WASC Interim Report: California State University, Dominguez Hills (Spring 2012)

by ALO CSUDH

Introduction & Directions

WASC Interim Report

Interim Reports must be submitted via LiveText

When taking accreditation action under the WASC *Handbook of Accreditation,* the Commission may request additional reports focused on identified issues of concern. In such cases, the institution is asked to prepare an Interim Report following the format prescribed here.

The WASC Interim Report Committee reviews the report and responds to the institution with one of three outcomes:

1) receipt of the report with recommendations;

2) deferral of action pending receipt of follow-up information; or

3) receipt of the report with a recommendation that the Commission send a site visit team to follow-up on specified issues.

Interim Reports are intended to be limited in scope, not comprehensive evaluations of the institution. The report should help the Interim Report Committee understand the progress made by the institution in addressing the issues identified by the Commission and the major recommendations of the last visiting team. The report is to be submitted to the WASC office via LiveText by the date specified in the Commission action letter that triggered the Interim Report.

If the Interim Report addresses financial issues, there are special reporting requirements in addition to those required for other concerns. These additional reporting requirements are noted in this document in Section VIII.

INSTRUCTIONS:

This template outlines the mandatory sections of the **WASC Interim Report**.

- Please respond to each element.

- As you move through the template adding information, take care not to delete the original questions.

- The narrative for each question <u>must</u> be included directly in LiveText. Attachments are only for supporting documents.

- Use the following naming convention for your document: [YEAR]: [INSTITUTION NAME], Interim Report
  Example: 2010: Sunshine University, Interim Report

- When complete, choose 'Submit for Review' and 'Submit' the report to 'WASCIRC'.

- **Please notify your WASC staff liaison and Jamie Wilkins, jwilkins@wascsenior.org, once the report is complete and has been submitted.**

Additional Resources

- For assistance formatting LiveText submissions, please review the **LiveText Tutorial.**

General Information

Cover Sheet

Please complete the following information:

1. Name of Institution:

California State University, Dominguez Hills

2. Physical address of main campus:

1000 East Victoria Street
Carson, CA 90747

3. Date of submission of this report:

February 29, 2012

4. Person submitting the report:

Dr. Janna Bersi, Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, Management, and Planning and ALO

I. List of Topics or Concerns Addressed in Report

Summary of Commission Topics or Concerns

Instructions: Please list the topics identified in the action letter(s) and that are addressed in this report.

The following issues were identified by the Commission and visiting team to be addressed in this Interim Report:
• progress in the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units within the institution, and
• the linkage of the results of such assessment with strategic planning processes.

II. Institutional Context

Institutional Context

Instructions: The purpose of this section is to describe the institution so that the Interim Report Committee can understand the issues discussed in the report in context.

Very briefly describe the institution's background; mission; history, including the founding date and year first accredited; geographic locations; and other pertinent information.

History

California State University, Dominguez Hills is a comprehensive public university and one of the 23 campuses that constitute the California State University (CSU) system. The Legislature of the State of California authorized the establishment of a college in the South Bay area of Los Angeles County in 1960, and the first students were enrolled in the fall of 1965. The first classes were taught in leased space at the California Federal Savings Bank in the Palos Verdes Peninsula, California, and the college was called California State College at Palos Verdes. The institution began with an enrollment of 27 freshmen and 14 juniors.

In the spring of 1965, a coalition of community leaders outlined to the State Department of Finance and the State College Board of Trustees the advantages of a tract on Dominguez Hill: abundant land, central location, access to freeways, and strong local support. Following the Watts Riots that same year, the Trustees approved purchase of the 346-acre tract on October 14, 1965 with the intention of serving an ethnically diverse student population and improving access to higher education in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. A few months later the site was officially named California State College, Dominguez Hills. In 1977, the College was certified as a university when it underwent its final name change to California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH).

Today CSUDH remains in its original 1965 location, 18 miles south of downtown Los Angeles in the city of Carson and primarily serves the South Bay region and greater Los Angeles metropolitan area. The campus is centrally located in a region whose population is multiethnic and international, and cultural pluralism is a major characteristic of the University today. In the early 2000s, the large amount of construction on the campus contributed to its development as a major urban institution for the South Bay. Recent investments in world-class state-of-the-art facilities include the Extended Education complex, Welch Hall, the Home Depot Center, the remodel of the Loker Student Union, the new Library South wing, University Art Gallery, and the Nursing Skills Lab.

University Mission and Institutional Background

CSU Dominguez Hills was created to serve the historic and highly diverse South Bay region; thus, the University focuses on the higher education needs of the surrounding local communities. Under the leadership of President Mildred García, CSUDH currently serves approximately 15,700 undergraduate and graduate students, including students enrolled in special sessions. The University takes pride in its outstanding faculty and friendly, student-centered environment. Recognized as one of the nation's most diverse campuses, CSUDH's student body, faculty, and staff reflect the social, economic and cultural reality of today's global workplace. Nearly 44% of CSUDH undergraduate students are first-generation college students. The University takes pride in its role as a gateway to higher education for new students and for returning students who are pursuing a new career path. One of the most diverse public institutions in

the western United States, the CSUDH student body is 48% Hispanic, 21% Black/African American, 16% White, 12% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 3% two or more races.

The University mission is to provide education, scholarship and service that are, by design, accessible and transformative. Through a strong selection of academic programs that blend theory and practice, broadly educate students in the liberal arts and sciences, and develop students' abilities to absorb, understand, evaluate and communicate information and knowledge, CSUDH is committed to making a positive impact on students' individual lives and the region at large. The CSU tradition of teaching excellence lies at the heart of students' educational experience at CSUDH. Its faculty includes nationally recognized and world-renowned experts in their specific disciplines, and 89% of full-time faculty hold doctoral or other terminal degrees in their fields.

The University's academic offerings are widely recognized and valued for the quality and professional preparedness of their graduates. CSUDH students have access to unique research and internship opportunities that enable them to collaborate side-by-side with faculty mentors in the classroom, the lab and in the field. The student-faculty ratio of 27:1 enables students to develop mentoring relationships with their instructors.

Attachment 1 – Organization Charts provides an overview of the University academic and administrative functions. Academic programs are housed in five colleges: Business Administration and Public Policy; Arts and Humanities; Natural and Behavioral Sciences; Professional Studies; and Extended and International Education. The University offers 45 undergraduate majors and 22 master's degrees, as well as multiple-subject, single-subject, and special education teaching credentials. CSUDH offers a full schedule of on-campus day and evening classes, as well as instruction in hybrid and online modalities. These different modes of instruction respond to the work and family obligations of the students. The majority of undergraduate students, who represent 80% of the student body, continue working while pursuing their educational goals. Currently business administration, psychology, liberal studies, and nursing are the most popular bachelor's degree programs. Approximately 44% of graduate students are enrolled in either education or nursing. Increasingly popular programs also include child development and biochemistry.

Accreditation

The University, as a CSU campus, was first granted a two-year initial accreditation by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in 1964. Upon completion of the campus visit, CSUDH was fully accredited by the WASC Commission in 1968. The last Educational Effectiveness Review was conducted in 2008, and CSUDH's accreditation was reaffirmed for 10 years. In 2009 the University was granted an approval to offer the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership. Due to severe budget cuts, CSUDH made a decision to postpone implementation of the Doctor of Education degree and continue focusing on its primary mission of serving undergraduate students. A number of CSUDH programs are accredited by other agencies in the specialized fields, including the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), American Chemical Society (ACS), National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE), National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education (ACOTE), National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), and others.

Strengths and Current Challenges

CSUDH continues to be committed to building on its academic excellence by offering programs that respond to the needs and demands of the communities' employers and prepare graduates with skills and knowledge needed to compete in a globalized 21st century; by innovating the academic offerings, building partnerships with community and professional organizations; and by attracting and retaining faculty committed to teaching and mentoring students in urban communities. Even in the face of shrinking state funding and state-mandated enrollment restrictions, the University actively seeks innovative strategies that offer students an opportunity to complete a university degree, pursue their career aspirations, and contribute to their communities. CSUDH also actively develops and implements programs that bolster entering students' university preparedness, identify and intervene with students at risk, and increase persistence among student populations with traditionally lower graduation rates.

While the University's strengths are significant, CSUDH also confronts a number of challenges:

• Increasingly dwindling state support and continuous state budget reductions;
• Continuously increasing student demand and enrollment levels;
• Underserved, underfunded and overburdened local K-12 schools, resulting in students underprepared for the rigors of university experience;
• Retention and graduation rates, although comparable to the similar institutions as identified by the Education Trust, remain below the national norm;
• Complex societal problems that necessitate a more integrated approach to teaching and learning strategies and methodologies; and
• Aging facilities and equipment negatively affecting STEM and the Arts programs.

Similar to other higher education institutions, CSUDH is also under increasing pressure to validate its educational effectiveness and be accountable for outcomes. The focus on assessment of student learning is a key component in the University's ability to demonstrate its educational effectiveness not only to WASC but to many internal and external constituencies concerned with the value, cost, and benefits of higher education. As a result, assessment of learning has been embedded in discussions on strategic planning across all divisions in their efforts to identify specific goals and establish divisional priorities and will continue to be on the forefront of institutional agenda going forward.

III. Statement on Report Preparation

Statement on Report Preparation

Instructions: Briefly describe in narrative form the process of report preparation, providing the names and titles of those involved. Because of the focused nature of an Interim Report, the widespread and comprehensive involvement of all institutional constituencies is not normally required. Faculty, administrative staff, and others should be involved as appropriate to the topics being addressed in the preparation of the report. Campus constituencies, such as faculty leadership and, where appropriate, the governing board, should review the report before it is submitted to WASC, and such reviews should be indicated in this statement.

Planning and preparation of the WASC Interim Report (Report) began in spring 2011 under the leadership of Associate Vice President for Academic Resources, Management, and Planning and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Janna Bersi. A number of faculty and administrators provided Dr. Bersi with input and participated in the preparation and review of the Report. Specifically, Dr. Sheela Pawar, Acting Assistant Vice President for Academic Programs; Dr. Kaye Bragg, Acting Dean of the College of Business Administration and Public Policy; Dr. Cathy Jacobs, Chair of the University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC) and Assessment Coordinator; and Dr. William Franklin, Associate Vice President for Student Success, assisted in drafting the report and its review. The Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP) assisted in providing the required data.

In spring 2011, President García established the WASC Interim Report Task Group (Task Group) chaired by Dr. Janna Bersi. This 15-member group representing Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, and Administration and Finance included three faculty, the Academic Senate Chair, four deans and associate deans, six administrators, and a student (Attachment 2 – Planning and Preparation Task Group Membership). The group was charged with developing an approach and strategy for the WASC Interim Report and assisting in its preparation. During spring 2011, the Task Group met four times to brainstorm and generate the best approach for preparation of the Report. In addition, Dr. Bersi and Dr. Jacobs briefed the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the Academic Senate, as well as the Program Review Panel, University Curriculum Committee, and General Education Committee on the topics to be addressed in the Report and a process for its preparation and submission. Dr. Bersi also made presentations to the President's Cabinet, Administrative Council, Academic Affairs Council, and Department Chairs, as well as at the Academic Affairs Annual Meeting regarding the Report and its topics. As a result of these interactions and discussions, a detailed outline for the Report was developed during summer 2011, and its first draft was prepared by fall 2011. During fall 2011, the work on the report continued by refining its contents and preparing attachments and required exhibits. At the end of fall 2011, the Task Group was provided with a status update and advised on the remaining steps for preparation and submission of the Report.

During spring 2012, the final draft was reviewed by the Academic Affairs Council, President's Cabinet, and certain members of the Task Group. Prior to its submission to WASC, President García reviewed and approved the WASC Interim Report.

