Development

37. Promote training on assessment for administrators and staff. (Vice Presidents) *began fall 2005; ongoing*

38. Increase participation by a broad range of staff and administrators in assessment development opportunities. (Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning with Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *began winter 2006; ongoing*

39. Recognize staff and administration members' assessment accomplishments. (President, Provost, and Vice Presidents)

Student Development

40. Promote leadership and participation of students in the assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness. (VP Student Affairs and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *began fall 2005; ongoing*

Student Learning Goals

41. Secure approval of Principles of Assessment of Student Learning. *completed fall 2004*

42. Revise Methods Used to Examine Institutional Effectiveness. *revision completed spring 2006*

43. Update inventory and document learning goals for academic programs—four stages: (1) learning goals stated, (2) methods and timeline identified (3) data collected and analyzed, and (4) data used by faculty to improve programs. (College Deans and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *completed spring 2005*

44. Align curriculum with learning goals (e.g., matrix of course embedded learning goals). (College Deans and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *ongoing through academic program review processes*

45. Document accomplishments for assessment of general education learning goals and work with GE Subcommittee to continue progress. (Vice Provost with Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning and General Education Subcommittee Chair)

46. Determine if desirable to implement proposed project on general education goal of Communication – Community of Learners. (Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) underway

47. Develop systematic protocols for assessing entering student preparation, needs and attitudes, and linking these to general education requirements and other managed learning activities. (AVP Enrollment Management and General Education Subcommittee)

48. Document accomplishment of assessment of learning goals in university-wide programs such as global/international education (Director of Global Affairs), service learning (Coordinator of Service Learning), honors (Director of the Honors Program and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning). *global affairs and service learning support unit review scheduled for 2006/07; honors and academic program review scheduled for 2006/07*

49. Document accomplishments for assessment of graduate (master's) learning goals and support efforts of Graduate Council and Graduate School to continue progress. (College Deans) *support unit review scheduled for 2006/07*

50. Document how data influenced program revision, general education (Associate Dean ALS), baccalaureate and graduate curricula (College Deans), academic support services (Enrollment Management), teaching methods (Director of the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning), academic mission (President), student support services (VP Student Affairs), retention and graduation rates (AVP Enrollment Management), institutional decision making (President's Office), etc. *underway*

51. Enhance quality of assessment methods to evaluate student learning and competence in major field. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *underway*

52. Enhance quality of assessment methods to evaluate student learning in general education. (Vice Provost and Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning with General Education Subcommittee) *underway*

53. Document organizational structure for general education. (AVP of Assessment and Quality Assurance and General Education Subcommittee Chair) *underway*

54. Ensure CSU Accountability Report contains descriptions of student learning goals and their assessment as per system requirements. (Institutional Research and AVP of Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed fall 2004*

Support Unit Reviews

55. Identify and enhance specialized assessment initiatives within each division. (Vice Presidents) *underway*

56. Incorporate student learning assessment into the support unit review process. (Provost) *completed spring 2006*

57. Evaluate effectiveness of Support Unit Review process. (Provost) *scheduled for 5 years after implementation – 2009/10*

WASC

58. Continue actions to address WASC recommendations as related to assessment. (Provost) *underway 2000; ongoing*

59. Promote understanding of new WASC process and standards as related to assessment and educational effectiveness. (Vice Provost/AVP of Assessment and Quality Assurance with Vice Presidents) *underway fall 2004*

60. Develop and update electronic data portfolio/institutional presentation as per WASC requirements. (Institutional Research) *underway summer 2005; ongoing*

Website

61. Develop website for assessment of student learning. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *completed spring 2006*

62. Develop website for Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance. (AVP of Assessment and Quality Assurance) *completed spring 2006*

63. Develop website for general education and its assessment. (Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning) *completed spring 2006*

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
TEN METHODS TO EXAMINE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Primary Purposes and Secondary Connections for Each Method with Each of Three Goals of the Examination
2005

