

Charting Our Campus Future

California State University, Fullerton
Institutional Proposal

Submitted to the
Western Association of Schools and Colleges

October 2007



WASC

 CAL STATE
FULLERTON

Table of Contents

A. Setting the Institution's Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards		
1. <i>Institutional Context Statement</i>	page	1
2. <i>Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation</i>	page	4
3. <i>Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Involvement</i>	page	5
B. Framing the Review Process to Connect the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews		
1. <i>Overview and Goals for the Accreditation Review Process</i>	page	9
2. <i>Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review</i>	page	10
3. <i>Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review</i>	page	11
C. Demonstrating a Feasible Plan of Work and Engagement of Key Constituencies		
1. <i>Work plan and Milestones</i>	page	12
2. <i>Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems</i>	page	14
3. <i>Commitment of Resources to Support the Accrediting Review</i>	page	15
D. Presenting Appendices Connected to the Proposal		
1. <i>Required Data Exhibits</i>	Binder	2
2. <i>Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs</i>	Appendix	1
3. <i>Institutional Stipulations</i>	page	15
4. <i>Appendices</i>		
1. List of Distance Education programs and CFR Review for Distance Education		
2. Additional Data Portfolio		
3. Update on Faculty Flow, August 2007		
4. 2006-2007 Academic Affairs Annual Report Guidelines		
5. WASC 2000 Letter		
6. General Education Committee End of Year Reports, May 2001- 2007		
7. Current Program Performance Review Guidelines		
8. Faculty Development Center Workshops		
9. Worksheets for Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards		
a. Institution-wide		
b. Distance Education		
10. Members of the Steering Committee		
11. Survey request to academic departments		
12. Academic Affairs Forum program		
13. Compiled/sorted lists from Academic Affairs Forum discussions		
14. WASC Newsletter 1: <i>Charting Our Campus Future</i>		
15. List of constituencies contacted/Contact letter		
16. Outreach materials for constituency meetings		
17. Campus report on Access to Excellence		
18. Growth Forum presentations and forced choice findings		
19. Electronic survey		
20. Initial survey findings: Exhibits B, C, D		
21. WASC Newsletter 2: <i>Charting Our Campus Future</i>		
22. Initial survey findings: Exhibit V		
23. Timetable/Flowchart of Milestones and Workplan		
24. Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies: 2006-2007 Annual Report		

CHARTING OUR CAMPUS FUTURE
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL
SUBMITTED TO THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES
OCTOBER 2007



A. Setting the Institution's Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards

1. Institutional Context Statement

Institutional background. Originally known as Orange Coast State College, California State University, Fullerton (CSU Fullerton) was established by an act of the California Legislature in 1957. The main campus is situated on 236 acres of what was once a vast orange grove in the city of Fullerton, in northwest Orange County. Instruction on this site began in 1960. CSU Fullerton also maintains the largest official off-site center in the CSU, Fullerton's Irvine Campus (see Appendix 1 for all Distance Education programs). CSU Fullerton was the 12th campus of what is now a 23 campus California State University (CSU) system. As part of the CSU system, the campus is subject to the policies of the California Legislature and the CSU Board of Trustees.

CSU Fullerton has developed a strong tradition of shared collegial governance, although the president is vested with final authority. A number of faculty and student groups initiate, review, and/or recommend various university programs, policies, and procedures. The Academic Senate, primarily comprised of teaching faculty, recommends curriculum and professional policies. The CSU Fullerton President's Advisory Board, comprised of community leaders interested in the welfare and development of the university, advises the president on community relations and other issues.

This fall 2007, CSU Fullerton has a headcount enrollment of 37,130 (28,132 re-benched FTES) and has become the CSU campus with the largest headcount for three years. Indeed, we have increased by close to 8,000 students since our last WASC reaccreditation, and in 2007 we became the second largest public institution of higher education in the state. During the 2006-07 academic year, 6,295 undergraduates earned baccalaureate degrees, 1,430 earned master's degrees, and 1,180 students were recommended to receive an education credential from CSU Fullerton (Appendix 2).

Student diversity continues to be among the campus' most distinctive characteristics. From fall 1990 to 2000 to 2006, the percentage of the student body classified as ethnically diverse increased from 31.2% to 47.8% to 52.5% respectively. In June 2006, *US News and World Report* ranked CSU Fullerton 8th nationally for number of baccalaureate degrees awarded to minority students, and in May 2007 *Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education* ranked our university number two in California and sixth in the nation in its listing of the top 100 colleges and universities awarding bachelor's degrees to Hispanics, based on 2006 data from the U.S. Department of Education. According to current student demographic indicators, the campus has nearly equal proportions of Hispanics (27%), Asians (22%), and Caucasians (33%). In addition to their ethnic diversity, our student body is also characterized by young, traditional freshmen; a mix of traditional and



nontraditional undergraduate transfers; as well as by Master's, teaching credential, and now Ed.D. students who are relatively mature and synthesize their academics with work and family interests and a strong record of achievement. Many CSU Fullerton undergraduate students transfer to our campus after completing their first two years of higher education at community colleges in the region. Our campus has been the number one destination for California community college transfers for the past eight consecutive years. Speaking to our success with transfer students, CSU Fullerton also graduates more transfer students than any other large CSU campus (Appendix 2).

Since our last reaccreditation, as of fall 2006, the number of full-time faculty has grown to 811 (an increase of 100 individuals); the number of part-time faculty is currently 1297 (an increase of 186 individuals) (Appendix 2). With President Gordon's commitment to search for 100 full-time faculty campus-wide each year for five years (initiated in fall 2005), the full-time/part-time ratio should continue to shift favorably toward full-time and is expected to reach 70% full-time faculty by the year 2015 (Appendix 3).