Attachments 📄 2_Planning_and_Preparation_Taskgroup_Membership.docx

IV. Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

Response to Issues Identified by the Commission

Instructions: This main section of the Report should address the issues identified by the Commission in its action letter as topics for the Interim Report. Each topic identified in the Commission's action letter should be addressed. The team report may provide additional context and background for the institution's understanding of issues.

Provide a full description of each issue, the actions taken by the institution that address this issue, and an analysis of the effectiveness of these actions to date. Have the actions taken been successful in resolving the problem? What is the evidence supporting progress? What further problems or issues remain? How will these concerns be addressed, by whom, and under what timetable? How will the institution know when the issue has been fully addressed? Please include a timeline that outlines planned additional steps with milestones and expected outcomes.

Following the 2008 Educational Effectiveness visit, Ralph Wolff's Commission Action Letter dated June 24, 2008 reaffirmed the accreditation of CSUDH and indicated that the Capacity and Preparatory Review will take place in spring

2018 and the Educational Effectiveness Review will be scheduled for fall 2019. A number of commendations of the work and dedication of CSUDH faculty and staff, as well as some areas requiring continuing attention were noted. Specifically, the 2008 Commission Action Letter requested an Interim Report to be submitted in spring 2012 which should address "progress in the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units within the institution, and the linkage of the results of such assessment with its strategic planning process."

This section of the report addresses the above-identified topic by focusing on three primary interrelated issues: the University strategic planning process, assessment of student learning in academic units, and assessment of student learning in co-curricular units. Throughout this section and in its conclusion, discussion and evidence are presented on how assessment of student learning is linked to the University strategic planning process.

University Strategic Planning Process

For half a century, California State University, Dominguez Hills has served as an integral member of and vital educational resource for the South Bay and all of Los Angeles County. In early 2009, as the University was approaching its 50th anniversary, the campus community embarked on a comprehensive strategic planning process. This year-long planning and development process, co-chaired by Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at the time, Dr. Ron Vogel, and Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Dr. Susan Borrego, consisted of four phases and provided an opportunity to re-examine the University institutional vision, mission, and goals and develop a strategy for achieving them during the next five years (Attachment 3 – Strategic Plan Four Phases).

The strategic planning process engaged each campus stakeholder through a diverse set of activities from the President's Cabinet level to divisions, colleges, departments, and student organizations. The process was initiated with a series of eleven town hall events to collect feedback from students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of the community as to what should be the core values, mission, and goals for CSUDH and how the University can truly become a model urban university for the 21st century. In addition, an online survey soliciting input was distributed to the entire campus community and off-campus constituencies. Once these town hall sessions were concluded and results of 800 online surveys were compiled, a committee comprising faculty, staff, and students came together to process and synthesize the available information. The outcome of the work completed by the members of the committee, ("synthesizers"), included a first draft of the strategic framework which was circulated to the various campus constituencies for further feedback and refinement in March 2009. Upon completion of this challenging and thoughtful process, a strategic framework document, containing the University mission, vision, core values, and major themes for CSUDH's future, was distributed to the campus community in May 2009 (Attachment 4 – Strategic Framework). The strategic framework was used to guide the campus community in its efforts to set priorities and establish goals that align with the University vision of becoming a model comprehensive urban university. This effort also ensured that CSUDH students receive the best possible educational experience and benefit fully from having graduated from CSU Dominguez Hills.

The 2010-15 Strategic Plan: Honoring Our History, Forging Our Future (Attachment 5 – Strategic Plan) focused on institutional goals and priorities, encapsulated the key strengths and attributes of CSUDH, and identified institutional opportunities and challenges for the near future. It defined the primary objectives as well as specific initiatives, that must be implemented to strengthen CSUDH's institutional vitality now and in the years ahead. The purpose of the plan was to articulate the University's forward-looking vision, to provide a roadmap for the next steps, as well as to create University-wide consensus and alignment. The strategies described in the plan will evolve and continually be adapted to changing circumstances and climates. These strategies intentionally did not cover every objective and tactic the University plans to undertake, but rather presented a big-picture view for institutional priorities and most pressing issues in the years to come.

Six specific University-wide goals were identified in the 2010-15 Strategic Plan:

1. Build excellent academic programs that reinforce our position as a comprehensive model urban university.
2. Enhance access to an excellent teaching and learning environment that supports the graduation rates and career success of our students on par with the best urban comprehensive universities nationwide.
3. Deliver a campus-wide enrollment management initiative to identify and recruit future students and support their transition, retention, and graduation.
4. Achieve fiscal stability and substantially increase revenues through a range of efforts, including fundraising, partnerships, foundations and research grants – thus strengthening our ability to effectively invest in and allocate resources necessary to achieve success.
5. Engage our communities to support CSU Dominguez Hills' position as the University of the South Bay.
6. Systematically improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of support services to strengthen academic programs and student services.

In addition, each goal within the Strategic Plan included a list of specific initiatives the University will focus on throughout 2010-15. These initiatives provided measures of institutional success going forward. The Strategic Plan also identified several overarching institutional initiatives that will allow faculty and staff to actively and effectively contribute to overall institutional success, align the assets with University goals, provide accountability, and unite all departments in working together toward the campus vision. These initiatives were considered part of the cross-departmental goals and focused on:

• Identifying and implementing best practices to improve customer and student support services across the University;
• Building and supporting leadership that fosters collaboration and communication, understands and supports the University's vision and values, and encourages responsibility and accountability across all departments and staff; and
• Structuring academic units, support services, programs and activities to allow the maximum use of resources while

reaching University goals.

In May 2010, based upon the University strategic framework and as part of the fourth stage of establishing the execution strategy and work plan, the division of Academic Affairs, similar to other University divisions, undertook development of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan (Attachment 6 – Academic Affairs Strategic Plan). This process was collaborative and inclusive in nature with input and broad participation of faculty, staff, and administration within the division. The Academic Affairs Strategic Plan identified six operational divisional goals for 2011-15 and linked each one to the University goals. The Academic Affairs Strategic Plan also included specific initiatives, implementation strategies, outcomes, and a timeline for achieving outcomes, as well as responsible parties. These measurable initiatives covered a broad range of priorities at both divisional and institutional levels and included the following operational goals to:

1. Maintain, strengthen, and develop the quality of the academic program in accordance with the assigned University target;
2. Support a high quality team of administrators, faculty, and staff that is committed to the generation, transmission, and application of knowledge and skills which lead to student success;
3. Maintain and continuously improve a systematic assessment process that provides evidence regarding program quality;
4. Expand and invest in the use of technology to support and enhance the mission of Academic Affairs;
5. Maintain, enhance, and expand infrastructure that is essential to a quality academic program (e.g., library databases, books, and materials; laboratory and studio equipment); and
6. Increase allocation of physical space for quality academic programs and scholarly activities.

Several of the above goals established ongoing collaboration and regular communication with other divisions, including Enrollment Management and Student Affairs; Administration and Finance; and University Advancement. In addition to this inter-divisional collaboration, this strategic planning process forged a renewed commitment by the Academic Affairs Council, which includes academic deans and associate vice presidents, to systematic assessment for student-centered learning across all colleges and to alignment of academic programs to the University mission and goals.

Parallel to the Academic Affairs strategic planning process, the division of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) under the leadership of Dr. Susan Borrego engaged in a similar process. Based on the University Strategic Plan, the EMSA plan focused on co- curricular student learning and support. It also included expected outcomes, timelines, and responsible parties. The following goals were identified in the Strategic EMSA Plan:

1. Continue to facilitate strategic enrollment management through managing enrollment to targets and providing data for strategic decision-making;
2. Develop comprehensive, outcomes-based assessment plan for EMSA;
3. Educate campus regarding integrated marketing plan;
4. Collaborate with Academic Affairs to facilitate graduation through strategic retention initiatives, expanding utilization of high impact practices and on-going implementation of Closing the Achievement Gap;
5. Develop/coordinate a comprehensive customer service initiative that will result in increased student satisfaction; and
6. Develop a comprehensive staff development program for EMSA.

Both Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management strategic plans, as well as Administration and Finance and University Advancement plans, were discussed and reviewed by the President's Cabinet at a full day retreat in summer 2011.

In August 2011, President García held a day-long Administrative Council Retreat to review the Strategic Plan initiatives and identify five top priorities for 2011-12. Members of the Administrative Council, which includes the President's Cabinet, deans, associate deans, associate vice presidents, Chair of the Academic Senate, and the President of the Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) participated in four cross-divisional teams. Each team conducted a number of brainstorming sessions, made presentations to the entire group, and engaged in discussions on broad institutional issues and priorities. As a result of the retreat, five initiatives for 2011-12 linked to the Strategic Plan and its goals were agreed upon by the Council:

1. Provide access through diverse instructional modalities (online/hybrid) to increase student access, flexibility, graduation, and learning for success (Goal 1/Initiative 1);
2. Hire and retain diverse faculty in disciplines that support the priorities and stated themes (Goal 1/Initiative 4);
3. Foster a rich environment of student learning and success through collaborative, co-curricular programs (Goal 2/Initiative 3);
4. Develop and enhance the infrastructure to support campus-wide fundraising and branding activities (Goal 4/Initiative 1); and
5. Establish a culture of customer service in all areas of the University. (Goal 6/Initiative 7)

As part of the University strategic planning process, a new organizational, cross-divisional framework evolved to continually review, assess, and refine implementation of the Strategic Plan and work on the issues of campus-wide importance and priorities. Under President García's leadership and with participation of the entire President's Cabinet, four University-wide groups were charged with specific areas of responsibilities (Attachment 7 – Campus Governance Structure).

• University Planning Committee: Chair – Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs, Vice Chair – Vice President, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs
• University Budget Committee: Chair – Faculty member

- Strategic Enrollment Management Executive Committee: Co-Chairs – Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs
- Administrative Council: Chair – President

Now, in the second year of implementation of the University Strategic Plan, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Vice President of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs continue to work closely with campus governance bodies to execute strategic objectives, continually review and refine the plan as needed, and evaluate its results to date. Outcomes are reviewed at the department and division levels, as well as by the University Planning Committee. Additionally, each Vice President's performance evaluation includes reporting on strategic objectives results and their assessment.

The Strategic Plan also offered an institution-wide framework for strengthening and refocusing University efforts and resources on building excellent academic programs and enhancing access to a first-rate teaching and learning environment that supports the graduation rates and career success of CSUDH students on par with the best urban comprehensive universities nationwide. Four core values of the Strategic Plan provided a strong foundation for continually improving educational effectiveness and student learning:

- Accountability – We recognize and live up to our responsibility to our students, campus resources and finances, staff, faculty, alumni, supporters, and the public.
- Collaboration – We work together, throughout all segments of the campus community, to support our vision as well as our students' success.
- Continuous Learning – We strive to continually improve teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Rigorous Standards – We identify, implement, and support excellence in all our practices.

As a result, goals one and two of the University Strategic Plan, as listed at the beginning of this section and detailed below, directly supported some of the most critical components of CSUDH's educational effectiveness objectives of quality assurance and continuous improvement of student learning while maintaining campus commitment to its primary mission of serving the community and its highly diverse student population, including low income, first generation, and students of color.

This report, therefore, addresses the required issues of progress in the incorporation of assessment of learning in academic and co-curricular units within the institution and the linkage of the results of such assessment with strategic planning processes through the lenses of the first two University strategic goals, which directly deal with student learning within academic and co-curricular units.

Strategic Planning and Assessment of Student Learning in Academic Units

University Strategic Goal 1: Build Excellent Academic Programs That Reinforce Our Position as a Comprehensive Model Urban University

Assessment of educational effectiveness is at the heart of the University's efforts to build and maintain excellent academic programs that reinforce CSUDH's position as a comprehensive model urban university. Core functions that support assessment efforts include the ongoing curriculum review process, annual program assessment reports, Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT), Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool Plus (PEAT+), program review, and General Education (GE) program review. These functions are administered by the following key academic committees:

- University Curriculum Committee (UCC),
- University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC),
- Program Review Panel (PRP), and
- General Education Committee (GEC).