Ten Methods Used to Examine Institutional Effectiveness	GOAL 1 *Assessment of Student Learning*	GOAL 2 *Evaluation/ Review*	GOAL 3 *Accountability*
Assessment of Student Learning–Classroom Level: *Methods faculty use to collect information, early and often, on how well their students are learning what they are being taught. The purpose of classroom assessment is to provide faculty and students with information and insights needed to improve learning quality.* [Adapted from Angelo, T.A. Ten Easy Pieces: Assessing Higher Learning in Four Dimensions. In T. A. Angelo (ed.) Classroom Research: Early Lessons from Success. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 46, Summer 1991, pp. 17-31.]	* Internal—Used by individual faculty members to verify and improve student learning.	+ Existence of the process serves as evidence of its application. Results are not reported.	+ Existence of the process serves as evidence of its application. Results are not reported.
Assessment of Student Learning–Program Level: *An ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning, involving (a) making our expectations explicit and public; (b) setting appropriate criteria and high standards for learning quality; (c) systematically gathering, analyzing, and interpreting evidence to determine how well performance matches those expectations and standards; and (d) using the resulting information to improve performance.* [Adapted from Angelo, T.A. Reassessing (and Defining) Assessment. The AAHE Bulletin, 48 (2), November 1995, pp. 7-9.]	* Internal—Used for programmatic improvement.	* Internal—Connected to program review. * External—Connected to accreditation. Summary data are reported if required.	+ Existence of the process serves as evidence of its application. Results are not reported; the act of using the results for program improvement is reported.
Assessment of Student Learning–University Level: *Multiple methods used by all faculty to design curricula, assignments, and assessment of student learning. Includes authentic and performance based; pedagogy systematically reviewed and revised based on assessment data* (WASC Framework for Educational Effectiveness, 2005) *Includes general education and university-wide goals addressed in curriculum and co-curriculum.*	* Internal—Used for programmatic improvement.	* Internal – Connected to university-wide assessment. * External – Connected to re-accreditation. Summary data reported.	* Existence of process serves as evidence of its application. Results reported in aggregate. * Examples of use of results for improvement of educational effectiveness are reported.
Evaluation of Instruction: *Processes used to evaluate and improve instruction, which include a contractually mandated process whereby students provide feedback on their perceptions of teaching effectiveness.*	+ Internal—Used by individual faculty member.	* Internal—Used within departments and colleges to improve instruction, and used as required in the RPT process.	+ External—Aggregate data may be reported as required.
Academic Program Review: *A process to examine the effectiveness of an academic program. The APR process is applied to degree programs, stand-alone minors, General Education, and academic centers and institutes. The process provides feedback (a) to the academic unit primarily responsible for the program, (b) to the appropriate academic administrators, and (c) to external units in the form of confirmation of the existence of the APR process and in the form of summaries of the outcomes.*	+ Internal—Program ASL considered. Used to support programmatic improvement.	* Internal—Used to verify and improve programmatic effectiveness.	+ External—Existence of the process serves as evidence of its application. Results are reported as required.
Support Unit Review: *A process employed to examine the operational effectiveness (strengths and weaknesses) of university administrative units or multi-unit functions.*	* Internal—Process describes effect of unit/function on learning environment.	* Internal—Used to verify and improve effectiveness of unit/function.	+ External—Existence of the process serves as evidence of its application. Results are reported as required.
Specialized Program Accreditation: *A process of program, unit, or discipline review where the examination of effectiveness is conducted within the context, requirements, and standards of a discipline-based accrediting body. The specialized program accreditation document and evaluation may be used in lieu of a separate academic program review process as determined by the provost.*	+ Internal and External— Program ASL considered. Results are reported as required by accrediting body.	* External—Used to verify and improve programmatic effectiveness.	+ External—Presence of accredited program serves as evidence of quality.
Institutional Accreditation: *The process of evaluating and improving the institutional and educational effectiveness of California State University, Stanislaus within the context, requirements, and standards of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.*	+ Internal and External— Program ASL considered. Results are reported as required by WASC.	* External—Used to verify and improve programmatic effectiveness.	* External—Presence of accreditation serves as evidence of quality.
Examination of Institutional Issues: *The process of examining emerging issues at the university level. These examinations may be generated by emerging issues in higher education, in the CSU system, or in the immediate environment of CSU Stanislaus. Identification of institutional issues may be proactive or reactive.*	+ May involve Program ASL depending on issues.	*Internal—Used to examine emerging issues.	+ External—Presence of function may be an element of accountability.
Accountability/External Reports: *External reporting is the process of collecting and reporting data, information, and/or analysis to meet the requirements of the CSU system, state government, federal government, or other key entities for which reports must be submitted to maintain the university's ability to achieve its mission. Accountability measures include the specific set of reporting elements employed in the CSU system's accountability-reporting process.*	+ External—Presence of process may be an element.	* External—Reports as required.	*External—Reports as required.

* Primary Purposes   + Secondary Connections

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WHO'S RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITHIN ACADEMIC AFFAIRS FOR ASSESSMENT-RELATED FUNCTIONS

2005

TEN METHODS	1 Assessment of Student Learning–Classroom Level	2 Assessment of Student Learning–Program Level	3 Assessment of Student Learning – University Level	4 Evaluation of Instruction	5 Academic Program Review	6 Support Unit Review	7 Specialized Program Accreditation	8 Institutional Accreditation WASC	9 Examination of Institutional Issues	10 Accountability External Reports
Individual Faculty	Conducts ASL in their classrooms.	Contributes; collaborates. Collectively designs and implements.	Contributes indirectly through classroom assessment, teaching, and program changes. No individual course assessment identified; aggregate only.	Implements, administers, reviews, and responds.	Contributes, endorses, and collaborates.	Participates if required.	Contributes, endorses, collaborates, and participates.	Participates as requested.	Identifies issues; participates if necessary.	
Individual Student	Establishes high expectations for responsibility and intellectual honesty in assessment activities. Provides primary assessment data.	Participates in learning communities, collaborative learning, and program evaluation.	Participates in policy development; representative on ASL Committee development and evaluation of the university's assessment programs.	Participates in policy development for student evaluation of instruction instrument/procedures. Provides primary assessment data.	Participates in assessment of program quality.	Participates as requested by each unit.	Participates in self-review for meeting accreditation standards and in accreditation of individual programs.	Participates in assessment initiatives.	Reviews outcomes of assessment efforts; makes recommendations for mproving university programs and services.	Reviews as requested or desired.
Associated Students Executive Council	Participates in policy development.		Participates in policy development; representative on ASL Committee; participates in the development and evaluation of the university's assessment program.	Participates in policy development for student evaluation of instruction instrument/procedures.	Participates in policy development.	Receives summary information.		Representative serves on WASC Leadership Team; participates in assessment initiatives; liaison to ASI for student learning assessment.	Disseminates assessment information to students.	Reviews as requested or desired.
Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee	Recommends policy.	Recommends policy. Advises ASL Associate regarding programmatic and resource needs. Advises UEPC regarding mission and scope of assessment plans. Advises UEPC regarding implementation of assessment plans.	Advises UEPC regarding policy on student learning. Advises Faculty Coordinator regarding issues and resource support.					Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues; participates if necessary.	Reviews and responds as appropriate per ASL Subcommittee's role.
University Educational Policies Committee	Recommends policy.	Recommends policy; provides support.	UEPC reviews and recommends policy, as necessary. General Education Sub Committee evaluates GE courses, implements policies and procedures that UEPC submits to GE Sub.	Recommends policy regarding teaching effectiveness as part of program review.	Reviews report. Recommends action. Recommends policy.	Provides input as needed.		Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates if necessary. Recommends policy.	Reviews and responds as appropriate per UEPC's role.