Since our last accreditation review, the College of Human Development and Community Service separated into two colleges. The College of Health and Human Development and a new College of Education brought our total to eight:

- 1) College of the Arts
- 2) College of Business and Economics
- 3) College of Communications
- 4) College of Education
- 5) College of Engineering and Computer Science
- 6) College of Health and Human Development
- 7) College of Humanities and Social Sciences
- 8) College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics.

Several graduate concentrations and programs have also received approval: a concentration within the Masters of Science in Nursing Anesthesiology, Masters in Social Work in the College of Health and Human Development, Master of Science in Instructional Technology and Design, Master of Science in Informational Technology, Master of Science in Software Engineering, and a doctorate in Educational Leadership. These degree programs expand our total degree offerings to 55 bachelors, 50 masters, one doctorate, as well as 3 basic teaching and 4 service credentials, and a wide variety of certificates both within and separate from academic programs.

As the number of students, faculty, and administrators has grown, so too has the number and quality of many campus facilities. CSU Fullerton on-campus student-resident population more than doubled with the completion of a 440-bed student housing facility in August 2002. A 71,000-square-foot expansion of the Kinesiology and Health Science Building was completed in 2003. The new wing includes the Wellness Center for Successful Aging, practice gymnasium, seminar rooms and a lecture hall. The Nutwood Parking Structure, a five-level, 2,500-space facility opened for the fall 2004 semester. The State College Parking Structure, which contains 1,400 spaces, opened in the fall 2006 semester. The construction of a new 102,000-square-foot Performing Arts Center, was completed in early spring 2006, provided a significant artistic addition to the campus and to North Orange County. This new complex features venues that include an 800-seat concert hall, 250-seat thrust theater and a 150-seat black box theater.

The following is a list of other facilities projects completed in the past seven years:

- Arboretum Visitor Center - Feb. 2006



- Auditorium and Fine Arts - Jan. 2006
- University Heights Faculty-Staff Housing- Dec 2006
- Kinesiology & Health Science - Nov. 2003
- Student Housing Expansion - Aug. 2003
- Humanities Seismic Upgrade - Nov. 2002
- Student Health Center Addition - Sept. 2002
- University Gables Faculty-Staff Housing-Sept 2001
- Ball Field Improvements - Nov. 2000
- El Dorado Ranch Renovation - Oct. 2000
- Langsdorf Hall Seismic Upgrade - Oct. 2000
- Titan House Renovation - Sept. 2000
- Student Recreation Center (new)
- Steven G. Mihaylo Hall (College of Business and Economics) (new)
- College Park Renovation (new)

Strengths and Challenges. Our *strengths*, as indicated by data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analytic Studies, are most easily seen in the strong, steady growth of our University and in the high standard of educational quality that we have maintained in the course of such growth. Our student population has increased across gender and ethnic boundaries. Our transfer population is among the strongest in the state and graduates with an equally impressive success rate. Our University President has made a commitment to growing the faculty commensurately with the growth in the student body. The healthy expansion of our faculty has led to a corresponding increase in our course offerings and additions and revisions to curricular programs. The physical complex of our campus has also grown considerably in the past few years as we have added buildings, parking structures, and provided a parallel increase in our technological infrastructure.

Many of our *challenges*, not surprisingly, also emerge from or are reflected in this growth. Although we have ranked #1 among the largest CSU campuses for six of the last seven years in freshman graduation rates, we would like to increase that success rate and continue to facilitate timely graduation. Though our lower division curriculum has been carefully reviewed, the explosion in courses at both the lower and upper division level and the fast increase in the number of new course proposals has impacted the opportunities for review and reflection of the University curriculum and its overall goals. As this growth in the curriculum and student/faculty populations has occurred, it has been increasingly difficult for faculty and staff to obtain and keep up with all the information needed in order to accomplish accurate and effective undergraduate advising and for faculty to maintain the kind of close student/faculty interaction that distinguishes us from the research-focused campuses in the University of California system. Finally, as our student population has grown in number and diversity (including both socio-economic and language diversity), the time has come for the entire campus to examine expectations and learning goals within and across the disciplines, giving particular attention to writing and communication.

Current State of the Institution's Approaches to Identifying and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes Across the Institution. The inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators was included in the 2006-2007 Annual Report requirements (Appendix 4). Each department and program was asked to submit a completed inventory with their review. Many programs and departments provided exemplary inventories, demonstrating their extensive attention to defining, implementing, and assessing student learning outcomes. However, several other programs and



departments submitted inventories whose brevity indicates the uneven manner in which learning outcomes have been identified and implemented as an elemental feature of academic programs.

How the Proposal Responds to 2000 Action Letter. Following our 2000 WASC review, the Commission acted to reaffirm our accreditation and commended the University for having taken up “previous concerns about University planning” and having understood “planning as a high priority to accommodate current and future growth” (Appendix 5). Furthermore, the University was commended for its work to identify learning outcomes and to improve its student support services. The Commission also identified several areas to which the University should address further attention:

1. refining the definition and improving evidence of learning
2. continuing to strengthen general education
3. improving the Program Performance Review Process
4. supporting faculty learning and development

Since this Action Letter was received, the University has made steady progress toward improving each of these areas. Most notably, we have “continued strengthening of general education,” having created and implemented General Education Learning Goals and recently completed a review of all General Education courses (Appendix 6). As recommended by the Commission, the University mission statement now provides a “frame” that serves as a touchstone for the full range of University core processes: course and program approvals, program performance reviews, evaluations of student support and requests for research assistance. Since our last review, we have directed attention to improvements in our Program Performance Review Process. To that end, we have clarified the Deans’ roles in the process and featured assessment of student learning more prominently in the guidelines (Appendix 7). Finally, the Faculty Development Center has expanded such that “faculty support [has been] enhanced not only for creative and scholarly development, but also for the types of faculty learning needed to promote and improve student learning” (Appendix 8). The current proposal, as will be detailed below, extends our response to the Commission’s concerns with our review of planning processes, evidence of student learning, and the related area of student engagement.

2. Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards of Accreditation

The WASC Steering Committee—an interdisciplinary group of faculty, staff, and administrators described more fully below—completed the “Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards” (Appendix 9), in spring/summer 2007 using the results to clarify further and more explicitly identify our institutional strengths and challenges as they had begun to emerge from data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Analytic Studies (Appendix 2). We provide an overview of these three areas below; a more complete presentation of our ratings and evidence for each item can be found on our worksheet (Appendix 9).

Institutional Strengths. The strengths of our University are visible in its organizational structure and its core educational objectives and functions. Together, these components work to support the needs of a fast growing, diverse, academically-oriented, urban, public university. Most generally, the institution “publicly states its commitment to academic freedom (CFR 1.4) and “operates with appropriate autonomy” in order to maintain “education as its primary purpose” (CFR 1.6). Campus governance includes a “chief executive with full-time responsibility to the institution” (CFR 3.10) and “an independent governing board” (CFR 3.9) balanced and supported by a faculty that “exercises effective academic leadership” (CFR 3.11). The sustainability of this structure is achieved by three means: 1) campus- and community-wide “access to information resources” (CFR 3.6) that “truthfully represent [University] goals, programs, and services” (CFR 1.7); 2) excellent “information technology resources” (CFR 3.6); and 3) “appropriate and



sufficiently supported faculty development” activities (CFR 3.4; Letter 2000) that provide a forum for the faculty to “engage in ongoing inquiry into teaching and learning” (CFR 4.7). As the number and diversity of our students and faculty continue to grow, each unit is committed to maintaining “graduate programs [that] are consistent with the purpose and character of the institution” (CFR 2.2), “demonstrate[ing] appropriate response to diversity” (CFR 1.5) and meeting our “obligation to transfer students” (CFR 2.14).

Institutional Challenges. The Steering Committee conducted its self-review under the standards contemporaneously with themes development. Yet it is perhaps not a coincidence that the three areas of institutional challenge that emerged from our self-review would, in the end, parallel those that emerged from our campus conversations and surveys. The areas we identified from the self-review are campus-wide planning, student learning, and promoting student success.

CAMPUS-WIDE PLANNING:

As noted in our last reaccreditation, our campus has “taken up previous concerns about University planning and continues to undertake planning as a high priority to accommodate current and future growth” (Letter 2000). However, questions continue to arise regarding the extent to which planning processes are “informed by appropriately defined and analyzed qualitative and quantitative data” (CFR 4.3) and the extent to which the University “engages its constituencies in reflection and planning” (CFR 4.1) that “define[s] and align[s] academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs” (CFR 4.2). To the degree that campus planning is related to campus growth, we face related questions regarding whether the institution “employs personnel in sufficient number” (CFR 3.1), aligns “faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices” and “fiscal and physical resources” with “institutional purposes and educational objectives” (CFR 3.3, 3.5).

STUDENT LEARNING:

Although a thorough “review of the general education program” has been completed, such that “significant foundation has been established in identifying learning outcomes and in reviewing specific courses” (Letter 2000), we continue to face the challenge of assuring that “educational objectives [are] recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes” (CFR 1.2) and that courses and programs across campus work together to ensure “the development of . . . college-level written and oral communication” (CFR 2.2). Similarly, questions exist as to whether our “expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared” across programs, colleges, and departments (CFR 2.4).

PROMOTING STUDENT SUCCESS:

Although the University has “responded to previous concerns about student support” (Letter 2000), particularly in terms of academic support and first year programs, questions have been raised about whether we provide consistently adequate and accurate advising that would “ensure that all students understand their requirements” (CFR 2.12) toward their major and toward graduation.

3. Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Involvement

Creating a Steering Committee. This institutional accreditation emphasizes a process of collaborative inquiry whose purpose is to tell our distinctive CSU Fullerton story and to chart plans for the future that are grounded in core mission and goals statements and pointed toward improvements in institutional quality. As we understand it, the accreditation process is as much (perhaps more) about working together, “Charting our Campus Future” at CSU Fullerton, as it is about achieving compliance with WASC. Consequently, the process by which we developed our proposal was an inclusionary and collaborative effort to determine what matters most to the



faculty, staff, students, and administrators at CSU Fullerton and what research themes provide the best opportunity to prove to ourselves that we are, in fact, the campus that we want to be and are headed in the direction of what we want to become.

In the very early stages of the process (fall 2005 and spring 2006), our WASC Administrative Liaison Officer and the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies invited College Deans and the Chair of the Academic Senate to nominate faculty for an Accreditation Work Group. Ideal individuals would have had some broad exposure to the campus but be new to WASC self-review, and be willing to participate in one or more of the three WASC review segments. The ten members the Work Group, who would later become the current members of the Steering Committee, include faculty from five departments and four colleges, from both junior and senior ranks, and administrators from both major divisions—Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, as well as the current President of Associated Students Inc. (Appendix 10). The assignment of this Group was to attend the winter 2006 WASC conference held in Irvine. Although this conference was well in advance of our proposal due date, it provided the members of the Work Group with a context for the proposal development.