These committees comprise faculty from across the disciplines, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, as well as administrative and student representatives. Institutional emphasis on continually strengthening educational effectiveness is supported by a structure of faculty-driven committees and systematic processes. The University Curriculum and General Education Committees report directly to the Academic Senate. Faculty members of all committees are elected through departmental, college, and/or Academic Senate processes. Chairs of all committees provide periodic reports to the Academic Senate. Administrative support for all committees is provided by the Office of the Provost. Attachment 8 – Key Academic Committees summarizes key elements of these committees, including purpose, membership, and reporting relationship. This attachment also illustrates how these committees interact with each other to assure quality of academic programs and continuous improvement of student learning.

Student learning outcomes assessment at CSUDH is a collegial process. The responsibility for the establishment, review, fostering, and demonstration of the attainment of academic student learning outcomes resides primarily with the faculty at large and is supported and coordinated by the Office of the Provost. University assessment efforts focus on strengthening programs and supporting units to improve student learning by establishing clear expectations, developing appropriate measurable standards, collecting and analyzing data, and utilizing the results to implement change as needed.

The importance of course and program assessment to improve student learning throughout the curriculum is also emphasized in current policies, guidelines, and academic strategic priorities and is periodically discussed in different venues throughout the entire campus. Such conversations take place during the Academic Senate, college,

departmental, and committee meetings, as well as the Academic Affairs Council, Administrative Council, and Academic Affairs Annual Meeting, to name a few. More importantly, the outcomes of assessment of student learning are also utilized to review and improve overall educational effectiveness as reflected in institutional policies developed by the Education Policy Committee (EPC) and approved by the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate and the Educational Policy Committee are actively engaged in developing and promoting policies, that foster the University's goals of educational effectiveness and student learning. For example, in 2011 the Academic Senate passed resolution EPC 11-05 mandating the inclusion of computer/information literacy expectations and student learning outcomes into the syllabi of hybrid and online courses.

Assessment of Curricular Learning

CSUDH has a long history of institutional commitment to quality assurance and improving student achievement through assessment of student learning outcomes. By 2006 most academic programs had put assessment procedures into place, and many programs were using data from assessment outcomes to implement curricular modifications in order to improve student learning. However, subsequent personnel and budgetary changes directly impacted the institutional assessment process for a period of time. These changes reduced the institutional capacity for systematic assessment process across divisions and colleges for approximately two years. In 2008-09, due to severe state and CSU budget cuts, the University implemented a hiring freeze of new faculty and experienced significant budget reductions impacting all areas. The retirement of Dr. Shirley Lal in summer 2009, who served as both University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (USLOAC) Chair and Assessment Coordinator, as well as the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Director, created a significant void in the University-wide assessment efforts, as well as activities of USLOAC. Due to the retirement of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Margaret Blue, in fall 2009 and continuing budget problems, Dr. Janna Associate Vice President (AVP) for Academic Resources, Management, and Planning, was assigned the additional responsibility of serving as the ALO.

While some of the functions of CTL were distributed to other relevant committees and units, no formal assistance or guidance on assessment practices and strategies was available to faculty through USLOAC during academic year 2009-10. During that time, PRP and UCC assumed responsibility for reviewing student learning outcomes when evaluating course and program documents. It was helpful, however, that some former USLOAC members continued to serve on both committees and had expertise in the area of assessment.

Although many program faculty continued to gather data on student learning outcomes and use the findings to improve programs, many others, particularly those without a well-established culture of outcomes assessment, slowed their progress. After an extended effort to identify an appropriate person with assessment expertise to serve as USLOAC Chair and Assessment Coordinator, Dr. Cathy Jacobs, a long-time member of USLOAC, was appointed to serve in this capacity under the general direction of AVP/ALO Dr. Janna Bersi in spring 2010. This new institutional leadership re-established an effective oversight and committee system, engaging faculty across all disciplines in the assessment and curriculum processes.

Today USLOAC meets twice a month and is actively engaged in all assessment-related activities. Dr. Jacobs' service as a Chair of UCC and a member of PRP fits well into the cohesiveness of the assessment-related functions and activities at CSUDH. USLOAC remains an integral functional component in the campus-wide assessment process. It is a critical, hands-on academic committee charged with developing, promoting, monitoring, and supporting campus-wide efforts in maintaining a consistent, systematic, and evidence-based assessment process. This University-wide committee consists of faculty elected by the Academic Senate, academic administrators, and a student representative. USLOAC is responsible for overseeing the implementation and review of all academic programs' assessment plans and assuring that assessment is an ongoing process designed to monitor and improve student learning. USLOAC works closely with UCC and PRP in assisting with review of course and program proposals and modifications, self-studies, and PEAT+. Dr. Bersi serves as an ex-officio member of USLOAC, PRP, and UCC.

A comprehensive, systematic process is in place to ensure that all courses and programs have student learning outcomes, which are well defined, appropriately documented, and clearly communicated to students and faculty. Curriculum committees at the department and college levels are faculty driven, while UCC comprises broader University representation. For example, new programs must complete a curriculum review process (Attachment 9 – Curriculum Review Guide) initiated by faculty or other campus community members before proceeding through various levels of review, including publication in the "Campus Academic Master Plan" and culminating in the CSU Chancellor's Office degree proposal and approval process. Committee members also review any proposed curriculum changes and ensure that student learning outcomes, both at the course and program levels, are measurable and that methods of gathering meaningful data are present in any proposal. Program proposals, including technical details, rationale, course syllabi, student learning outcomes, faculty curriculum vitae, appropriateness to the University's Strategic Plan and the CSU mission, and other pertinent information are submitted for review. Crucial to each proposal is the development of sound program-level student learning outcomes that are specific, student-centered, and measurable. Each outcome is expected to be mapped to classroom activities and course-level student learning outcomes, as well as to institutional-level student learning outcomes. Program and student-level outcomes are reviewed by USLOAC prior to submission to UCC. Modified programs, as well as modified courses and new courses, undergo a similar process to assure quality and focus on improvement of student learning.

At the end of the 2010-11 academic year, all programs and departments submitted annual assessment reports using an improved, user-friendly format developed by USLOAC (Attachment 10 – Assessment Reports 2011 Summary and Samples). These reports initiated a constructive dialogue between USLOAC and academic departments about assessment that results in curricular revision. Since one barrier to faculty buy-in was the burden of submitting detailed annual reports, the streamlined process reduced the amount of time required to prepare the document. Department

chairs used a template to guide them through completion of the report. All previous reports and feedback letters were made available on Blackboard for easy reference. Sample reports were offered to assist in the process. In addition, to help organize the collection of data, a worksheet to set up an evaluation schedule was also made available. Furthermore, Dr. Jacobs conducted a number of workshops for faculty, as well as met with college councils and individual department chairs who requested additional assistance. As Chair of USLOAC, Dr. Jacobs also reported three times on assessment issues and activities and provided a brief overview of the new procedure to the Academic Senate during 2010-11. During summer 2011, Dr. Jacobs completed a cursory review of all submitted assessment reports and prepared them for full review and analysis by USLOAC. At the beginning of fall 2011, USLOAC members completed review of all 2010-11 reports by performing a thorough analysis and completing a commentary form. Based on these reviews and the Committee's subsequent discussions, individual feedback letters were distributed to department chairs with a copy to the Provost, ALO, and deans in November 2011 (Attachment 11 – USLOAC Feedback Letters Sample). The letters indicated the rating level and offered recommendations for improvements for submission of the next annual assessment report.

USLOAC members rated all reports utilizing the WASC recommended Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes. Based on this review, 42% of programs were considered to be at the highly developed level, 33% - developed, 22% - emerging, and 3% - initial. Most programs rated "highly developed" are accredited by their specialized agencies with ongoing history of assessment standards similar to those of WASC. These data also indicate that the outcomes assessment is being utilized at a high rate but can benefit from further improvement. Most programs primarily employed direct measures of outcomes or a mixture of direct and indirect methods. None relied entirely on indirect methods to collect data. Capstones and senior projects or performances were widely used, as well as embedded assessments in key courses. Some programs required additional assistance in improving their assessment methods and guidance on how to use outcomes data. More importantly, the commitment of faculty to the use of outcomes assessment to improve student performance was clear. All workshops and consultations have emphasized to the faculty that this is a faculty-driven process and should involve the entire program/department faculty in discussion of outcomes, gathering and analysis of data, and decisions made as a result of the findings. As a result, most faculty are now involved in the process and are committed to the use of student learning outcomes across the campus.

For example, assessment of student learning for first-time freshmen enrolled in developmental Math courses showed a positive trend over the last five years improving from 64% completion rate in fall 2005 to 83% in fall 2010. The last three years were especially encouraging with a steeper slope as indicated in the Attachment 12 – Fall First-Time Freshmen Cohort Completion in Developmental Math Requirements. Dr. John Wilkins, Mathematics Department Chair, noted that the main reason for these successful results is the strong teamwork between Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management and Students Affairs (EMSA), and faculty and staff, including such programs as:

• Educational Opportunity Program (EOP), EMSA;
• Encounter to Excellence (ETE), Title V, EMSA;
• Math Summer Bridge Program (supplemental instruction integrated), EMSA; and
• Math Winter Bridge Program (supplemental instruction integrated), EMSA.

Other team members included Math instructors teaching MAT 03 and 09 (both remedial Math courses) and two staff members who assist in designing and analyzing the department-wide tests. Dr. Wilkins also involved the entire faculty of the Mathematics Department in raising their awareness of the challenges experienced by entering freshmen and discussing possible options to resolve these challenges. As a result, the design of the department-wide tests was improved to ensure better validity and reliability. Review of these assessment data and subsequent discussions resulted in the creation of a new course that allows students to finish their Developmental Math and GE Math requirement. This has been extremely successful in providing students with a more meaningful mathematics experience during their first year at CSUDH.

As another example, in spring 2011 the Department of History (Department) modified its Bachelor of Arts (BA) program in History and its BA Education Option in History partly in response to the results of assessment practices instituted by the Department over the previous academic year. In spring 2010 and fall 2010, the Department introduced new assessment rubrics in order to undertake a more detailed analysis of the attainment of the program student learning outcomes, specifically focusing on disciplinary writing skills. Initial assessments from HIS 300 revealed that 30% of the students entering the BA program in History and BA Education Option in History program fell into the "minimal attainment" or "no attainment" categories, indicating an inability to clearly communicate facts or arguments in writing. These findings were significant, because at the time HIS 300 was designated as one of the Department's "Writing Intensive" (WI) courses, which required more than fifteen pages of formal disciplinary writing, and students were required to earn a C grade or better in the course in order to be eligible for enrollment in a capstone seminar. The Department decided to remove the WI designation from HIS 300 in order to reduce the amount of formal disciplinary writing in the course and provide more discrete writing assignments that offer remedial instruction in basic writing skills. Under the modified program, students receive instruction in more advanced disciplinary writing skills during their second or third semester at CSUDH in a new course, HIS 400: "Proseminar in History." It is expected that these changes will: 1) improve time to graduation for History majors, by reducing the number of students who must repeat HIS 300 in order to earn the required C grade; and 2) improve the disciplinary writing skills of History students in a more effective manner, enhancing their performance in upper-division electives and capstone seminar, HIS 490.