H1

TEN METHODS	1 Assessment of Student Learning–Classroom Level	2 Assessment of Student Learning–Program Level	3 Assessment of Student Learning – University Level	4 Evaluation of Instruction	5 Academic Program Review	6 Support Unit Review	7 Specialized Program Accreditation	8 Institutional Accreditation WASC	9 Examination of Institutional Issues	10 Accountability External Reports
Graduate Council	Recommends policy.	Recommends policy; provides support.	Recommends policy, as necessary. Evaluates assessment of graduate student learning goals and recommends actions for university wide improvement.	Recommends policy regarding teaching effectiveness as part of program review.	Reviews report and recommends action. Recommends policy.	Provides input as needed.		Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates if necessary. Recommends policy.	Reviews and responds as appropriate per Graduate Council's role.
Senate Executive Committee	Facilitates policy.	Facilitates policy.	Facilitates policy discussions and development.					Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates if necessary. Facilitates policy.	Reviews and responds as appropriate per SEC's role.
Academic Senate	Facilitates policy.	Facilitates policy.	Approves and recommends policy to President.	Recommends policy.	Recommends policy.			Participates and contributes. Reviews and endorses self study.	Identifies issues and participates if necessary. Facilitates policy.	Reviews and responds as appropriate per Academic Senate's role.
Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning	Explores ASL issues with faculty. Advises faculty. Provides support. Promotes ASL at the classroom level.	Explores ASL issues with programs. Advises programs. Provides support. Promotes.	Provides support for enhancing quality of assessment efforts by faculty, provides faculty development activities, reviews over-all assessment results and recommends actions.	Advises.			Advises. Supports.	Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates.	
Faculty Development Center Director	Promotes ASL at the classroom level. Educates. Advocates.	Promotes. Educates. Advocates.	Designs and supports faculty development assessment activities. Enhances faculty expertise in assessing student learning.	Advises. Educates. Mentors.		Participates as required.	Advises. Supports.	Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates.	
Chairs & Program Heads	Encourages. Supports. Mentors. Reports presence of process as required.	Coordinates and implements. Reports presence of process as required.	Supports university wide assessment as relates to academic disciplines, general education, and graduate education outcomes.	Reviews. Carries out. Mentors.	Writes the review. Implements the recommendations.	Participates as needed.	Conducts the review; participates in preparing the report. Holds ownership. Chair/program head/Program faculty hold ownership as appropriate to the specific accreditation.	Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participants. Takes action if appropriate.	Provides input.
Deans	Encourages, supports, coordinates, and reports presence of process as required.	Encourages, supports, coordinates, and reports presence of process as required.	Encourages, supports, and reports processes and use of assessment outcomes.	Reviews. Carries out. Mentors.	Oversees development of program review document. Reviews results with provost and program faculty. Recommends action. Takes action.	Reviews and recommends action. Implements as required.	Holds prime responsibility and leads the process.	Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates. Takes action if appropriate.	Provides input. Coordinates, compiles, and produces reports as required.

TEN METHODS	1 Assessment of Student Learning– Classroom Level	2 Assessment of Student Learning– Program Level	3 Assessment of Student Learning – University Level	4 Evaluation of Instruction	5 Academic Program Review	6 Support Unit Review	7 Specialized Program Accreditation	8 Institutional Accreditation WASC	9 Examination of Institutional Issues	10 Accountability External Reports
Office of Institutional Research	Assists by providing data if requested by faculty.	Provides data/information as necessary for review. Assists in collecting and compiling data.	Collects and provides data, for assessment of student learning. Assists faculty in assessment efforts. Reports in aggregate.		Assists in process design and in data collection and analysis. Stores data. Provides data/ information. Assists in collecting, compiling, and analyzing data.	Assists in process design and in data collection and analysis. Stores data. Assesses review process.	Provides data and analysis as required.	Provides data and analysis as required. Responsible for mandated data portfolio. Participates and contributes.	Identifies issues and participates. Provides data and data collection instruments as needed.	Coordinates, compiles, and produces external reports as required. Participates as required.
Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance	Assists with methods for classroom research and assessment, if requested by faculty.	Provides expertise to enhance quality of information gathered. Leads discussion; not directive. Educates; enhances quality.	Provides leadership for coordinating university wide assessment of student learning.		Assists in design of assessment strategies. Supports assessment initiatives.	Assists with assessment elements as requested. Ensures focus on student learning in reviews.	Assists with assessment elements as requested.	Coordinates assessment efforts in accordance with WASC standards.	Identifies assessment issues and participates in planning.	Coordinates, compiles, and produces external reports related to assessment, as requested.
Vice Provost	Encourages; supports.	Encourages; supports.	Encourages and supports.		Manages process, reports results as required, and archives. Supports implementa-tion of recom-mendations as appropriate. Assesses review process.	Takes action as needed.	Serves as institutional officer for accreditation.	Serves as accreditation Liaison Officer. Coordinates process. Coordinates self study.	Identifies issues and participates.	Coordinates, compiles, and produces external reports as required.
Provost	Encourages; supports.	Encourages; supports.	Encourages and supports.	Implements required process.	Reviews results with dean and faculty. Imple-ments results and recom-mendations. Supports process.	Reviews. Implements. Takes action. Mages process. Assesses review process.	Reviews. Implements. Takes action.	Monitors performance. Provides leadership and in meeting standards. Oversees coordination of the process.	Identifies issues and participates. Takes action if needed.	Oversees reporting process. Approves reports before submission.