Reaching out to the Whole University. As a precursor to more formal activities, in November 2006, the Reaccreditation Work Group requested that members of each academic department propose what they believed to be the “top three concerns that should matter most to our campus.” The most commonly occurring topics were, in descending order of frequency: (a) addressing student needs and instructional resources, (b) specific faculty interests, (c) facilities, (d) sense of campus community, and (e) connectivity with our external communities (Appendix 11).

In January 2007, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Ephraim Smith, formally designated the Work Group to be the WASC Steering Committee that would shepherd the University through the current accreditation process. The ten member Committee grew by one in spring 2007 when Dr. Gerald Patton joined CSU Fullerton in May as the new Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness. Reflecting the collaborative nature of our reaccreditation process, we structured the committee in an intentionally non-hierarchical fashion and held working meetings/discussions for two hours each week. Although some members had specific roles (Editor/Author) or responsibilities (financial liaison to the Vice President), the work of the committee was distributed among all members; the role of meeting “convener” rotated weekly; and agenda, minutes, and related documents were stored on a Blackboard site to which we all have editing access. Most importantly, we continually reminded ourselves of our responsibility to determine and convey the interests, concerns, and goals of the campus in an inclusive and systematic manner.

The Committee’s first task was to select the approach our campus would use for the WASC self study. Based on what we learned at the WASC conference and the January 2007 WASC proposal writing workshop in Pomona, from the other sample proposals we read, and our own collective sense of our University, we selected a thematic approach. We then began searching for the themes we would use by completing the Worksheet for Preliminary Self-Review under the Standards and determining, through numerous small group conversations and by reaching out to as many campus constituencies as possible, “*What matters to CSUF? How do we define what we are and what we aspire to be?*”

The annual Academic Affairs Forum, held in January 2007, served as the formal campus-wide kickoff to the accreditation process (Appendix 12). That Forum included a presentation by the President and Executive Director of WASC, Ralph Wolff, to the campus and a set of breakout sessions that used the results of the Academic survey as a starting point for “Brainstorming



Campus Futures.” Discussions among the 131 faculty, staff, students, and administrators at the Academic Affairs Forum of what matters most to CSU Fullerton coalesced around: addressing student learning and assessing its success, enhancing campus community, growth and institutional quality, supporting faculty and staff needs for effectiveness, and the intersection of growth and campus planning (Appendix 13).

Informing the Campus. The members of the Steering Committee agreed that if our colleagues were to be convinced that the new WASC process was no longer about proving to an outside body of reviewers that our University is *their* ideal campus but about who we are and who we want to become, the re-accreditation process on our campus must be as transparent as possible. To this end, in addition to seeking input from as many constituencies as possible, we made available the details of the process by means of a regularly published newsletter (Appendix 14) and a campus WASC website (www.fullerton.edu/wasc/).

Talking to Constituencies. Working at our weekly meetings, the Steering Committee compiled and organized the results of the Academic Affairs Forum discussions. Aware that a relatively small percentage of the University attended this pre-semester event, the Steering Committee began its next round of outreach: identifying major constituencies on campus whose input we would seek (Appendix 15). Although we contacted more than a dozen such standing groups, seven responded with invitations: Library staff, Chairs and Deans, Associated Students, Student Affairs Executive Managers, Alumni, and Information Technology. Small groups of Steering Committee members (2-5 per meeting) met with each group, providing a brief overview of the WASC process, sharing the list of topics from the Academic Affairs Forum, and inviting members of the constituency to add to, or delete from the lists and then to suggest researchable questions related to the items that remained (Appendix 16).

Additional Resources. The breadth of the information available to us was expanded further by means of several campus committees whose work informed our own: the University Planning Committee; the Planning, Resources, and Budget Committee and its Priorities Subcommittee. Several university-wide discussions also served as valuable resources: a survey conducted by the Senate ad hoc Committee on Academic Quality and the CSU system-wide visit to discuss our *Facilitating Graduation* initiatives. Two large-scale forums further enriched the information base for shaping our reaccreditation research themes and the proposal. By a Chancellor's Office request to every campus, our *Access to Excellence* event occurred on March 21, 2007, drawing 263 attendees. Its purpose was to discuss campus strengths and areas needing improvement in two domains that intentionally aligned with our reaccreditation work --- ensuring success in student learning and building faculty and staff excellence to promote that student success (Appendix 17).

The second event, the *Complexities of Growth* forum (April 5, 2007), was attended by 182 people. Participants worked through a “Forced Choice Exercise” that required planning and prioritizing in the face of limited resources and heard presentations on the economics and politics of enrollment growth as a CSU campus. Results of the discussions, ranging from infrastructure challenges to financing, our imprints on the local community, adequate staff support, and even some inherent predicaments in the nature of growth per se will be used to organize further campus-wide events in 2007-08 (Appendix 18).