These examples demonstrate successful application of outcomes-based assessment. However, University leadership and faculty recognize a need for greater consistency among all programs and colleges. In preparation for the submission of the 2011-12 assessment reports, the report template was further revised based on faculty comments and department chairs' questions regarding the rubric. A group of USLOAC members attended a WASC workshop on assessment in

September 2011, and a series of assessment workshops was conducted by Dr. Jacobs for faculty and administrators during fall 2011. Both AVP/ALO Dr. Bersi and Assessment Coordinator Dr. Jacobs continue to work closely with deans, department chairs, faculty, and key academic committees to emphasize the importance of the University's ability to continually improve student learning throughout the entire campus based on assessment outcomes and to identify ways to assist faculty in these processes. Such efforts are fully endorsed and supported by the Provost and the entire President's Cabinet and are considered an important element in successfully accomplishing the University strategic goal of building and maintaining excellent academic programs that reinforce CSUDH's position as a comprehensive model urban university. Focus on systematic and comprehensive outcomes-based assessment is noted in strategic plans of both Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Management and Student Affairs. The Strategic Plan's core values of accountability, collaboration, continuous learning, and rigorous standards also constitute a robust platform for this message.

Under the auspices of PRP and USLOAC, all existing programs participate in a cycle of six-year systematic reviews and annual reporting, including:

• Annual Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT)
• Annual Assessment Reports
• Triennial Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool Plus (PEAT+)
• Program Review (every sixth year)

Program Effectiveness Assessment Tool (PEAT), an annual cycle of reporting and review that culminates every six years in full program review, contains over 30 quantitative performance indicators assessing faculty and student quality, centrality and complementariness, demand, uniqueness, program vitality, and fiscal status. Faculty use program effectiveness data, both quantitative and qualitative, to assess and document not only program quality but also the relationship to the University's strategic planning goals, uniqueness, vitality, demand, and cost benefit. Each year data are collected by individual departments and Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning (IRAP).

Every third year, departments complete the PEAT+ report, which is a review and analysis of both aggregated quantitative PEAT data and 19 additional qualitative performance indicators addressing curriculum, teaching and learning, faculty, students, and service and outreach activities. This instrument also includes a section on student learning outcomes, which incorporates ten essential elements of learning outcome assessment to provide evidence of student learning outcomes achievement. These elements include:

1. Program and University mission relationship clearly stated and relative;
2. Program-level, student centered and measurable objectives/outcomes;
3. Clear linkage between course and program outcomes; course level outcomes are student centered and measurable;
4. Program level assessment description clear; evidence present of measurement of achievement of program level outcomes;
5. Program level assessment results summarized; evidence of student learning as identified in program level outcomes;
6. Conclusions stated clearly; justification for action present;
7. Description of action taken is clear and relevant to program level outcomes, and revision of outcomes and/or assessment(s) identified or indicated as warranted;
8. If action taken, evidence of improvement in student learning and/or program quality;
9. Description is clear of how outcomes assessment is used consistently; and
10. Evidence is presented of ongoing program quality maintenance and/or improvement.

PEAT+ reports are submitted to the Program Review Panel (PRP) for review and meta-assessment. PRP provides guidance as to the proper collection and interpretation of data for the upcoming full program review and issues a feedback memo to the Department Chair and College Dean. Each program's progress in achieving ten essential elements of learning outcome assessment is monitored and assessed annually by USLOAC.

Every sixth year, departments undergo full program review consisting of a self-study report, external reviewer's report, and commentary from USLOAC, PRP, the Academic Dean and the Provost. Programs must provide evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning outcomes assessment. In addition to addressing ten essential elements of learning outcomes assessment to provide evidence of student learning outcomes achievement, the self-study requires that other factors be considered in the full assessment efforts, including academic advising, counseling and career planning, laboratories, library resources, instructional media, housing, financial aid services, extracurricular activities, health services, campus social life, and the quality and quantity of student contacts with the faculty. The review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examinations and placement. Through the PEAT process, departments demonstrate that their graduates consistently achieve stated levels of attainment and ensure that the University's expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. Program reviews include a section on student learning outcomes, and USLOAC committee members read that part of the review and comment on the use of outcomes assessment by the program.

In addition to institutional review procedures, seventeen programs/schools are subject to review by external accrediting agencies. The School of Education, within the College of Professional Studies, accredited nationally by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and at the state level by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), hosted a successful joint accreditation visit in November 2011. The College of Business Administration and Public Policy is completing a lengthy review process for international accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) for its master's and baccalaureate level business administration programs and expects to receive accreditation by 2013. Many other programs maintain accreditation by other agencies

in specialized fields and undergo periodic accreditation reviews. Accreditation reports, including supporting data, are an important part of each program's review process, particularly the self-study report, as described in the Attachment 13 – Program Review Guide.

Assessment of General Education (GE)

General Education (GE) courses are periodically reviewed by the General Education Committee. This review seeks to ascertain whether GE course outcomes are student-centered, specific, measurable, and reflective of GE program objectives; determine the extent of evidence that students are mastering the stated University GE objectives and course outcomes; and determine whether individual courses comply with GE goals and standards. By reviewing syllabi and course-level assessments and learning outcomes in relation to GE and institutional goals and learning outcomes, GE review ensures that:

• Institutional-level student learning outcomes are met by all undergraduate students and are reflected at the program and course levels;
• Academic programs actively involve students in learning and challenge them to meet high expectations;
• Expectations for student learning outcomes are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work; and
• Program faculty are an integral part of the development and assessment of program goals and learning outcomes.

The General Education (GE) Committee undertook an assessment of each of the six GE areas. During this review process, the committee collected a body of evidence, including exemplary portfolios that are available for sharing with faculty as "best practices." As a result faculty have made (and continue to make) significant revisions to GE courses to better align instruction with stated objectives, to ensure that all instructors understand the requirements, and to generally improve the courses. Specific issues that emerged included the issue of disparate grading practices and the need for template syllabi in some areas to better align the diverse courses with the GE learning outcomes. The Committee encouraged departments and programs to systematically request grade distributions and to analyze and discuss grading practices at the various levels within the colleges with the belief that such discussions are helpful in dealing with issues of academic quality and equity across courses.

GE assessment was extensive and thorough and a key factor in nurturing a culture of assessment on the campus; however, the assessment plan proposed in 2003 proved to be cumbersome and redundant. As a result in fall 2011, the GE Committee designed a streamlined GE assessment process and provided departments with applicable timelines for submission of data building upon the annual data submitted to USLOAC. Thus, the University's strategic planning process and feedback on prior assessment have been brought to bear as the GE Committee begins another cycle of assessment in spring 2012.

Faculty Engagement and Participation

The entire assessment-related process at CSUDH, including its relevant committees and practices, is built upon the conviction that faculty are the driving force of successful assessment to improve student learning that ultimately leads to the institutional ability to build and maintain excellent academic programs that reinforce the University's position as a comprehensive model urban university. This premise is reinforced by the committees' structure, membership, and reporting relationship; peer review and consultation processes; and continual conversation on the subject throughout the division of Academic Affairs and, ultimately, the entire campus. It is further supported by on- and off-campus training and educational opportunities on assessment of learning and program review available to faculty and administrators. Such opportunities include in-house assessment workshops on "Assessment: The Big Picture" and "Data Collection: Using Rubrics" offered each semester to faculty and administrators by Assessment Coordinator Dr. Cathy Jacobs, as well as department chairs' training and one-on-one consultations. In addition, faculty are invited to participate in the WASC workshops and programs, CSU programs, and national conferences, such as NASPA Conference on Assessment and Persistence, AACSB, etc. The University is also supportive of cross-divisional teams participating in conferences and symposia focused on improvement of student learning. For example, a working team from Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Management and Student Affairs attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) week-long program on high-impact strategies in summer 2011. Another team of faculty, deans, and administrators participated in the AAC&U annual conference in January 2011.

It should be noted that in addition to USLOAC, the Instructional Technology Center (ITC) assists faculty in designing assessment strategies appropriate to new instructional technologies. The focus of ITC is to assist faculty in training, development, and use of instructional technology that is appropriate to pedagogy and student learning outcomes, accessible in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and affordable for students in accordance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act. Accordingly ITC assists faculty by disseminating information on best practices, pedagogy, and teaching resources (e.g., assessment strategies, managing courseware design, etc.) and provides group and individual targeted training on new technologies, Blackboard, and the CSU's Accessible Technology Initiative. ITC also created the Academy for Online Teaching to assist faculty in its transition to expanded online and hybrid programs. The Academy for Online Teaching emphasizes pedagogically sound strategies that intentionally tie student learning outcomes to presentation/delivery methods and instructional activities. ITC is now working closely with the newly established Faculty Development Network unit to support faculty teaching and learning activities.

Curriculum Development Engaging Non-Academic Experts

The University's commitment to building excellent academic programs and ensuring student success is supported not only through active engagement and participation of its faculty in continual curriculum review but also through

involvement of industry and government experts. Industry experts and other community stakeholders are brought together to assist departments and programs with program development, curriculum development, internships, and job placement. CSUDH faculty believe that engaging industry representatives, subject matter experts, and community members on a regular basis is critical to preparing students for successful careers in their chosen fields.

For example, in 2001 the College of Business Administration and Public Policy (CBAPP) created the College of Business Administration and Public Policy Advisory Board (Board), whose mission is to advocate for CBAPP and the University by improving the visibility and enhancing the reputation of the business programs in the community and to provide advice, opinions and ideas on how to improve CBAPP's competitiveness through its curriculum, programs and student recruitment and placement. The 2011-2012 goals of the Board are to expand advisory board membership and involvement, integrate real world practices and academics, and help increase CBAPP's resources. Board members speak or act as panel participants in classes, participate in faculty candidate interviews, provide research and internship opportunities for CBAPP, and review curriculum as needed. Board members provide paid internship opportunities for students, act as student mentors, recruit and hire students after graduation, provide scholarship funds, and participate in fundraising efforts. The Board also engages in special and on-going projects, such as supporting NASPAA and AACBS Accreditation and identifying projects to support research institutes on campus, while proactively identifying project areas that will benefit the College.

Similarly, the College of Extended and International Education utilizes a number of advisory boards to engage subject matter experts in review and evaluation of its curriculum. Advisory board members also focus on the current industry trends and knowledge, as well as skills, attitudes, and values necessary for the graduates to be effective in their chosen fields. For example, the Quality Assurance faculty work closely with its Advisory Board, which consists of subject matter experts from the traditional applications of quality in manufacturing and the current service-related quality applications, such as healthcare and financial industries. This Advisory Board reviews the program and the individual course contents to assure that student learning outcomes are aligned with current industry requirements. As a result of the Advisory Board recommendations, the Master of Science in Quality Assurance program recently developed eight new master's level classes specific to service, pharmaceutical, and medical industry needs. The content of these new courses provides cutting edge information from instructors who are subject matter experts in these areas. Since textbooks are not yet available for many of these new subjects, peer reviewed journal articles, conference papers, and case studies are used as the basis for instruction. In addition, the Bachelor of Science in Quality Assurance program completed a major curriculum restructuring based on Advisory Board comments that identified many technological advances that are now required skills for quality professionals. Consistent with current University policies and practices, all such changes have been reviewed and approved through the established curriculum review process.

The School of Education (SOE), within the College of Professional Studies, also utilizes Program Advisory Groups to help maintain close working relationships with the School partners and to demonstrate to accrediting agencies (NCATE and CCTC) a systematic plan for cooperation. These groups meet with program faculty and grant directors two to three times a year and provide counsel and guidance related to curriculum, goals, assessment, and program policies. They also serve as a relationship-building and networking function, bringing together a diverse group to discuss issues related to teacher preparation in general.