H3

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC BASIC DESCRIPTIVE DATA PROFILE
DATA ELEMENT 1
HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT BY LEVEL
FALL 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 AND 2005

Fall Term	Total Headcount Enrollment	Bachelor Headcount		Credential Headcount		Postbaccalaureate (Unclassified) Headcount		Master's Headcount		Total FTE Enrollment
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2001	7,534	5,694	75.6%	752	10.0%	512	6.8%	576	7.6%	5,626.7
2002	7,850	5,927	75.5%	664	8.5%	575	7.3%	684	8.7%	5,855.3
2003	8,072	6,154	76.2%	656	8.1%	522	6.5%	740	9.2%	6,056.7
2004	7,858	6,192	78.8%	694	8.8%	273	3.5%	699	8.9%	5,986.0
2005	8,137	6,483	79.7%	424	5.2%	531	6.5%	699	8.6%	6,197.7

Definitions

Percentages are based on "total headcount enrollment."
Consistent with IPEDS definitions, postbaccalaureate students seeking a second bachelor's degree are counted as undergraduates. A graduate student holds a bachelor's or first-professional degree, or equ
Credential headcount include students enrolled in CSU CCTC-approved credential or subject matter waiver programs but exclude students enrolled in a Master's program. A postbaccalaureate student holds an acceptable baccalaureate or equivalent degree and has not been enrolled in a Master's or credential program.
Total FTE Enrollment: Full-Time + (Part-Time/3). FTES for official CSU reporting purposes are calculated differently (Total Student Credit Units/15) and are slightly lower.

Narrative

CSU Stanislaus overall headcount enrollment SU
Chancellor's Office-mandated restrictio
years while the graduate headcount enrollment experienced a 10.1% decrease. Students in a master's program increased 21.4% since 2001 but have fallen slightly from their peak of 740 students in 2003.

The large number of unclassified postbacc
admitted to a Master's degree program and a breakdown in the internal process used for entering credential student classifications into the campus student database. The overall graduate headcount enrollment decl
the number of credential students. Credential headcount includes students in Multiple Subjects (elementary), Single Subject (secondary) and Special Education programs.
Credential student numb   y feeder program for
the credential program; required tests for program admissions such as the CSET, RICA and CBEST are perceived as barriers by some students; the elimination of class size reduction changed the job market; and increased c
and on-line teacher training programs.
The University is in the process of developing new professional master's degree programs and a Education doctorate program which should increase graduate student enrollment.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC BASIC DESCRIPTIVE DATA PROFILE
DATA ELEMENT 2
HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT BY STATUS AND LOCATION
FALL 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 AND 2005

Fall Term	Total Headcount Enrollment	Full-Time		Part-Time		On-Campus Location		Off-Campus Location	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2001	7,534	4,673	62.0%	2,861	38.0%	6,303	83.7%	1,231	16.3%
2002	7,850	4,858	61.9%	2,992	38.1%	6,615	84.3%	1,235	15.7%
2003	8,072	5,049	62.5%	3,023	37.5%	6,885	85.3%	1,187	14.7%
2004	7,858	5,050	64.3%	2,808	35.7%	6,861	87.3%	997	12.7%
2005	8,137	5,228	64.2%	2,909	35.8%	7,164	88.0%	973	12.0%

Definition

Stockton is an official off-campus center. Off-campus student headcount is defined as any student taking one or more courses at Stockton. The Stockton headcount includes students taking a mix of courses at Stockton and Turlock. Televised distance education course headcounts are not included in off-campus figures.

Narrative

Full-time student headcounts have increased over the last five years while the ratio of full-time/part-time students has remained fairly constant. The overall part-time headcount declined slightly from fall 2003 to fall 2004, probably due to the state budget cuts and CSU Chancellor's Office-mandated restrictions on admitting unclassified postbaccalaurate students. After those restrictions were removed, the overall part-time headcount increased in fall 2005. The number of

restrictions. Headcount e

budget cuts; and rising student transportation costs.

Distance learning at California State University, Stanislaus consists of courses broadcast from the main Turlock campus to the Stockton Center; Merced Tri-College Center and Tuolumne County Office of Education in Sonora via ITFS (one-way visual; two-way audio), cable television and CODEC videoconferencing (two-way audio and visual) originating from Turlock or the Stockton Center.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC BASIC DESCRIPTIVE DATA PROFILE
DATA ELEMENT 3
DEGREES GRANTED BY LEVEL
COLLEGE YEARS 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04 AND 2004-05

College Year	Total Degrees Granted	Bachelor		Master	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2000-01	1,385	1,267	91.5%	118	8.5%
2001-02	1,382	1,241	89.8%	141	10.2%
2002-03	1,425	1,282	90.0%	143	10.0%
2003-04	1,550	1,368	88.3%	182	11.7%
2004-05	1,656	1,454	87.8%	202	12.2%

Definitions

College Year: Summer, Fall, Winter and Spring. Summer 2004 courses were not state-supported.

Narrative

Total degrees granted has increased 19.6% over the last 5 years. The ratio of bachelor's and master's degree has been slowly changing during this period. In 2000-01, master's degrees represented only 8.5% of total degrees awarded but this percentage increased to 12.2% by 2004-05.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC BASIC DESCRIPTIVE DATA PROFILE
DATA ELEMENT 4
FACULTY BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
FALL 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 AND 2005

Fall Term	Total Faculty Headcount	Full-Time Faculty [1]		Part-Time Faculty [2]		Total Faculty FTE [3]	Full-Time Faculty as % of FTE
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
2001	466	264	56.7%	202	43.3%	331.3	79.7%
2002	466	276	59.2%	190	40.8%	339.3	81.3%
2003	472	285	60.4%	187	39.6%	347.3	82.1%
2004	457	264	57.8%	193	42.2%	328.3	80.4%
2005	495	285	57.6%	210	42.4%	355.0	80.3%

Definitions

Note: Full-time and part-time percentages are based on "total faculty headcount." Headcount based on payroll as of November 1st of respective years.

[1] Full-time faculty includes tenure, tenure-track, and non tenure-track faculty members.

[2] Part-time faculty includes graduate assistants.