Creating and Distributing the Electronic Survey. By mid-March, 2007, the Steering Committee had collected information from a wide cross-section of the campus. Our final challenge, in this part of the process, was to complete the sifting, sorting, and organizing of emerging issues and themes to test it out one final time in a campus-wide electronic survey. Working with the



University Information Technology staff, the Steering Committee created the electronic survey that was distributed via our University Portal and made available to the entire campus community for five weeks (Appendix 19). The survey questionnaire was organized into six issue domains:

- Addressing the Needs of Students
- Ensuring Student Learning
- Faculty Excellence and Effectiveness
- Staff Excellence and Effectiveness
- Campus Planning and Vision
- Campus and Community Partnerships

For each of 48 items distributed across these domains, respondents were asked to react to two dimensions: *How well is the campus doing in this area?* *How important is it to address this area now?* A total of 1,242 valid surveys were completed, representing a good cross-section of the university community. The distribution of respondents is as follows:

Students	408	32.9% of total
Administration	94	7.6%
Staff	334	26.9%
Part-Time Faculty	124	10.0%
Full-Time Faculty	282	22.7%
Total	1242	100%

Analysis of the Survey. A wealth of evidence emerged from the survey responses indicating both strengths and challenges of our campus. One useful way of viewing CSU Fullerton strengths is to focus on those activities and qualities which respondents regard as the university doing “Very Well” and are considered to be “Very Important” (Appendix 20). Prominent assets and strengths include our strong technological infrastructure, welcoming and accessible environment of the university, attention to student success, and service to the needs of our regional community, along with the needs of our students.

In contrast, the survey found general concerns about staff sufficiency and for more integrated campus planning and vision. Campus challenges were identified through cross-combinations of areas which were marked both “not well done” and “very important” to address at this time. Students also expressed an interest in having more engagement with faculty and more out-of-classroom learning experiences (Appendix 20).

Additionally, 430 (34.7%) of all respondents took the time and effort to provide written comments at the end of the questionnaire. Taken as a whole, these written comments demonstrated a qualitative richness behind the patterns of the quantitative results.

It is important to remember that the survey is a convergence of several months of information gathering, sorting, and ranking. The WASC Steering Committee worked diligently to make the survey be a reflection of the input we received from the numerous constituencies with whom we spoke at a variety of campus and independent meetings. Similarly, our analysis of the results of the survey was conducted so as to determine what matters most across ranks and constituencies. We looked at the various data in multiple ways, ultimately focusing on those items that 20% or more of each status group indicated as being “urgent,” that is, issues that are both “very important” to the campus and “not well done.” This final process, of sorting and ranking, the culmination of our campus research, our review of the WASC 2000 letter, and our self-review,



enabled the Steering Committee to identify the themes that best reflected what matters to our campus now.

Sharing our Results. In fall 2007, the entire WASC Steering Committee met with President Milton Gordon and Vice President of Academic Affairs, Ephraim Smith and then presented to the annual Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat an overview of our entire process to date along with the themes and research questions that we had identified. President Gordon and Vice President Smith provided encouragement and useful observations about the questions that we used in making our final edits. The questions and comments from Retreat participants also indicated their general consensus about the appropriateness of the themes and revealed to us some ways in which the research questions would need to be revised so as not to be misconstrued. We also asked the participants' help to begin brainstorming a list of the existing and needed resources, structures, and processes that the campus could use to find answers to our research questions. The Steering Committee also prepared and distributed the second WASC Newsletter, Charting Our Campus Future: Reaccreditation Process Update (Appendix 21) and published an overview article in the Senate Forum, providing the whole campus with more venues in which to find a description of our work and announce the expected date by which we would post the Proposal to the campus on the WASC website.

B. Framing the Review Process to Connect the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

1. Overview and Goals for the Accreditation Review Process

Campus Themes. Three themes and related research questions will provide the framework for the inquiry and outcomes of our accreditation process. The themes clearly emerged from the various lines of inquiry we have pursued—data from Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, the preliminary self-review under the standards of accreditation, review of the 2000 letter, and our own campus-wide outreach and survey (Appendix 22).

CAMPUS-WIDE PLANNING

In the face of enrollment pressures and system-wide expectations, how does each campus unit define and assess indicators of quality and their contributions to the academic mission of the University? How do we integrate and prioritize these indicators of quality with campus-wide planning?

STUDENT LEARNING AND ITS ASSESSMENT

What are the student learning goals that we hold in common across baccalaureate degree programs? How are these learning goals articulated and achieved through curricular and co-curricular experiences? How can we improve the use of quality review processes such as the Program Performance Reviews, annual reports, and discipline-based accreditation, so as to assist departments in assessing student learning and using the results to improve their programs?

How can student and faculty conceptions about what constitutes “effective writing skills” be aligned, and what existing and potential means of support would assist in developing such skills?

PROMOTING STUDENT ENGAGEMENT AND SUCCESS

How can we better promote student engagement and success by means of our teaching, mentoring, and advising and make the best use of our resources in order to achieve this objective?



2. *Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review*

The Institution's Self-assessment of Capacity, Infrastructure, and Level of Preparedness to Support Educational Effectiveness Review. As the Steering Committee reviewed the themes and research questions, it became clear that a number of existing campus resources, structures, and processes can provide information and means for assessing our capacity as it relates to our identified themes. Moreover, the high feasibility that we will reach our CPR and EER outcomes in the course of our WASC review and that there will be sustained campus engagement throughout the reaccreditation process is in large part a consequence of this existing infrastructure. As the chart below demonstrates, there are few new resources to be developed. Rather, we can draw on the synergy of existing resources—challenging ourselves to integrate and coordinate their existing knowledge and expertise. In the section that follows, we have outlined more specifically the preliminary CPR outcomes and the final EER outcomes.