In addition to college/school-level advisory boards, a number of advisory boards exist at the department/program level. These include the Clinical Science Advisory Committee; the Computer Science Department Industry Advisory Council; the Human Services Community Advisory Board; the Labor Studies Program Advisory Board; the Nursing Advisory Board; the Occupational Therapy Advisory Committee; and the Public Administration Advisory Board. The successful utilization of advisory boards by the College of Business Administration and Public Policy, College of Extended and International Education and the School of Education has prompted other colleges and schools within the University to create their own boards.

Collegiate Learning Assessment

The University participated in the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) in academic years 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2010-11. Participating CLA institutions have been critical of value-added data as samples of college seniors tend to be small and are biased due to the need to provide incentives in order to get students to participate. In fact, the CSUDH 2008-09 senior sample was too small for analysis. The Office of Academic Programs, the Testing Office, and the Office of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning (IRAP) work together and with similar stakeholders at other participating institutions to continually develop and improve testing plans in order to work toward the best possible samples given monetary constraints. So far, assessment results indicate that CSUDH adds significant value to students' skills.

The CLA measures higher order skills (critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem solving, and clear and cogent communication) of student samples to provide an estimate of an institution's contribution, or "value added," to the development of these skills. Results suggest that the educational experience at CSUDH increases students' abilities in these areas, adding value over and above what would be expected at the average college campus. Among the institutions participating in the CLA during academic year 2010-11, the CSUDH value added estimate was reported at the 90th percentile for the overall score; 93rd percentile for performance task; 75th percentile for the analytic writing task; and 97th percentile for the make-an-argument task. Only for the critique-an-argument task did the estimated value of the CSUDH educational experience fall below the 50th percentile (at 32nd percentile). The 2007-08 CLA results also showed that CSUDH adds more value to the educational experience than most of the other institutions participating in the assessment. During academic year 2007-08, the CSUDH value added estimate was reported at the 77th percentile for the overall score; 72nd percentile for the performance task; 77th percentile for the analytical writing task; 89th percentile for the make-an-argument task; and 78th percentile for the critique-an-argument task.

Closing the Achievement Gap – CSU Graduation Initiative

During the last two years, CSUDH has been actively involved in the CSU Graduation Initiative: Closing the Achievement Gap. As a CSU campus, the University is committed to increase the college-going rate and reduce graduation gaps for low-income and minority students by 2016. The CSU initiative aims to improve graduation rates by 7% systemwide and halve the achievement gap by the end of 2015-16, and CSUDH has a target of improving its six-year graduation rates by 7% by 2016. This initiative is also aligned with the University Strategic Plan as noted in goal two and supported by a number of campus programs, including:

- Early Start and Summer Bridge Programs,
- Learning Communities,
- Degree Audit and Early Warning Advising,
- First and Second Year Experience Programs, and
- Roadmaps to Graduation.

In December 2009, CSUDH outlined four specific goals to meet the objectives of the Closing the Achievement Gap (CAG) initiative:

1. Improve retention rates for first-time freshmen
2. Restructure the University Advisement Center
3. Recast Outreach Services
4. Review course offering, course planning, and degree roadmaps.

One of the primary goals of CAG is to improve retention rates for first-time freshmen through the First and Second Year Experience (FSYE) program. FSYE provides students with a robust transition experience in the summer and culminates in the academic year with a variety of linked courses designed to support students in making vital connections and successful transitions to University life. A number of high-impact practices were employed in the institutional effort to increase retention rates, including Developmental Education Academy, Supplemental Instruction, Block Registration, Early Warning, and Intrusive Advising. Attachment 14 –Graduation Initiative January/February 2011 provides data on the fall 2009 cohort. The preliminary results are promising and indicate that students who participated in the FSYE program had higher retention rates for fall 2009 to spring 2010 and to fall 2010, higher average GPA, and on the average completed more total units as compared to non-participating students. A progress report and additional information were provided during the CSU Chancellor's Office visit to the campus in April 2011 (Attachment 15 – CSUDH Graduation Initiative April 2011). Based on these preliminary results, plans are now underway to increase the number of participating students in co-curricular programs and broaden utilization of high-impact practices across the campus.

Strategic Planning and Assessment of Student Learning in Co-Curricular Units

University Strategic Goal 2: Enhance Access to an Excellent Teaching and Learning Environment that Supports the Graduation Rates and Career Success of Our Students on Par with the Best Urban Comprehensive Universities Nationwide

Another important component of CSUDH's educational effectiveness is focused on enhancing access to an excellent teaching and learning environment. The University recognizes and strongly believes that co-curricular units reinforce student learning and extend it beyond the classroom. Institutional commitment is, therefore, broad-based and supports the learning of all students within the context of the University's mission and strategic plan by offering a well-organized and appropriate array of student services. CSUDH responds to the full spectrum of diverse student needs, abilities, and cultures by regularly identifying the characteristics of its students and assessing their preparation, needs, and experiences. Student support services (such as the library, financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, health services, housing, athletics, computer labs, and information services) are designed to be flexible and to meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the curricula it offers while reflecting the University mission and strategic plan.

CSUDH develops and assesses its co-curricular programs and tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success. The University believes that being intentional about student life and learning outside the classroom is not only vital to increasing persistence and retention rates, but also critical to the enhancement of students' learning and their ability to successfully function in an increasingly global, interdependent, and complex world. The University's co-curricular programs are considered an important and integral component of the entire educational experience in order to enhance student success, including application of the classroom knowledge to real world experiences.

Assessment of Co-Curricular Learning

As part of the University's goals to continuously strengthen its educational effectiveness and improve student learning, CSUDH places a great deal of importance not only on the assessment of learning within academic units but also on collaborative processes for aligning co-curricular learning outcomes with the institutional mission, vision, and values. For example, the Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) division took definitive steps in fostering and enhancing the assessment of co-curricular student learning outcomes by holding a three-phase, division-wide retreat beginning in 2009 led by Dr. Lori Varlotta, an expert on higher education, assessment, and accountability, with an aim toward the implementation of organized, systematic, and sustainable assessment practices.

EMSA's assessment process emphasizes the vital role of intentional strategies for enhancing and assessing student life and learning outside the classroom in improving learning, increasing persistence and retention rates, and advancing students' ability to succeed in today's environment. With this focus, the first phase of the retreat was designed to map and integrate departments' practices, programs, and services to student learning, as well as to develop, implement, and assess clearly articulated and measurable key learning outcomes.

In the second phase, EMSA reviewed the mission, key initiatives, and goals highlighted in the University Strategic Plan and affirmed that departmental planning and assessment must be intentionally aligned to the strategic direction of the division and University. The overall goals of this phase were to help the division build a culture of inquiry, assessment of student achievement, and accountability; focus on how learning outcomes and assessment will inform planning and decision-making; and help departments set manageable and achievable goals that are aligned with the University Strategic Plan. Upon conclusion of this phase, each unit and department developed clearly defined goals and student learning outcomes focusing on what any student should be able to know, do, and/or value after experiencing key programs and services (Attachment 16 – EMSA Student Learning Outcomes).

In the third phase, held in spring 2011, EMSA members utilized a six-step assessment model highlighting assessment efforts as the basis for demonstrating the value of programs and services. Staff received training to use assessment data for the review of departmental procedures and processes in order to increase efficiency and effectiveness; to measure participation, utilization, and student satisfaction; and to track two of the most imperative summative outcomes: student retention and graduation rates.

As a result, the following goals and objectives within co-curricular areas are emphasized:

• Continuing to address the importance of out-of-class experiences;
• Developing and utilizing a common process, language, and understanding of the desired learning outcomes for students in light of the institutional conditions and student experiences, which are most likely to produce these outcomes; and
• Regularly assessing and reporting on the impact of co-curricular programs and services.

Co-curricular activities take place across the campus, and all of its divisions collectively contribute to the goals of the University Strategic Plan. Some co-curricular units within both Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Management and Student Affairs divisions are further along in the development, implementation, and assessment of student learning outcomes than others; however, a sustained assessment program that is effective, feasible, and accurate, while supporting the University's goals, mission and values, is the goal of all co-curricular units. Both divisions are collaborating on sharing expertise and resources to strengthen assessment within co-curricular units. Below are some examples of such efforts and their outcomes to-date.

University Advisement Center (UAC)

The University is committed to ensuring that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements. The University Advisement Center (UAC) provides academic advising for new freshmen, undeclared majors, new transfer students, and admission exceptions (special admits), and facilitates requests for exceptions in the General Education program. UAC is open to all students who have concerns about academic regulations or procedures, graduation requirements, community college course equivalencies, concurrent enrollment, and other topics. UAC aims for flexibility in its scheduling and modalities and is open for walk-in advising five days a week, as well as late hours twice a week to accommodate evening students. UAC also offers online webcam advising for distance learners. UAC has created several workshops aimed at specific populations of students: "Strategies Towards Educational Progress and Success" (STEPS), a mandatory academic probation intervention program for undergraduate students who are on academic probation; "Mandatory Freshmen Advising" (MFA), a mandatory program designed for all first and second semester freshmen; and the "Undeclared Workshop" (UW), a joint-collaboration project between the University Advisement Center and the Career Center designed to assist undeclared students as they explore various career options deriving from major courses of study at CSUDH. Online Transfer Tutorial on transfer requirements is available to transfer students.

Attachment 17 – Strategies Towards Educational Progress and Success (STEPS) provides data on attendance and outcomes for undergraduate students who participated in the STEPS workshops during fall 2009 through spring 2011. The results indicate that attendees are more likely to maintain grade point averages (GPAs) at or above class level minimums by the end of the term, raise their GPAs to 2.0 or above by the end of the term, and be retained at census (or graduated by) the subsequent fall term than students on academic probation who have not participated in these programs. Similarly, Attachment 18 – Impact of Mandatory Freshmen Advising (MFA) demonstrates the impact of the MFA policy implemented in fall 2010 on improving the course completion rates. Data on the first full cohort of students attending the MFA program in 2010 as compared to the 2008 cohort show that students in the 2010 cohort had higher average course completion rates, earned more units during their first year, attempted and earned more General Education (GE) units, and were less likely to qualify for probation at the end of the spring term of their first year.

UAC has identified unit- and service-level student learning outcomes and has created a comprehensive assessment plan to collect and analyze data that have been used to improve services, as well as refine the data gathering and analysis process. Learning outcomes for students accessing UAC services include:

• Knowledge of all graduation requirements;
• Knowledge of the importance of developmental math and English requirements and the consequences of failing to complete remediation in two semesters;

• Working knowledge of CSUDH accounts, including registration procedures and enrollment dates, viewing holds, paying tuition, and utilizing the degree progress report;
• Ability to use Assist.org to check course equivalencies at sister campuses and California community colleges;
• Knowledge of relevant University policies;
• Knowledge of academic standing;
• Ability to properly prepare a class schedule; and
• Knowledge of how to change/declare a major/minor.

Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Title V – Encounter to Excellence Program (ETE)

The University supports the learning of all its students, including those who are underprepared and those who are disadvantaged economically. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) and Encounter to Excellence (ETE) Program are alternate admission programs that recruit and admit students who may not meet the standard admissions requirements of the University but who display the potential to succeed. EOP facilitates the enrollment and academic success of both the educationally and economically disadvantaged students. Acceptance into the program is based upon an evaluation of the student's past educational experience, completion of an EOP admissions packet (which may be used at all campuses within the CSU), and a personal interview. Once admitted to the EOP, students are provided with support services such as academic advisement, counseling and financial aid advisement to maximize their potential success. ETE works with incoming freshmen who need developmental math and English courses. Summer Bridge, a component of these programs, helps first-year students make a successful transition into college life. After their Summer Bridge experience, students are supported for two years with a number of high-impact (engaged) practices and services, such as Supplemental Instruction, Intrusive Advisement, Peer Advising and Mentoring. These programs provide a set of learning experiences for incoming freshmen to demonstrate effective communication skills and to use analytical and quantitative techniques for problem solving. These basic learning outcomes build a strong foundation to support the academic learning goals of their degrees.