[3] Total Faculty FTE: Full-Time + (Part-Time/3)

Narrative

CSU Stanislaus total faculty headcount has increased 6.2% since 2001 while the ratio of full-time/part-time faculty has remained fairly stable during this period. Full-time faculty generally account for approximately 80% of faculty FTE.
The drop in the number of full-time faculty in 2004 was primarily due to a Golden Handshake offering by the CSU and CFA. Faculty were given the opportunity to retire with 2 additional years of service credit if they retired during a short window period in the Summer of 2004.

Source: IPEDS Fall Staff/Human Resources Surveys
Institutional Research (03APR06)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
WASC BASIC DESCRIPTIVE DATA PROFILE
DATA ELEMENT 5
KEY FINANCIAL RATIOS
FISCAL YEARS 2000-01, 2001-02, 2002-03, 2003-04, AND 2004-05

Fiscal Year	Return on Net Assets Ratio [1]	Net Income Ratio [2]	Operating Income Ratio [3]	Viability Ratio [4]	Instructional Expense per Student [5]	Net Tuition per Student [6]
2000-01	1.9%	-0.6%	N/A	N/A	$3,972.75	-$2,169.75
2001-02	7.5%	12.3%	36.8%	210.0%	$3,525.90	-$1,650.90
2002-03	2.0%	-4.9%	33.5%	28.6%	$3,708.01	-$1,685.01
2003-04	39.6%	2.1%	35.2%	147.2%	$3,993.51	-$1,490.51
2004-05	-0.6%	3.1%	37.3%	173.5%	$4,421.29	-$1,614.29

[1] Return on net assets ratio = Change in Net Assets / Total Net Assets at the beginning of fiscal year. Return on Net Assets increased in 2003/04 due to a 45.8 million bond for the Science Building.

[2] Net Income Ratio = Unrestricted Net Assets / Total Unrestricted Revenues; Financial statement presentation/method changed in 2001/02 to conform to GASB revenue for fee waivers and "gift" grants/financial aid. Total reduction to tuition and fee revenue for 2001/02 was $7,051,825.

[3] Operating Income Ratio = Operating Income / Total Education and General Expenses; Prior financial statement information not presented in this format. Effective in 2001/02, new GASB 34 35 presentation provided information in this format.

[4] Viability Ratio = Expendable Net Assets / Long-term Debt; Prior financial statement information not presented in this format. Effective in 2001/02, new GASB 34 35 presentation provided information in this format. Ratio has fluctuated due to issuance of a 17.3 million revenue bond (which increased long-term debt) for Housing Project RIV III in 2002/03 and Science Building 45.8 million bond appropriation in 2003/04.

[5] Instructional Expense per Student = Instructional Expense / Annualized Student Headcount, including summer. Instructional expense figure per GAAP audited statement. Annualized student headcount per Chancellor's Office Analytic Studies website, statistical reports, college year reports, Table 1. Instructional expense per student has been steadily climbing primarily due to rising salary and benefit costs.

[6] Net Tuition per Student = Annual Tuition & Fees per student - Instructional Expense per student. Fees based on IPEDS Institutional Characteristics survey figures for a full-time undergraduate in-state student for the full academic year. Student fees do not cover cost of instruction. Net tuition has stayed relatively stable for past 4 years primarily due to tuition increases. California State University, Stanislaus is a public instit

The educational effectiveness inventory provides a method for examining the status and progress for student learning assessment in the academic programs and general education. This inventory has provided guidance to the Faculty Coordinator for Assessment of Student Learning in his work with specific departments and the General Education subcommittee to enhance their assessment initiatives. The inventory is displayed in a template compatible with WASC requirements.

A review of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness suggests the following areas for action:

Institutional-Level Student Learning Outcomes. We do not appear to have explicitly stated institutional-level student learning outcomes. Although we could proclaim that general education + major + mission statement outcomes = institutional-level student learning outcomes, we would have to do so clearly and through governance structures and then begin to gather data to substantiate this assertion.

Direct Methods for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. The inventory indicates that the University should build on the traditional indirect methods of surveys for assessing quality and employ a wider variety of direct methods for assessing student learning. To date, we have some excellent examples, but not widespread, of student work samples, student portfolios, course-embedded assessment prompts, scenario and performance-based tests, and direct observations of student performance.

General Education. Assessment of student learning goals in general education is a critical area for development. We must build an infrastructure that ensures strong faculty leadership and continuity in assessment of general education learning outcomes.

Program Assessment Coordinators. The University has invested its assessment resources in the formal designation of program assessment coordinators and a university-wide assessment leadership team as a method for building even greater institutional infrastructure for review of the University's assessment program and outcomes.

Brief Chronology of Quality Assurance Activities

<u>Organizational Structures for Quality Assurance</u>
In 1999, CSU Stanislaus substantially increased its support for assessment and institutional research by establishing an office devoted to institutional research, assessment, and planning. New staffing was added, including a full-time assistant vice president and two additional high level research technicians and analysts. In fall 2004, CSU Stanislaus changed this organizational structure to focus on increased services for institutional research and mobilized its resources to enhance the amount and sophistication of its institutional research capacity, especially in support of the assessment of student learning. At the same time, the Office of Assessment and Quality Assurance, led by the Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance, was created to coordinate university-wide assessment and quality assurance initiatives. Also formed were the university-wide Assessment Leadership Team with representatives from each of the University's divisions and the Assessment Council, comprised of assessment coordinators from each academic program and led by the Faculty Coordinator for the Assessment of Student Learning.

<u>Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning</u>
After several years of spirited faculty discussions, the Academic Senate approved a document, *Principles for the Assessment of Student Learning* (2004), that describes principles for the assessment of student learning. The faculty affirmed the compelling need for meaningful assessment practices in effective education, emphasized the primary role of faculty in developing and implementing assessment measures, asserted the importance of separating assessment of student learning from faculty evaluation, and stressed the importance of formative assessment. These principles have guided the development of the assessment program at CSU Stanislaus.