Self Assessment of Available and Proposed Resources, Structures, and Processes to Support Thematically-Focused Educational Effectiveness Review

Campus-wide Planning

Existing Resources

- Academic Senate
- Annual reports
- Audit reports—financial and process
- Bench marking reports
- Dept. and college structures
- Dept. curriculum committees
- Director of Assessment
- Divisional Leadership Teams:
 - Council of Deans
 - Deans and Directors
- Information available from CMS/HR/Finance
- Institutional research office
- Mission and Goals document
- Planning, Research, and Budget Committee
- President's Administrative Board
- Program Performance Review
- Report of the Committee on Academic Quality
- Spring and Fall Chief Financial Officer reports
- Strategic planning report
- University and unit budget reports
- University Planning Committee
- University Planning Initiatives

Proposed Resources

- External planning consultant/facilitator
- University Assessment Committee

Student Learning and its Assessment

Existing Resources

- Academic programs
- Assessment conference
- Annual reports
- English Dept.'s Composition Committee
- Course syllabi
- CSUF website, catalog, viewsheets
- Curriculum committee
- Dept. assessment committees
- Director of Assessment
- Discipline based accreditation
- English Writing Proficiency Exam/English Placement Test
- Faculty Development Center
- Graduate Executive Committee
- General Education Committee
- General Education learning goals
- General Education Program Performance Review
- General Education progress report
- New Faculty Orientation curriculum and materials
- New staff orientation
- New Student Orientation curriculum and materials
- Program Performance Review
- WASC Steering Committee Campus-wide Survey
- University Writing Board
- U.P.S. 411
- Writing Center

Proposed Resources

- Collect anecdotal evidence about assessment College of Business
- University Director of Writing in the Disciplines
- University Assessment Committee

Promoting Student Engagement and Success

Existing Resources

- Academic Advisement Center
- Academic Advising Conferences
- Academic Senate committees
- Associated Student Inc. committees
- Campus academic and student support "Centers"
- Campus budget review
- Campus co-curricular involvement levels
- CSU Student Research Competition
- Existing mentoring programs
- Faculty Development Center
- Graduate Studies operations
- Intramural research grants for student/faculty research
- McNair Scholars and Honors Programs as models
- New Student Orientation
- Office of Financial Aid assessments, student feedback
- Physical resources review e.g. facilities inventory, workspace for community or joint research
- Retention grants
- Faculty incentives for including students in research projects
- Staffing formulas/benchmarks
- Titan Degree Audit process, SIS+, CMS

Proposed Resources

- Advising Task Force
- Best practices for using Information Technology to build community
- Catalog existing faculty/student research partnerships
- Standing Committee on Retention and Graduation
- University Assessment Committee



3. *Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review*

The Institution's Intended Specific Outcomes and Plans for Reviewing and Improving Student and Organizational Learning. In as much as our research themes and questions resulted from the convergence of what we learned from the Self-review, the review of our WASC 2000 letter, and our own campus inquiry, so, too, do our corresponding outcomes. And although each theme takes into account student learning, the second theme, *Student Learning and Its Assessment*, most directly targets reviewing and improving student and organizational learning. In order to be most confident of achieving our intended outcomes for the Educational Effectiveness Review, we have created a set of goals that integrates these with outcomes for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. As is evident below, some CPR outcomes are complete in themselves; others are preliminary, moving us toward final EER outcomes.

Desired Outcomes of the CPR and EER Processes

Research Themes and Questions	CPR Outcomes /Spring 2010	EER Outcomes /Fall 2011
Campus-Wide Planning		
In the face of enrollment pressures and system-wide expectations, how does each campus unit define and assess indicators of quality and their contributions to the academic mission of the University? How do we integrate and prioritize these indicators of quality with campus-wide planning?	▪ An institutionalized process to identify and prioritize indicators of quality within the context of enrollment-driven funding ▪ A universal assessment of faculty and staff needed to optimize quality as a big university ▪ A "fit/gap analysis" of all current planning processes: where they intersect, what's missing, and how each one relates to enrollment	▪ A long-term integrated university strategic plan ▪ A concept map of all planning processes showing how they contribute to the university strategic plan ▪ General consensus about and understanding of the campus strategic plan and priorities
Student Learning and Its Assessment		
What are the student learning goals that we hold in common across baccalaureate degree programs? How are these learning goals articulated and achieved through curricular and co-curricular experiences? How can we improve the use of quality review processes such as the PPR, annual reports, and discipline-based accreditation, so as to assist departments in assessing student learning and using the results to improve their programs?	▪ A central database on the university website designating student learning outcomes for each degree program ▪ An infrastructure framework to support and coordinate the work of individual units in assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes ▪ An institutionalized process to identify and prioritize indicators of academic and co-curricular quality, and link them to resources	▪ A preliminary set of student learning goals that are held in common campus-wide. ▪ Accessible evidence of ongoing process of assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes at the program and campus level
How can student and faculty conceptions about what constitutes "effective writing skills" be aligned, and what existing and potential means of support would assist in developing such skills?	A process involving students and faculty to ▪ Identify shared views of effective writing within and across disciplines, and ▪ Develop a set of descriptive rubrics	▪ A set of campus-wide student learning goals for writing ▪ A coordinated set of faculty and student resources and programs for writing to learn, writing pedagogy, and writing assessment. ▪ A public statement that articulates how we expect student writing to develop throughout the course of the baccalaureate degree
Promoting Student Engagement and Success		
How can we better promote student engagement and success by means of our teaching, mentoring, and advising and make the best use of our resources in order to achieve this objective?	▪ Assess student, faculty, and staff experiences and perspectives regarding advising ▪ Establish and support an all-university community of advisors and implement a professional development system for them ▪ Review and improve the use of Titan Degree Audits as a tool for facilitating graduation. ▪ Assess the extent and ways in which CSU Fullerton students engage in the academic and co-curricular aspects of the campus. ▪ Provide more accessible information about student-faculty research and scholarship by expanding the annual compendium of faculty research to include and profile student-faculty research projects	▪ Create an improved advisement system that demonstrably facilitates student success ▪ Establish a permanent working committee to review student engagement research results and recommend actions, and to monitor the impact of campus strategic initiatives to promote student engagement and success



C. Demonstrating a Feasible Plan of Work and Engagement of Key Constituencies

1. Work plan and Milestones

Our work plan has been crafted so as to make use of as much existing information and infrastructure as possible and to integrate seamlessly the actions that have been identified from our CPR and EER outcomes (Appendix 23). Actions will be guided to completion by relatively small task forces whose membership is drawn from existing groups, committees, or programs and from a limited number of newly created groups or positions (labeled as “new” in the plan below). Each task force will, in turn, collect information from its members’ own respective and additional appropriate constituencies. Continuing the campus conversation started by the WASC Steering Committee, the task forces will be expected to find and create opportunities for consultation with the campus community. To that end, chairs of all Task Forces will be responsible for campus outreach as well as for meeting regularly with the WASC Steering Committee to review their progress.