EOP/ETE's assessment data demonstrate links between high-impact program activities and student retention and reveal both short- and longer-term impacts of EOP/ETE services on students: students' help seeking behaviors and knowledge of on-campus learning support programs improved greatly and students reported greater confidence as a result of EOP/ETE services. For example, through the use of various high-impact activities students gained an appreciation of the impact an undergraduate degree would have on their social and economic future.

Using a tool called StudentVoice®, EOP and ETE staff collected data through web-based technology and mobile data collection tools. They measured outcomes using both direct and indirect methods and assessed learning outcomes that have guided them in planning the most relevant and needed programs and services. Qualitative data via student testimonials and focus groups have also been collected and analyzed. Services such as Supplemental Instruction, Peer Mentoring, Intrusive Advising, and the Early Warning system were noted as helpful and beneficial. The 2009 and 2010 cohorts of Summer Bridge students are continuing to track at least 10-15% ahead of all other freshmen in retention, developmental courses completed, and grade point average. The outcome data for the 2009-11 Summer Bridge participants are included in the Attachment 19 – EOP ETE Bridge Data and Outcomes 2009-11.

In addition, each year, an annual performance review must be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. The focus on student learning outcomes and program assessment are instrumental in EOP's and ETE's abilities to produce quality data for the annual reports.

Ronald E. McNair Scholars Program (McNair)

The University serves its underrepresented, though academically talented and driven, students and supports their research efforts and professional development through a number of programs and initiatives. The Ronald E. McNair Scholars Post-baccalaureate Program (McNair), for example, is a federally funded program designed to increase the number of first-generation, low-income and/or underrepresented minority students who complete advanced degrees in all disciplines. Ninety-three CSUDH McNair Scholars graduated with a bachelor's degree since 2004 and 97% of them have been accepted into graduate schools. Attachment 20 – CSUDH McNair Scholars offers additional information on the total number of scholars who graduated since the 2003-04 cohort.

The McNair Program is funded by the United States Department of Education for five years. McNair is open to CSUDH sophomores, juniors, and seniors with a GPA of 3.0 or above. Students must be committed to continuing their education with the goal of achieving a doctoral degree. Eligible students include first-generation and low-income or underrepresented minority, U.S. citizens or permanent residents, who are enrolled in a degree program at CSUDH. The program provides a summer research experience; a research methodology course; workshops on entering, applying to and financing graduate school; GRE preparation; faculty mentors; and educational planning and support. In addition, the program provides supplementary support through summer research stipends, travel to conferences, travel to research institutions, laptop computers, a student study lounge with Internet accessible computers, and personal mentoring.

A key component of McNair is UNV 395 "Research Methods," a required course for all McNair scholars. The course provides a clear avenue for outcomes assessments using both direct and indirect methods. Similar to all University courses, it has specific, detailed, and measurable student learning outcomes. For example, all students were quizzed on assigned reading to ensure that they comprehended the material. Once an area for improvement surfaced as a result of this assessment, the instructor reviewed that specific topic again to improve student learning.

All students also conducted oral presentations at the end of the semester, including a presentation of their research

proposal to be carried out during the following summer. Final proposals were graded using a detailed rubric. These proposals led students to conduct research with a faculty mentor in their area of study during the summer at the following campuses: California State University, Dominguez Hills; University of California, Irvine; University of Florida; University of California, Los Angeles; and Harvard University (2011 cohort). Students presented their work at either the 2011 McNair Research Symposium at the University of California, Berkeley or at the Claremont Graduate University.

The GRE Preparation Course was also used to assess student learning. Each student was provided with a Kaplan book and completed weekly GRE practice tests that were tracked and analyzed for areas of improvement. Students were assigned weekly homework that included mathematic problem sets related to the unit of the week, vocabulary to memorize, and prompts to respond to in an essay format. Each week, students were given a quiz to see if they were grasping concepts. For those students that appeared deficient in certain areas even after instruction, individual instruction and practice sets and sessions were provided. Essays were graded using the 1-6 scale employed by the GRE, and students were provided with this feedback.

University Library

The University supports the academic, personal, and professional development and success of its students, faculty, and staff by providing access to information, literature, and research and by promoting literacy and information literacy. Specifically, the University Library serves the needs of students, faculty, and staff by providing library and information technology services, including library instruction, inter-library loan, reference and circulation, government documents, student and thesis services, faculty services, laptop loan program, and support for distance students. The Library planning and evaluation process focuses on the effectiveness of student learning and the extent to which learning is actualized within the context of the Library. Quality is defined as a multi-faceted concept that focuses on collections, services, and the place of the Library in the learning process. The University Library considers its services from the customer's perspective, including the provision of high-quality services to address information needs as well as measure what students have learned.

As part of an effort to improve accountability measures, the Library focuses its efforts on determining results rather than counting the number of books. For example, the CSUDH Information Literacy Initiative partners with faculty to customize classroom presentations and make them significant and relevant to students. This program initiates the development of core learning abilities and competencies including informational literacy skills and the habit of critical analysis of data obtained from library electronic collections, monographs, and Internet-based sources.

The Library assessment process addresses the impact of library service operations on student learning. The process focuses on changes in Library users as a result of their contact with the Library programs, resources and services, such as improvement in student content, developed skills and abilities, and acquired attitudes and values. The Library also contributes to accountability by compiling and reporting annually to the CSU Chancellor's Office input and output measures concerning its efforts to provide services designed to meet the information needs of students. Accountability increasingly emphasizes quantifying and qualifying student learning and is measured through outcomes assessment processes. Library instruction, conducted in groups or individually, is used to improve information literacy skills, as well learning outcomes as a result of their interactions with the Library. These outcomes assist in demonstrating the Library's value as an institutional teaching and learning partner. University Library administration and staff work closely with teaching faculty to pursue other types of outcomes and to ensure that the instruments and techniques used are valid and reliable and lead to true improvement in instructional programs.

This approach represents expanded responsibility and a more active role in the student learning process and its assessment by the Library. Furthermore, the Library, along with its sister CSU libraries, is actively engaged with the California Organization of Library Deans (COLD) in recognizing that sufficient information was lacking in assessing library services nationwide. As a result of these efforts, assessment was identified as the key strategic initiative for the CSU libraries. The University Library, in concert with the other COLD libraries, is developing tools and resources to collect and analyze data emphasizing three assessment areas: library resources, information literacy, and cohorts. The CSUDH Library Assessment Plan is described in more detail in the Attachment 21. Full data collection and analysis, utilizing correlative and comparative data as assessment methodologies, will be implemented starting in spring 2012 (Attachment 22 – Library Assessment Program Planning Grid).

Career Center

The University engages with and supports the professional and personal development of its students through a variety of programs, including counseling services, career development, and employment programs. The Career Center offers programs and educational experiences that complement the classroom experience by assisting students in learning processes and developing skills that facilitate the attainment of their educational, career, and personal goals. Students who participate in Career Center programs demonstrate the ability to formulate an educational plan that supports their academic and career goals and connect their educational training to direct job skills. Career planning services assist in the career planning needs of CSUDH students and provide a link for the student between the academic world and the job market. Career counseling, as well as assistance in writing resumes, preparing for interviews, and searching for employment, is provided. The Career Center facilitates workshops, seminars, job fairs, and resume clinics; conducts an on-campus job interview program; maintains a career library to provide information on employers and occupations in business and industry; and provides information regarding graduate and professional schools, including applications, admissions criteria, and financial aid. A workshop in choosing and applying for graduate schools and a graduate school fair are also offered.

Two key programs offered by the Career Center have been used to gauge student learning outcomes and program

quality: "Choosing a Major/Choosing a Career" and "Writing a Winning Resume." These programs' outcomes are assessed using both direct and indirect methods based on learning outcomes, and results are utilized in planning the most effective programs and services. The assessment results of "Choosing a Major/Choosing a Career" indicate that students demonstrate knowledge of how to choose a major and choose a career. More than 80% of surveyed students responded correctly on a comprehensive post-test, showing a fundamental understanding of the process. Follow-up assessment with the same students is planned after two semesters to determine if knowledge continues to persist. Exit interviews upon graduation also will provide additional data on the effectiveness of this program.

Upon completion of the "Writing a Winning Resume" workshops, students complete a learning outcomes survey consisting of questions that address their knowledge of resume format and content. This knowledge is considered critical to writing an effective resume. By answering 70% or more of the post-workshop questions correctly, students demonstrated effective understanding of how to write a resume. The Career Center found that roughly 80% of the surveyed students understood how to write an effective resume. While difficult to assess, the Center is exploring ways to determine if the learning is sustained in the long-term. More importantly, the outcome data were invaluable in gaining an evidence-based understanding that students need more hands-on and interactive workshops focused on choosing a major/career and writing effective resumes.

Student Health and Psychological Services (SHPS)

CSUDH addresses the physical and mental well-being and social development of its students and offers learning opportunities that address their immediate needs while encouraging lifelong learning. The Student Health and Psychological Services (SHPS) unit includes student health services and psychological counseling services. This unit provides an integrated approach for services designed to meet both the physical and emotional health needs of CSUDH students, including health education and consultation. The psychological counseling services are available to students who are experiencing any type of personal or interpersonal problem and are interested in a counseling experience through an individual and/or group counseling programs. Students are encouraged to seek counseling for maximizing their own growth potential. SHPS goals include ensuring that students acquire accurate knowledge on matters that impact their health and well-being. SHPS assesses its student learning outcomes by using a series of pre- and post-tests in workshops on topics such as contraception, sexual health, and alcohol awareness. Data reveal that students' knowledge and willingness to continue learning about health matters increases as a result of SHPS workshops. SHPS also administers annual student surveys to student patients, revealing that the majority of students are pleased with the services they receive and remember important information they learned as a part of their visits. SHPS uses these data to prioritize their workshops and programs and to track program quality. Attachment 23 – SHPS Student Learning Outcomes Activities 2010-11 provides additional information.

Office of Student Life

CSUDH continually seeks to create and sustain a student-centered environment that promotes academic success and personal development through programs and services offered through the Office of Student Life. A major vehicle for promoting student personal development is the Cross Cultural Retreat (CCR), a weekend, residential program that provides students, faculty, and staff with interactive activities and thought-provoking discussions about cross-cultural issues. CCR participants receive pre- and post-retreat surveys. Pre-retreat surveys seek to gauge participants' overall awareness on issues of diversity and social justice. Post-retreat surveys target participants' increase in knowledge/awareness as a result of retreat participation and overall effectiveness of the retreat. CCR post-retreat survey data indicate positive regard for the knowledge obtained at the retreat and an overall increase in knowledge as a result of attending the retreat. In addition, qualitative and quantitative feedback suggests that participants have a strong commitment to improving views of diversity and a better understanding on how to implement change.

A large majority of CCR participants report that the event was helpful in increasing their knowledge and understanding of critical issues related to diversity. Before the CCR, only 35% of individuals participating in the retreat said they were very familiar with their role in enhancing diversity and community. After the retreat 73% of participants indicated that they were very familiar with their role in enhancing diversity and community. Moreover, before the CCR, 62% of individuals participating in the retreat said they were very familiar with the effects of stereotypes. After the retreat 89% of participants noted that they were very familiar with the effects of stereotypes. Prior to the CCR, 38% of individuals participating in the retreat said they were very familiar with specific ways to create change in their campus/community. After the retreat 70% of participants felt as though they were very familiar with specific ways to create change in their campus/community.