<u>Methods Used to Examine Institutional Effectiveness</u>
In 2002, the provost and faculty reached consensus on the methods used at CSU Stanislaus to examine institutional effectiveness. Ten methods were identified, along with the primary purposes for each method and three goals: assessment of student learning, evaluation/review, and accountability. Also created was a companion document to identify roles and responsibilities within academic affairs for assessment-related functions, *Who's Responsible for What* (2002). These two documents resulted from a common understanding of assessment and alleviated many of the concerns of the faculty with regard to the uses of assessment information.

The document *Ten Methods to Examine Institutional Effectiveness* (2002; updated 2005) provides an overview of the methods used at the University to examine institutional effectiveness:

- ❖ assessment of student learning at the classroom level
- ❖ assessment of student learning at the program level
- ❖ assessment of student learning at the university level
- ❖ evaluation of instruction
- ❖ academic program review
- ❖ support unit review
- ❖ specialized program accreditation
- ❖ institutional accreditation
- ❖ examination of institutional issues
- ❖ external accountability reports

Two of the methods for examining institutional effectiveness are considered primary as they are university-wide and include periodic review for every administrative unit and academic program: support unit review and academic program review.

Support Unit Review. Initiated in 2003/04, the support unit review provides a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of each administrative support unit. The review demonstrates the ways, supported by evidence, in which the support units contribute to student learning.

Academic Program Review. Following a pilot program of two years, a revised academic program review process was approved in 2004/05. The revised process (a) establishes the centrality of the evaluation of student learning goals, (b) focuses on future program planning and development that result from assessment of program quality and student learning goals, (c) provides greater responsibility for assessment at the college level, (d) adds mandatory meetings with the provost at the conclusion of the process, and (e) links program review with strategic planning and budgetary decisions.

These quality assurance processes are described in more detail in the appendices to the Institutional Proposal: Appendix F, *Overview of Assessment at CSU Stanislaus*; Appendix G, *Ten Methods to Examine Institutional Effectiveness*; and Appendix H, *Who's Responsible for What* (2005).

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
General Education					
Traditional General Education (Lower and Upper Division)	Yes	General Education Website University Catalog	Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement Written Portfolios Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2009-10
General Education Summit Program (Upper Division Clustered Courses)	Yes	General Education Website University Catalog	Capstone Projects Oral Presentations Service-Learning Projects Summit Program Survey Written Portfolios	2003-04	2010-11

Program Level
(Accredited Programs in CAPS)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
College of the Arts						
ART	BA/BFA	Yes	Academic Program Review Department Website National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Bachelor of Fine Arts Review Examinations Interviews National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) Accreditation Papers Portfolios Project Critiques Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1999-00	2009-10
MUSIC	BA/BM	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi Department Website National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Capstone Projects Examinations Junior Qualifying Examinations Jury Performance Examinations National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Accreditation Senior Recital Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2012-13
THEATRE ARTS	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	In-Class Evaluations National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST) Accreditation Senior Seminar Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2012-13

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Business Administration

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Applied Studies	BA	Yes	University Catalog	Business Exit Examinations Case Studies Reviewed External Reviewers Examinations In-Class Papers Graded by External Reviewers Oral Presentations Poster Session Presentation Research Papers Senior Research Project Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1998-99	2006-07
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	BS MBA MSBA	Yes	AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Accreditation Department Website University Catalog	AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Accreditation Business Exit Examinations Case Studies Reviewed External Reviewers In-Class Papers Graded by External Reviewers Oral Presentations Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-11
COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS	BS	Yes	AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Accreditation Academic Program Review University Catalog	AACSB International—The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Accreditation Examinations Papers Presentations Real-World Project Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-11

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

DATA ELEMENT 6

2006

College of Education

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
EDUCATION	MA	Yes	Academic Program Review National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	California Basic Educational Skills Test Competency Assessment by Fieldwork Supervisors Competency Feedback Interviews Comprehensive Examinations (end of program) Master's Project Performance-Based Assessments California Subject Examinations for Teachers Employer Surveys (Program) Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance Examinations Field Work Visitation Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Accreditation Portfolios Reading Instruction Competence Assessment Thesis	2002-03	2009-10
Physical Education	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review University Catalog	Focus Groups Graduate Job Placement Graduates Continuing to Post-Baccalaureate Study Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-11

I11

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Human and Health Sciences

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Child Development	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Capstone Seminar Examinations Portfolio Review by External Community Member Portfolios Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2009-10
Cognitive Studies	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Department Website Online Course Syllabi University Catalog	Capstone Courses Senior Project Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2008-09
NURSING	BS	Yes	Academic Program Review Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Alumni Surveys (one and three year - program) Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) Accreditation Employer Evaluation Formal Papers In-Class and Take-Home Examinations Individual and Group Projects Journals Licensure Examinations Senior Evaluation Senior Survey (University)	2002-03	2007-08

I12

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
College of Human and Health Sciences (continued)						
PSYCHOLOGY	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Department Website Program Assessment Report University Catalog	American Psychological Association Format Papers Examinations Poster Session Presentation Senior Research Project Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-11
PSYCHOLOGY	MA/MS	Yes	Association for Behavior Analysis (ABA) Accreditation Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Association for Behavior Analysis (ABA) Accreditation Case Studies Examinations Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) Research Papers Thesis Writing Proficiency Review by External Reviewers	2003-04	2010-11
SOCIAL WORK	MSW	Yes	Academic Program Review Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Accreditation University Catalog	Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Accreditation Examinations Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) Student/Faculty Forum Thesis	2002-03	2010-11

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Humanities and Social Sciences

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Agricultural Studies	BA	Yes	Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Feedback from Industry Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	N/A	2009-10
Anthropology	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Capstone Course Embedded Examinations and Assignments Field Journals Fieldwork Laboratory Projects Oral Presentations Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2001-02	2008-09
Communication Studies	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Capstone Project – Public Relations Campaign or Research Paper Examinations Oral Presentations Research Papers Senior Survey (Program) Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2000-01	2007-09
Criminal Justice	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Alumni Feedback (Program) Research Methods Project Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2010-11