Milestones / Work Plan for CPR and EER

Campus-Wide Planning (CWP)

Action	Key Participants	Dates
An institutionalized process to identify and prioritize indicators of quality within the context of enrollment-driven funding, via Workshops and Annual Reports	CWP Task Force-1 President; Division Heads; Lead University Planner (new); Deans; Department Chairs and other Unit Heads; ASI Executive Staff; external planning consultant / facilitator (new)	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by July 15, 2009
A universal assessment of faculty and staff needed to optimize quality as a big university	CWP Task Force-2 PAB – Divisional HR Liaisons; Lead University Planner (new); College Deans; HR; Senate Executive Committee or PRBC; ASI Executive Staff; external planning consultant / facilitator (new)	Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009
- A “fit/gap analysis” of all current planning processes: where they intersect, what’s missing, and how each one relates to enrollment - A concept map of all planning processes showing how they contribute to the university strategic plan	CWP Task Force-3 President; Lead University Planner (new); UPC; PRBC and Priorities Subcommittee; Campus Facilities & Beautification Committee; Academic Programs; IR & AS (Enrollment); CFO-Budget Planning; Facilities Mgmt; ASI Executive Staff; external planning consultant / facilitator (new)	Fit/gap analysis Spring '07 through Fall '09 Completed by December 15, 2009 Concept map Fall '09 through Spring '10 Completed by May 15, 2010
- A long-term integrated university strategic plan - General consensus about and understanding of the campus strategic plan and priorities	Representatives from CWP Task Forces-1,2,3 President; PAB; Lead University Planner (new); UPC; Senate Executive Committee; ASI Executive Staff; external planning consultant /facilitator (new)	Spring '10, Fall '10, Spring '11, Fall '11 Completed by October 15, 2011

Student Learning and its Assessment (SLA & W for Writing)

Action	Key Participants	Dates
- A central database on the university website designating student learning outcomes for each degree program - An infrastructure framework to support and coordinate the work of individual units in assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes	SLA Task Force-1 Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; Academic Programs; IT WEB representative; University Assessment Committee (new); Teaching and Learning Coordinator FDC; Student Affairs representative; ASI representative	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009
An institutionalized process to identify and prioritize indicators of academic and co-curricular quality, and link them to resources	SLA Task Force-2 Vice President of Academic Affairs; Academic Programs; Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; University Assessment Committee (new); additional Senate Committee; Student Affairs representative; ASI Executive Staff; Distance Education representatives	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009



Action	Key Participants	Dates
A preliminary set of student learning goals that are held in common campus-wide	SLA Task Force-1 College Deans; Senate Curriculum and GE committees; Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; University Assessment Committee (new); ASI Executive Staff; Student Affairs representative; Distance Education representatives	Fall '09, Spring '10, Fall '10 Completed by October 15, 2010
Accessible evidence of ongoing process of assessment and improvement of student learning outcomes at the program and campus level	SLA Task Force-2 College Deans; Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; University Assessment Committee (new); Student Affairs representative; ASI Executive Staff; Distance Education representatives	Fall '09, Spring '10, Fall '10, Spring '11, Fall '11 Completed by October 15, 2011
A process involving students and faculty to - Identify shared views of effective writing within and across disciplines - Develop a set of descriptive rubrics	W Task Force-1 VP Academic Affairs, Dean of H&SS; Senate Curriculum, GE, and Graduate Education Committees, ASI Executive Staff; English Dept Composition Committee and Director of Writing Center; University Writing Board	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009
A set of campus-wide student learning goals for writing	W Task Force-2 Associate Deans of Colleges; Senate Curriculum, GE, and Graduate Education Committees; Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; ASI Executive Staff; English Department Composition Coordinator; Alumni Assn. representative	Spring '09, Fall '09, Spring '10, Fall '10 Completed by October 15, 2010
A coordinated set of faculty and student resources and programs for writing to learn, writing pedagogy, and writing assessment	W Task Force-1 Academic Programs; FDC Director and Teaching and Learning Coordinator; University Director of Writing in the Disciplines (new); University Learning Center representative; ASI Executive Staff; Writing Center representative; Library representative	Spring '10, Fall '10, Spring '11, Fall '11 Completed by October 15, 2011
A public statement that articulates how we expect student writing to develop throughout the course of the baccalaureate degree	W Task Force-1 and other representatives from work group for writing action 1; Academic Programs; University Director of Writing in the Disciplines (new); ASI Executive Staff	Fall '10, Spring '11 Completed by May 15, 2011

Promoting Student Engagement and Success (SE)