High-Impact (Engaged) Practices

The University recognizes and supports the efficacy of high-impact (engaged) practices on student learning. Thus, one of the components of the Academic Affairs strategic plan focuses on utilization of high-impact (engaged) practices, teaching and learning strategies that have been identified by educational experts as to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds. These practices can take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts, including first-year seminars and experiences, undergraduate research, capstone sources and projects, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, service learning, internships, international experiences, to name a few. Attachment 24 – CSUDH Engaged Practices offers a high-level summary of how the University plans to incorporate application of engaged practices into further improvements of student learning.

In great part, CSUDH's heightened interest in application of such educational practices at the campus-wide level was a result of a University team participating in the 2011 Institute on High-Impact Practices and Student Success (Institute) in summer 2011. CSUDH was among a select few in the CSU system to be awarded with an all-expense paid trip to the

Institute. The Institute's program was designed to help campuses develop high-impact practices, activities, and strategies that are engaging to students and effective at improving both persistence and achievement of essential learning outcomes. The weeklong institute offered innovative models for program implementation and assessment. CSUDH team included a campus-wide, cross-functional group involved in the institution-wide curricular or programmatic changes and assessment processes for new or existing programs or practices. The team included Acting Provost, Dr. Mitch Maki; Vice President for EMSA, Dr. Susan Borrego; Associate Vice President for Student Success, Dr. William Franklin; Dean of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, Dr. Laura Robles; Department of Mathematics Chair and PRP Chair, Dr. John Wilkins; and the former Academic Senate Chair and Chair of the Chicana/o Studies Department, Dr. Irene Vasquez.

Upon completion of the Institute's program, President García requested a full report, including an action plan that was developed during the program using current persistence and retention data, NSSE outcomes, high DFW rates, and 6-year graduation outcomes, to name a few. The team presented an action plan and timeline to begin developing, fostering, strengthening, enhancing, and assessing high-impact programs and services designed to improve student learning and success (Attachment 25 – Presentation to Administrative Council HIP).

As stated previously, CSUDH faculty and staff currently utilize a number of engaged strategies across curricular and co-curricular programs and activities, including Developmental Education Academy, Supplemental Instruction, Block Registration, Early Warning, and Intrusive Advising. In addition Service Learning, Civic Engagement, Undergraduate Research, Writing-Intensive Courses, and Internships are widely employed throughout the campus. Some brief examples of such engaged practices are offered below. Based on the national research that suggests these practices improve persistence for all students, especially the traditionally underserved, CSUDH is planning to bolster its efforts in utilization of these and other high-impact practices to improve retention and graduation rates and reduce achievement gaps without compromising educational quality.

Service Learning, Internships, and Civic Engagement (SLICE)

The Center for Service Learning, Internships, and Civic Engagement (SLICE) assists students, faculty, and staff with experiential learning opportunities, community-based participatory research, and community engagement opportunities. As one of the recognized high-impact (engaged) educational practices, SLICE is committed to helping foster an awareness of civic responsibility to address the needs of the local and global communities. The Center develops and maintains community partnerships to promote internship and volunteer placements and currently houses the JusticeCorps and Jumpstart programs. As a result of institutionalizing community engagement activities, CSUDH was named to the President's Honor Roll with Distinction for the past two years and in 2010 was awarded the Carnegie Institute of Higher Learning Community Engagement Classification.

The University is a member of the Western Region Campus Compact Consortium (WRCCC) which in 2009 conducted a survey of member institutions on Service-Learning and Community-Based Research in order to explore how higher education faculty bring involvement in their local communities to their work and how this affects them. The survey collected data on teaching and reflection strategies, student learning, and development outcomes that faculty expect and the personal and professional impacts faculty experience due to their use of service-learning and/or community-based research. Survey results indicated that faculty affirmed service-learning as effective pedagogy, enhancing such student learning outcomes as the application of, understanding of, and engagement with course content and reflective judgment, problem solving, and critical thinking. In addition, faculty affirmed that service-learning and community-based research enhanced interpersonal and developmental outcomes such as confidence and adaptability, oral communication, respect, and professionalism. In fall 2008, the University conducted a survey on attitudes toward civic engagement among students enrolled in first-year experience classes. This study documented incoming students' exposure to volunteer activities during high school and helped provide an understanding of their attitudes toward civic engagement. Of the 346 student participating in the survey, the majority (79%) had been exposed to volunteer activities during high school and a majority reported attitudes supportive of civic engagement activities, with more than 91% stating they would volunteer in the future. Many participants feel that volunteering can help them understand both campus and community needs and believe that more service learning courses should be offered on campus. Additionally, most participants reported possessing skills that may be beneficial to a positive volunteering experience, such as beginning conversations with a stranger, speaking in front of a group, or interacting with and learning from people of differing ethnicities. However, only 66% of students reported the volunteer activity as helpful to understanding course lectures and readings. SLICE plans to further assess the service learning component of the first-year experience courses. These data, along with feedback from instructors, are integral to the University's current discussion of revision of the first-year experience program.

Student Research Day

The annual CSUDH Student Research Day, initiated in 2005, provides an opportunity for graduate and undergraduate scholars to share their research or creative projects within a supportive community of peers and faculty. Undergraduate students anticipating graduate work at either the master's or doctoral levels or graduate students continuing in doctoral programs are especially invited to participate. This experience stimulates students' persistence through engagement in research by working closely with faculty mentors and librarians to develop skills in systematic investigation and research leading to presentation and distribution of research, scholarship, and creative work.

During the 2010-11 academic year, approximately 120 undergraduate and 80 graduate students participated in this event. In February 2012, 215 students made 137 presentations during the seventh annual CSUDH Student Research Day, and more than 600 students attended the event. Students give oral and/or poster presentations and demonstrations with time to respond to questions of visitors and judges. Students giving oral presentations are judged

by faculty, and top presenters receive a monetary award. Representing nearly 40% of full-time faculty, more than 50 faculty mentors and 50 faculty judges are actively involved in CSUDH Student Research Day. Based upon the results, up to 10 presentations are selected to represent the University at the annual California State University Student Research Competition. In 2011, the University sent 14 students to the systemwide research competition to make presentations on topics, such as "Experience of Combat Veterans upon Re-entrance into the Civilian Society," "Chicana/Chicano Indigenous Identity," "Implementing Diagnostic, Rescue Assignment, Translations and Story Problems (DRTS): An Intervention Model Used Among Middle School Math Teachers," "Virtual Friendships: A Study of Digital Media Usage and Empathy," and "Exploring the Relationship between Persona with Visual Impairments and Their Dogs," to name a few. Three CSUDH students won top awards at the 2011 systemwide competition.

Writing Intensive (WI) Courses

Another high-impact practice, writing intensive courses, emphasizes writing at the upper division level of an academic discipline, including final-year projects. Through enrollment in writing intensive course CSUDH students are encouraged to create and revise various forms of writing for different audiences. The CSUDH policy on Writing Intensive (WI) courses was enacted in order to improve students' skill at communicating within academic disciplines. This policy, initiated by the Academic Senate, required all undergraduate students to earn at least a C in two designated WI courses as a part each academic program's major, mandated a minimum of 3,750 words of formal writing in form and format appropriate to the discipline, and required the opportunity for substantial revision based on instructor feedback. WI courses have a maximum of 25 students per instructor. The Writing Competency Committee is charged with approving Writing Intensive courses, assisting faculty in the creation of assignments and syllabi, and periodically reviewing WI courses.

Although the policy was to be executed in fall 2008, fiscal considerations have prevented full implementation. In spite of this, WI courses have been approved and are offered when feasible, although they are not required. In fall 2010, 17 WI courses (25 sections across 12 departments) were offered; in spring 2011, 13 WI courses (19 sections across 10 departments) were offered; and in fall 2011, 21 WI courses (30 sections across 13 departments) were offered. Recent efforts centered on reconstituting the Writing Competency Committee, which had been inactive since 2008. At present, the Committee, chaired by the Director of Composition, is undertaking assessment of WI courses. This initiative is also considered an important component of the institutional efforts to utilize high-impact (engaged) practices within CSUDH's curricular and co-curricular strategies.

Promoting Excellence in Graduate Studies Center (PEGS)

The Promoting Excellence in Graduate Studies (PEGS) Center offers programs committed to preparing all graduate students at CSUDH for lifelong learning experiences, thus empowering them to make a difference in the global community through excellence in teaching and research. PEGS focuses on under-represented, low-income, and Hispanic graduate students and offers a structured and coherent foundation for all graduate students, closing educational gaps while providing students with a personalized approach to teaching and learning. PEGS is designed to build an institutional infrastructure that permanently supports and promotes academic excellence. In doing so, PEGS strengthens CSUDH through educational programs, scholarly research initiatives, experiential learning internships, and community service activities. PEGS offers a variety of workshops, writing support through Graduate Writing Tutorials, scholarships, learning internships, community service activities, mentoring to develop awareness of campus and general academic resources, and faculty support in the development of culturally responsive pedagogy, distance learning instruction, mentoring of graduate theses, and collaborative scholarship with students.

Internships

Internships also have been identified as one of high-impact (engaged) practices in order to strengthen students' educational experience. A number of University programs utilize internships, including biology, criminal justice, education, Africana studies, history, computer information science, nursing, social work, digital media/television, political science, and many others. A number of CSUDH undergraduate and graduate programs include internships as a common form of experiential learning and a graduation requirement. These internships require enrollment in an upper division or graduate level course and are administered by a faculty member. Completion of a report, paper, and/or project is a required component of the internship. The purpose of the off-campus internship course is to provide the student with direct work experience in the field of study under the supervision of a professionally qualified mentor. This supervised work experience helps to bridge the gap between the academic program and the real world environment. As for all University courses, internships have a pre-approved syllabus which includes student learning outcomes, course requirements, grading policy, and other pertinent information. Assessment of internships is part of the annual assessment process, and its results are used to further improve programs and student learning.

Future Plans and Timelines

In summary, as addressed in previous sections, all of CSUDH curricular areas have a well-established, ongoing assessment process in place, which will continue to be refined and streamlined. Co-curricular areas across the campus are executing a framework that incorporates assessment, documentation, and utilization of assessment results to improve student learning. This framework is necessary in order to continuously strengthen programs and services and demonstrate the impact of co-curricular learning on student success. During the last year, both Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Management and Student Affairs divisions have taken important collaborative steps to achieve this goal. A joint team from Academic Affairs and EMSA participated in the National Association of Student Professional Administrators (NASPA) conference on Assessment and Persistence. The conference was designed to address student

persistence and promote student learning and success by strengthening assessment, quality improvement, and intentional progression and retention programs. During the conference, CSUDH had an opportunity to learn and discuss best practices and current strategies and approaches to a comprehensive assessment, persistence and completion program as part of strategic planning.

By the time of the next WASC Institutional Proposal (Narrative), the University is planning to demonstrate sufficient evidence and progress in the following areas, which were identified as a result of work completed during planning and preparation of this Interim Report. Specifically, the following goals are established and are consistent with the current University Strategic Plan:

1. Explicitly integrate the assessment, quality assurance, and accountability elements as essential components of University strategic planning now and in the future;
2. Continue to further streamline and improve the institutional assessment process in both curricular and co-curricular areas;
3. Continue collaborative and targeted approaches to support and promote the culture of evidence across the campus with an emphasis on both improvement, as well as quality assurance and accountability;
4. Continue broad-based faculty and staff engagement in the assessment process;
5. Continue implementation of the Closing the Achievement Gap initiative; and
6. More broadly implement utilization of high-impact (engaged) practices across the campus.

Attachment 26 – Future Plans and Timelines provides more information on specific initiatives, desired outcomes, timelines, and responsible parties. It is important to note that this a preliminary plan which will be further refined prior to implementation in academic year 2012-13 and beyond in preparation for the next Institutional Proposal (Narrative).