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (continued)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Criminal Justice	MA	Yes	Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University)	2002-03	2010-11
Economics	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Alumni Feedback (Program) Capstone Course Exit Surveys (Program) Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2001-02	2008-09
English	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Senior Seminar Capstone Course Student Survey (Program) Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2001-02	2008-09
English	MA	Yes	Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report	Comprehensive Examinations Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) Thesis Project	2001-02	2008-09
French	BA		Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Oral Performance of Language Skills Senior Survey (University) Standardized Assessment Tools Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University) Written Performance of Language Skills	2001-02	2008-09

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (continued)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Geography	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2009-10
History	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Senior Seminar Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2009-10
History	MA	Yes	Department Website Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Comprehensive Examinations Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) Thesis	2002-03	2009-10
Liberal Studies	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report Program Website University Catalog	Alumni Questionnaire California Basic Educational Skills Test Portfolios Program Assessment Questionnaire Senior Questionnaire (Program) Senior Seminar Senior Survey (University) Success in Credential Program Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1999-00	2006-07

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (continued)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Philosophy	BA	Yes	Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Capstone Paper Examinations Journal Student Papers Departmental Evaluation Forms Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2000-01	2007-08
Politics	BA	Yes	Course Syllabi Program Assessment Report Program Website University Catalog	Essays Examinations Presentations Research Papers Senior Survey (Programs) Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2004-05	2011-12
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	MPA	Yes	Academic Program Review Course Syllabi National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Comprehensive Examinations Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) Accreditation Thesis	2004-05	2011-12

117

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

DATA ELEMENT 6

2006

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (continued)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Sociology	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Class Discussions Examinations Focus Groups Research Proposals Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University) Written Papers	2002-03	2009-10
Social Sciences	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review University Catalog	Capstone Seminar California Subject Examinations for Teachers Embedded Coursework Informal Feedback Senior Survey (University) Student Admission to the Teaching Credential Program Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-11
Spanish	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Oral Performance of Language Skills Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University) Written Performance of Language Skills	2001-02	2008-09

California State University, Stanislaus
Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
Data Element 6
2006

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
College of Natural Sciences						
Biological Sciences	BA/BS	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Examinations Graduate Placement Hands-On-Skills Assessment Senior Survey (University) Student Survey (Program) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1999-00	2006-07
CHEMISTRY	BS	Yes	Academic Program Review American Chemical Society (ACS) Accreditation Program Assessment Report University Catalog	American Chemical Society (ACS) Accreditation American Chemical Society Standardized Test Classroom Examinations Embedded Oral Presentations Interviews Laboratory Reports Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2000-01	2007-08
Computer Science	BS	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Senior Seminar Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2002-03	2009-10

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

College of Natural Sciences (continued)

Major	Degree	Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Geology	BA/BS	Yes	Academic Program Review, Program Assessment Report, University Catalog	Book Reports/Term Papers, Capstone Courses, Computer Laboratory Assignments, Field Projects, Informal Alumni Feedback, Map-Making, Portfolios, Senior Survey (University), Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University), Written and Oral Examinations, Written Field Research Reports	2000-01	
Mathematics	BA/BS	Yes	Academic Program Review, Program Assessment Report, University Catalog	Capstone course, Exit Interview, Portfolio for Subject Matter Preparation Program, Senior Survey (University), Subject Matter Competency Committee, Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2000-01	2007-08
Marine Science	MS	Yes	Academic Program Review, University Catalog	Graduate Alumni Survey (University), Graduate Exit Survey (University), Thesis	2003-04	2010-11
Physical Sciences	BA	Yes	Academic Program Review, Program Assessment Report, University Catalog	Examinations, Homework, Laboratory Reports, Senior Survey (University), Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1999-00	2006-07

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS

INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

DATA ELEMENT 6

2006

		Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
College of Natural Sciences (continued)						
Major	**Degree**					
Physics	BA/BS	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report University Catalog	Examinations Homework Laboratory Reports Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	1999-00	2006-07

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
INVENTORY OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS
DATA ELEMENT 6
2006

		Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published?	What measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated learning outcomes?	Date of last program review	Date of next program review
Interdisciplinary Majors						
Major	**Degree**					
Interdisciplinary Studies	MA/MS	Yes	Academic Program Review Program Assessment Report	Graduate Alumni Survey (University) Graduate Exit Survey (University) Thesis	2003-04	2010-11
Special Major	BA/BS	Yes	Academic Program Review	Senior Survey (University) Undergraduate Alumni Survey (University)	2003-04	2010-00

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
CSU ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT QUALITY INDICATORS

California State University, Stanislaus reports biennially its achievement of accountability goals for indicators 1-9 to the CSU System via the CSU Accountability Report process. Indicator 10 for the quality of graduate and post-baccalaureate programs is reported every four years.

1. Quality of baccalaureate degree programs (learning goals outcomes, core competencies of general education, quality assurance processes at programmatic level)

2. Access to the CSU (first-time freshmen and upper-division California community college [CCC] transfers who applied to the University and were admitted)

3. Progression to degree (first-year continuation rates for first time freshmen and CCC transfers; upper-division units earned to degree for junior CCC transfers and native FTF)

4. Persistence and graduation (graduation rates from the campus of origin; estimated total first-time freshmen who eventually will graduate; estimated CCC transfers – juniors – who eventually will graduate)

5. Areas of special state need (first time, new-type credentials recommended by the university, excluding interns: multiple-subject, single-subject, special education)

6. Relations with K-12 (the number of CSU faculty, CSU students, K-12 schools, and K-12 students involved in outreach efforts)

7. Remediation (percentage of students requiring remediation in mathematics and English who complete in one year and prepare for collegiate study)

8. Facilities utilization (state-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus; state-supported course annual FTES occurring via CPEC-approved center)

9. University advancement (charitable gifts, special revenues, alumni participation, private fund goal)

10. Graduate and post-baccalaureate education (course and teaching effectiveness, program completion, alumni and employer satisfaction, external accreditation, learning goals assessment)

<div align="center">

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS
CORE INDICATORS OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY
2006

</div>

CSU Stanislaus has identified a preliminary set of "core indicators" that focus on educational quality. These core indicators will be refined and redefined as campus discussions of the inquiry questions develop throughout the University's reaccreditation self study. These seven quality indicators have been linked to specific self-study inquiry questions and to the WASC standards.