Action	Key Participants	Dates
Assess student, faculty, and staff experiences and perspectives regarding advising via a "fit/gap analysis" of advising practices across the campus.	SE Task Force 1 Admissions & Records; advisors in academic departments and colleges; advisors in advising centers; Probation Advisement Team; New Student Orientation representative; ASI Executive Staff; Alumni Assn. representative	Phase I (related to CMS student module rollout) Fall '07, Spring '08 Completed by March 15, 2008 Full analysis Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009 Re-analysis Fall '09, Spring '10 Completed by March 15, 2010
Establish and support an all-university community of advisors, and implement a professional development system for them	SE Task Force 2 Academic Programs; Assistant Deans (Colleges - Student Affairs); advisors in the Academic Advisement Center and other advising centers; Probation Advisement Team; ASI Executive Staff	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09, Fall '09 Completed by October 15, 2009
Review and improve the use of Titan Degree Audits as a tool for facilitating graduation	SE Task Force 3 Academic Programs; Admissions and Records; IT-CMS representative; ASI Executive Staff	Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009
Create an improved advisement system that demonstrably facilitates student success	Representatives from SE Task Forces 1, 2, 3 VP Academic Affairs; College Deans; Senate Executive Committee; VP Student Affairs; ASI Executive Staff	Fall '09, Spring '10, Fall '10, Spring '11, Fall '11 Completed by October 15, 2011



Action	Key participants	Dates
Assess the extent and ways of CSUF student engagement via: Review, select, administer, analyze, report, and use the full findings from the CSEQ, CSS, NSSE, or UCUES (coordinated with our VSA membership)	SE Task Force 4 VP Academic Affairs; VP Student Affairs; IR & AS; University Assessment Committee (new); Student Affairs Assessment Committee; ASI Executive Staff	Fall '07, Spring '08, Fall '08, Spring '09 Completed by May 15, 2009
Provide more accessible information about student-faculty research and scholarship by expanding the annual compendium of faculty research to include and profile student-faculty research projects	SE Task Force 5 College Deans; Office of the VPAA; Grants and Contracts; Faculty Development Center; ASI Executive Staff; Library representative	Fall '07, Spring '08, Fall '09 Completed by October 15, 2009
Establish a permanent working committee to review student engagement research results and recommend actions, and to monitor the impact of campus strategic initiatives to promote student engagement and success	Representatives from SE Task Forces 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 VP Academic Affairs; VP Student Affairs; Senate Executive Committee; Student Academic Life Committee; ASI Executive Staff	Fall '08, Spring '09, Fall '09, Spring '10, Fall '10, Spring '11 Completed by May 15, 2011

2. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

Since the 2000 reaccreditation review, our Analytical Studies Office was renamed to Institutional Research and Analytical Studies to reflect its dual role (IR university-wide coverage and AS Academic Affairs studies). The Director was promoted to Assistant Vice President to better reflect her role university-wide, and a new position was provided to hire a new Director of the office. Since these changes occurred in late 2001, the office has been viewed as “at full complement.” Annual reports filed by the Office chart the extent to which goals were met and declare goals and plans for the coming year (Appendix 24).

The rigor with which we have conducted our inquiry for this Proposal is, indeed, a reflection of the CSU Fullerton commitment to effective data gathering and analysis. Not only must adequate data be gathered, but it must be appropriate to the inquiry being conducted. To that end, in our workplan, we have already begun to make a distinction between the quantitative and qualitative data we will collect, recognizing the value of both. Our Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies serves as a significant campus data-gathering and analysis resource, providing us with extensive information about undergraduate and graduate student demographic and academic profiles, university curriculum, faculty and staff hiring and retention, and a variety of ways in which we compare to other CSU campuses (www.fullerton.edu/analyticalstudies).

Several of the actions in our workplan items will result in additional databases and information resources. The Task Force participants whom we have identified include individuals, such as the Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness, the University Assessment Committee, and the Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, who can appropriately advise us in data gathering and its assessment. In fact the Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness will be responsible for compiling and managing qualitative databases that include the results of program performance reviews and annual reports and other faculty-driven teaching and learning assessments. The newly created databases and information resources will be reviewed by members of the Task Forces within which they are created and, furthermore, by the WASC Steering Committee that oversees all of the Task Forces. Because, as has been explained, we have carefully dovetailed the CPR and EER work we will do, there will be adequate opportunities as we approach and arrive at each outcome to review the means by which information is being collected as well as its appropriateness.



3. Commitment of Resources to Support the Accrediting Review

Both the 2006-07 and 2007-08 WASC budgets were approved and funded as submitted. The multi-year scope of funding likely to be requested has already been discussed with the Vice President of Academic Affairs and the President and they have given their preliminary approval. A proposal for the 2008-09 budget is now being developed.

D. Presenting Appendices Connected to the Proposal

1. Required Data Exhibits

See Binder 2

2. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs

A list of our off-campus and Distance Education degree programs is provided in Appendix 1. A representative from Distance Education, working in conjunction with our WASC Administrative Liaison Officer and the Director of Extended Education, has completed the Self-review under the Standards as it applies to these programs (Appendix 9).

3. Institutional Stipulations

CSU Fullerton is using the review process to demonstrate its fulfillment of the two Core Commitments; it will engage in the process with seriousness and candor; the data presented are accurate and the Institutional Presentation will fairly present CSU Fullerton.

CSU Fullerton has published and made publicly available policies in force as identified by the Commission. Such policies will be available on request through the period of accreditation. Special attention will be paid to the institution policies and recordkeeping regarding complaints and appeals.

CSU Fullerton will abide by procedures adopted by the Commission to meet United States Department of Education procedural requirements.

CSU Fullerton will submit all regularly required data, and any data specifically requested by the Commission during the period of Accreditation.

CSU Fullerton has reviewed its off-campus programs and distance education degree programs to ensure that they have been approved as required by the WASC Substantive change process.