Attachments 📄 3_Strategic_Plan_Four_Phases.pdf, 📄 4_Strategic_Framework.pdf, 📄 5_Strategic_Plan.pdf, 📄 6_Academic_Affairs_Strategic_Plan.pdf, 📄 7_Campus_Governance_Structure.pdf, 📄 8_Key_Academic_Committees.pdf, 📄 9_Curriculum_Review_Guide.pdf, 📄 10_Assessment_Reports_2011_Summary_and_Samples.pdf, 📄 11_USLOAC_Feedback_Letters_Sample.pdf, 📄 12_Fall_First_Time_Freshmen_Cohort_Completion_in_Developmental_Math_Requirements.xlsx

V. Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Identification of Other Changes and Issues Currently Facing the Institution

Instructions: This brief section should identify any other significant changes that have occurred or issues that have arisen at the institution (e.g., changes in key personnel, addition of major new programs, modifications in the governance structure, unanticipated challenges, or significant financial results) that are not otherwise described in the preceding section. This information will help the Interim Report Committee gain a clearer sense of the current status of the institution and understand the context in which the actions of the institution discussed in the previous section have taken place.

Changes in Key Personnel and University Organization

The past five years have seen critical changes in the executive leadership at CSUDH which resulted in renewed institutional energy, strategic focus, and continually improving student success. Dr. Mildred García*, former President of Berkeley College, joined CSUDH in 2007 as its first female president and the first Latina of 11 female presidents who have served the 23-campus CSU system. Dr. Susan Borrego, Vice President for Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, was appointed in 2008. After serving as Associate Vice President of Development and Acting Vice President for University Advancement since 2006, Greg Saks was named Vice President for University Advancement in 2008. Dr. Ron Vogel became Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in early 2009.

Upon departure of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs Dr. Ron Vogel in May 2011 to assume a position of Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs at the CSU Office of the Chancellor, Dr. Mitch Maki, former dean of the College of Professional Studies and then Associate Vice President for Academic Programs, served as Acting Provost while a national search for the permanent Provost was conducted. Dr. Ramon S. Torrecilha, former Executive Vice President at Mills College, was appointed as the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in February 2012.

This executive team, along with Mary Ann Rodriquez, Vice President for Administration and Finance since 2006, brought not only experience and stability, but a fresh outlook on the collective vision for the future of the University. Under this leadership team, numerous significant achievements were accomplished, including creation and development of an enrollment management function; attaining enrollment targets for three years in a row, after many years of under-enrollment; improving graduation rates; eliminating a structural budget deficit; strengthening fundraising efforts, including funding of the first endowed professorship; enhancing relationships and partnerships with external communities; and spearheading a University-wide collaborative strategic planning process. Furthermore, strategically planned community outreach and communication efforts are now yielding benefits of elevating the campus identity and reputation, and strengthening relationships with friends, supporters, and partners.

As a result of organizational changes and employee transitions, three of the six college and library dean positions currently are being served by acting deans: the College of Arts and Humanities, the College of Business Administration and Public Policy, and the College of Professional Studies. National searches are underway to recruit the dean of the College of Arts and Humanities and the dean of the College of Business Administration and Public Policy. It is anticipated that these two appointments will be made by fall 2012. The recruitment for the dean of the College of Professional Studies will be initiated by fall 2012.

Financial Challenges

Despite continuous budget challenges within the state of California and the CSU, the University has made effective improvements during the past five years to enhance its financial management and strengthen its overall financial position. An existing structural deficit of $2.8 million was eliminated by President García within the first two years after her arrival in 2007. Financial management has been strengthened through effective administrative leadership, coordination of strategic priorities through the University Budget Committee (UBC), the alignment of program priorities with budget decisions, use of performance benchmarks and tracking, better controls and reporting, and targeted cost savings efforts.

The most challenging current issue facing CSUDH is the ongoing statewide economic crisis and budget reductions. Since 2008, the campus has coped with a permanent cut of $9.7 million to its state fund support budget. As the administration has managed through this difficult period, every effort has been made to lessen the impact on the core of its academic mission and student support services. In most part, this has been made possible through availability of one-time funding, such as federal stimulus dollars, as well as gained internal efficiencies and collaborative cost sharing efforts among other CSU campuses. However, the cuts continue to have negative impact on all academic, support, and operational areas across campus. As the University continues to work to stabilize its financial position, hiring new faculty and addressing student retention and graduation issues remain a top priority for CSUDH.

Unprecedented budget reductions to the CSU system required the University, like many other campuses across California and the entire nation, to conduct an institution-wide review of its resources. Every division was asked to develop plans in anticipation of budget shortfalls. With Academic Affairs accounting for 62% of all divisional budgets, the development of a focused planning process for academic programs was essential to developing appropriate cost-reduction strategies. As a result, the Academic Affairs division underwent an extensive, collaborative, faculty-involved process during the 2009 fall semester to determine the criteria that should be used when considering program elimination and/or consolidation to help bridge a budget gap that was anticipated for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This planning process was conducted in conjunction with the college deans and ensured that all faculty were given the opportunity to provide meaningful and significant input into the development of criteria. The entire process was then reviewed and vetted by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, Academic Senate, and the Associated Students, Inc. While program cuts did not take place during the 2010-11 fiscal year, the University now has the academic program evaluation process in place and is in a much better position to review and prioritize programs in the event of further budget cuts.

After three years of a hiring freeze of full-time faculty, during academic year 2011-12 eleven tenured/tenure-track faculty positions were approved for hiring, spanning all four colleges. The approval process was a result of an extensive, collaborative effort involving faculty, department chairs, and deans and was directly linked to the University Strategic Plan. Recruitment processes are currently underway in all colleges, and it is anticipated that new faculty members will be joining CSUDH in fall 2012.

The financial outlook for 2012-13 remains uncertain. The 2012-13 State Budget Proposal has identified a possible $10.3 billion state budget shortfall. The Governor has proposed an initiative, which would be presented to the voters in November 2012 and, if passed, would increase income tax rate on higher income taxpayers for five years and would increase state sales tax rate by 0.5% for four years. In the event that voters do not pass the tax initiative, the Governor has indicated that the CSU state funding would be reduced by $200 million in 2012-13. The impact of this on CSUDH is a potential reduction of $5.3 million. If this is to occur the campus would work collaboratively with all divisions within the University and other CSU campuses to minimize the impact of any reduction on CSU Dominguez Hills' ability to provide an excellent education and experience for all its students.

Changes in Academic Programs

In 2008, the College of Education and the College of Health and Human Services were merged to form the College of Professional Studies which now includes three schools under its umbrella: the School of Education, School of Health and Human Services, and School of Nursing.

A number of other changes in CSUDH academic programs have occurred since 2008. Two new programs were approved by the University and the Chancellor's Office in September 2008 and implemented in spring 2009: Bachelor of Arts in Computer Technology and Master of Science in Environmental Science. Two new academic programs were approved by the University through its curriculum processes and are currently pending the Chancellor's approval: Master of Public Health and Master of Arts in Kinesiology: Physical Education and Athletic Administration. During academic year 2010-11 the Bachelor of Science in Information Technology program was approved by the University Curriculum Committee but is pending Provost's and President's approvals before submission to the Chancellor's Office. In 2009, Bachelor of Arts in Recreation and Leisure Studies program suspended admission of new students.

*At their January 2012 meeting, the CSU Board of Trustees announced the appointment of Dr. Mildred García as the new President of CSU Fullerton effective June 2012.

Attachments 📄 13_Program_Review_Guide.pdf, 📄 14_Graduation_Initiative_Jan_Feb_2011.doc, 📄 15_CSUDH_Graduation_Initiative_April_2011.pdf, 📄 16_EMSA_Student_Learning_Outcomes.docx, 📄 17_Strategies_Towards_Educational_Progress_and_Success_STEPS.xlsx, 📄 18_Impact_of_Mandatory_Freshmen_Advising_MFA.xlsx, 📄 19_EOP_ETE_Bridge_Data_and_Outcomes_2009_11.pdf, 📄 20_CSUDH_McNair_Scholars.doc, 📄 21_CSUDH_Library_Assessment_Plan.doc, 📄 22_Library_Assessment_Program_Planning_Grid.pdf

VI. Concluding Statement

Concluding Statement

Instructions: Reflect on how the institutional responses to the issues raised by the Commission have had an impact upon the institution, including future steps to be taken.

Since 2008 CSUDH coped with a number of challenges and made some significant improvements as described in previous sections of this Interim Report. Planning and preparation of this Report resulted in strengthened refocusing of institutional energies and priorities on the most critical components of educational effectiveness: student learning and success and the teaching and learning environment. A series of conversations with faculty, academic and institutional committees, Academic Senate, and administrative and academic leadership provided a more focused, long-term perspective and a great deal of valuable insight and recommendations on the need to:

1. Explicitly integrate the assessment, quality assurance, and accountability elements as essential components of the University strategic planning process now and in the future;
2. Continue collaborative and targeted approaches to support and promote a culture of evidence across the campus with an emphasis on both improvement, as well as quality assurance and accountability;
3. Continue utilization of best practices and more integrative curricular and co-curricular approaches to teaching and learning strategies and methodologies; and
4. Support and nurture broad-based faculty engagement in assessment and related functions.

Planning and preparation of the Interim Report, as well as many training and educational experiences, also presented an opportunity for institutional self-assessment and reflection on numerous challenges and accomplishments since 2008. More importantly, many faculty and administrators embraced an active role in becoming strong supporters and endorsers of the assessment imperative and its desired linkage to institutional and divisional strategic planning processes.

The following diagram, developed in the process of planning and preparing this Interim Report, illustrates the cohesive and highly collaborative approach to the issue identified by the Commission in 2008 and implementation of proposed actions in the future in preparation of the next Institutional Proposal (Narrative) for WASC.

As previously noted, the University strongly believes that the focus on assessment of student learning and success and quality assurance is a key component in the University's ability to demonstrate educational effectiveness not only to WASC but to internal and external constituencies concerned with the value, cost, and benefits of higher education. Assessments of learning, quality assurance, and student success have been embedded in discussions on strategic planning across the entire campus and will continue to be at the forefront of the institutional agenda going forward. Furthermore, as the University prepares for leadership transitions and continuing financial challenges, it is now in a much stronger position to move forward with many plans and goals developed through preparation of this Report.

Strategic Planning

Assessment of Learning in Academic Units

Assessment of Learning in Co-Curricular Units

Attachments 24_CSUDH_Engaged_Practices.pdf, 25_Presentation_to_Admin_Council_HIP.pdf, 26_Future_Plans_and_Timelines.docx, 23_SHPS_Student_Learning_OUtcomes_Activities_2010_11.pdf

VII. Required Documents for all Interim Reports

Required Documents

Instructions.   Attach the following documents:

1. Current catalog(s) [.pdf or link to web-based catalog] - attached

2. Summary Data Form (available at www.wascsenior.org/interimreport) - attached

3. Complete set of Required Data Exhibits (available at www.wascsenior.org/interimreport) - attached

4. Most recent audited financial statements by an independent certified public accountant or, if a public institution, by the appropriate state agency; management letters, if any - attached

5. Organization charts or tables, both administrative and academic, highlighting any major changes since the last visit - attached

Attachments 1_Organizational_Chart.pdf, 27_Summary_Data_Form.doc, 28_Required_Data_Exhibits.doc, 29_Audited_Financial_Statements_2011.pdf, University_Catalog_2011_13.pdf

VIII. Additional Financial Documents

Additional Financial Documents

If any of the issues identified in the Commission's action letter relate to financial management or financial sustainability, the Interim Report must also include the following documents. Attach them to this page.

1. Financial statements for the current fiscal year including Budgeted and Actual Year-to-Date and Budgeted and Actual Last Year Totals.

2. Projected budgets for the upcoming three fiscal years, including the key assumptions for each set of projections.

N/A - no financial issues were identified

Created with LiveText - livetext.com