Program Quality (Inquiry Question 1 and WASC Standard 1)

These data will be collected for all programs and all students.

1. number of programs accredited and reaccredited by disciplinary accreditation agencies
2. ratings by students on exit surveys
3. ratings by alumni on surveys
4. student satisfaction on national surveys
5. ranking by external groups (e.g., *U.S. News and World Report*, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities)

Quality of Teaching (Inquiry Question 3 and WASC Standards 2 and 4)

These data are collected for all programs and all students as extracted from student ratings of course and teaching quality on the course evaluation form, IDEA.

The results will be analyzed by *course type* to determine if student ratings of the quality of teaching and learning are differentiated: undergraduate and graduate, general education (lower and upper division), writing proficiency, and distance learning.

The results will be analyzed by *instructor classification* to determine if student ratings of the quality of teaching and learning are differentiated: full-time tenured and tenure track, full-time lecturers, and part-time lecturers.

6. Overall student ratings of item #17 – *Overall, I rate this instructor an excellent teacher.*
7. Overall student ratings of item #18 – *Overall, I rate this course as excellent.*
8. Frequency of faculty selection of the 12 IDEA course objectives—those identified as essential/important
9. Essential/ important course objectives identified by faculty
10. Congruence of student ratings of progress on objectives chosen by faculty
11. Student ratings of their learning for objectives identified by faculty as essential/important. Comparisons can be made between those objectives listed as being essential/ important to faculty to those found to be the most popular in the student rating to determine effectiveness of teaching approach/method.
12. Student progress on a given type of objective related to teaching approach
13. Frequency of faculty selection of 9 IDEA primary approaches to teaching (lecture, discussion, seminar, skill/activity, laboratory, field experience, studio, multi-media, practicum/clinic, other)
14. Frequency of faculty selection of course requirements for writing, oral communication, computer applications, group work, mathematical/quantitative work, critical thinking, and creative/artistic/design endeavor
15. The relationship (congruence) of teaching methods to learning objectives
16. Student ratings of their achievement of general education goals across both general education and non-general education courses

Quality of Faculty Development (Inquiry Question 3 and WASC Standard 3)

Faculty development activities will be analyzed in the following categories: instructional technology, assessment of student learning; retention, promotion, and tenure; teaching effectiveness: navigating the University, Book Club Program)

17. number of faculty development activities offered annually

18. percentage of faculty participating in faculty development activities

19. number of faculty implementing classroom changes/innovations as a result of faculty development activities

20. number of faculty employing instructional technology for classroom instruction as a result of faculty development activities

Quality of Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (Inquiry Question 4 and WASC Standard 2)

These data will be collected annually by sampling a minimum of 25% of the faculty and ensuring a representative sample from broad disciplinary areas, rank, gender, and ethnicity.

21. amount of scholarly work (publication/public venue presentations of faculty)

22. applications of faculty scholarship to courses/teaching

23. number of sponsored programs through grants and contracts

Quality of Engaging Students in Learning (Inquiry Question 1 and WASC Standard 2)

Student and faculty perceptions/satisfaction of the engagement of students in learning will be gathered from national surveys such as First Year Initiative Survey, National Study of Student Engagement, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, and the Novel Levitz Institutional Priorities Survey.

24. level of academic challenge/rigor

25. number of students receiving library instruction

26. number of students using library services/collections

27. frequency of students using library services/collections

28. number of students engaged in undergraduate and graduate research with faculty

29. amount of student scholarly work (publication/public venue presentations of students)

30. amount of student/faculty interaction outside of classroom

31. level of supportive campus environment, recognition and affirmation of group differences and affiliations, number of students participating in co-curricular activities in support of diversity as an educational outcome

32. student engagement active/collaborative learning

Student Quality (Inquiry Question 1 and WASC Standards 1 and 2)

At Matriculation

33. number of students scoring at or above national mean on SAT/ACT

34. increase in rate of students taking SAT/ACT)

35. GPA from high school (computed for all courses that meet CSU college preparation pattern in 10-12) and GPA for junior transfers

36. number of students fully prepared in English (English Placement Test) and mathematics (Entry-Level Mathematics Test)

37. number of high school valedictorians enrolled and percentage of student body

38. student pass rates on the Writing Proficiency Screening Test (WPST)

39. student scores on GRE/MAT/GMAT for entry into graduate programs

40. student performance and growth on national performance-based tests (e.g., *Collegiate Learning Assessment*)

41. student pass rates on certification and licensure examinations and the number of competitive awards

42. number of students who are employed in their chosen fields/professions

43. number of undergraduate students who accepted into and complete master's degrees

44. number of master's students who accepted into and complete doctoral programs

45. percentage of students meeting performance standards for general education learning outcomes

Support for Learning (Inquiry Question 2 and WASC Standards, 1, 2, 3, and 4)

46. budgetary priorities in planning/allocation documents

47. strategic planning priorities linked to educational quality

48. resource support for faculty development

49. faculty workload agreement outcomes

50. hiring patterns sufficient to support instruction and learning

51. diversity of faculty, staff, and administration

52. level of funding to library in support of instruction, research, and learning

53. instructional technology support focused on instructional technology for learning

54. allocation of appropriate academic space

55. financial and personnel support for assessment and institutional research