

Program Performance Review

Master of Science in Higher Education

California State University, Fullerton



Submitted Spring 2025

Reviewers (alpha order):

Dr. Natasha N. Croom - Clemson University

Dr. Jason Laker - San Jose State University

Dr. Antoinette Linton - California State University, Fullerton

Table of Contents

Review Process	3
Reviewer Bios	3
Review Charge.....	4
Review Process	4
Strengths, Challenges, Recommendations	5
Strengths	5
Challenges	5
Recommendations	6
Program Performance Review	8
I. Department/Program Mission, Goals and Environment.....	8
II. Department/Program Description and Analysis	11
III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	13
IV. Faculty.....	25
V. Student Support and Advising	26
VI. Resources and Facilities	31
VII. Long-Term Plans.....	32

Review Process

At the invitation of Dr. Lissa Stapleton Associate Professor and Program Coordinator of the MSHE program, Drs. Natasha Croom, Jason Laker, and Antoinette Linton conducted a review of the Masters of Science in Higher Education program at California State University, Fullerton.

Reviewer Bios

Dr. Natasha N. Croom (she/her) is Associate Professor of Higher Education and Student Affairs in the College of Education and Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs in the Graduate School at Clemson University. She holds a Ph.D. in Education - Higher Education Administration from Iowa State University. As a critical race feminist scholar-practitioner, she works in and with communities to create equity-centered praxis – an iterative and generative engagement with research and practice which privileges the needs of minoritized communities in higher education contexts by identifying systemic inequities and creating transformative policies, practices, and procedures. Her research emphasizes three threads: (1) Black womyn in higher education, (2) faculty advancement, and (3) equity praxis.

Dr. Jason Laker (he/him/his) is a Professor of Higher Education, Student Affairs, and Community Development; Chair of the Department of Counselor Education; and former Vice President for Student Affairs at San José State University (SJSU) in California, USA. He previously served as AVP/Dean of Student Affairs and member of the Faculty of Gender Studies at Queen's University at Kingston, Ontario, Canada, and remains highly active in international higher education. He holds a Ph.D. from the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Arizona. His current research focuses on sexual consent communication among post-secondary education students and deploying reforms to advance sexual agency to end sexual coercion and violence (see: www.consentstories.org).

Dr. Antoinette Linton (she/her) is Associate Professor and Subject Area Coordinator for Secondary Science Education at California State University, Fullerton. She specializes in science teacher preparation, epistemic practices, and the operationalization of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for 6th-12th grade students and teachers. A former high school biology and chemistry teacher, she has led initiatives that improved student achievement and contributed to the development of CSUF's secondary science preservice program. She holds an Ed.D. from the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California. Her most recent publications include, *Science Teacher Education, Epistemic Agency, and Multicultural Education*, a chapter in *Evolving Multicultural Education for Global Classrooms*; and *Developing a Mentorship Practice Through Self-Study* in the *Journal of School Leadership*.

Review Charge

The program held a “External Review Kick-Off” meeting on January 22, 2025, to discuss expectations of the review, timeline, and introduce the team to the program and some of the faculty, staff, and department/college administration. They shared the *Program Performance Review Summative Feedback Template* which included the following instructions:

[Program Performance Review \(PPR\)](#) external reviewers are encouraged to access the Program Performance Review Guidelines prior to conducting the review. The external reviewers’ report should comment on the **strengths, challenges, and recommendations** for each of the seven report sections identified in Section 6 of the guidelines (“Content Requirements and Elements of the Self-study”) and any other observations they find significant. The following template is provided to help structure the report, but the external reviewers may follow different report structures if desired.

Review Process

The following section provides an overview of the review process. Data for this report were drawn from the program’s self-study document, as well as virtual and in-person meetings with constituents (faculty and current and former students) from January 30th - February 14th. Discussion prompts were shared at the beginning of each session to help guide conversation and sharing. Participants were also invited to share in any manner that felt appropriate for them if the prompts felt too constraining.

The faculty were provided with the following prompts: Strengths (current success and productive work towards the program's mission and goals); Challenges (barriers to working towards the mission; current areas for change); Opportunities (possible avenues and possibilities to engage that would support the program’s mission and goals). The alumni were provided with the following prompt: Identify strengths and weaknesses of the Master of Science in Higher Education program. From there it was unstructured and responsive to each interviewee’s narrative.

The external team met six times to discuss the process, delegate tasks, process data, and complete the report, which was due on February 17th. The remainder of this report includes an overview of the strengths, challenges, and recommendations for the program and responses to the relevant prompts/questions provided in the Program Performance Review Summative Feedback table.

Strengths, Challenges, Recommendations

Strengths

Social Justice Focus: The program's commitment to social justice and advocacy was a significant strength. Alumni noted that these principles were intentionally woven into the curriculum, preparing them to advocate for equity and inclusion in their careers.

Diverse Perspectives: The inclusion of diverse perspectives and authors in the curriculum, as well as the hiring of new faculty with specific experience supporting Black students, was appreciated. This commitment to diversity and inclusion was seen as a positive step towards creating a more equitable educational environment.

The program offers **opportunities for networking and job placement**, with faculty and peers sharing available positions.

The cohort model promotes support and community-building, mitigating the often competitive nature of graduate programs.

Students expressed **strong appreciation for the current Program Coordinator**, highlighting her **approachability, relatability, and proactive leadership** in shaping their experiences within the MSHE program. Many noted that she brings a **fresh perspective**, is deeply invested in student success, and actively works to **improve the program**. They also acknowledge that **too much of the program's improvement efforts fall solely on her**.

Challenges

Staffing Challenges: The program faced staffing issues due to retirements and departures, which could impact the advising load on remaining faculty and the overall student experience. Ensuring adequate support for students during these transitions was a concern.

Students noted that the program is marketed as **"for the working professional,"** yet they often struggle to balance coursework, fieldwork, and employment. Alumni noted challenges in balancing the program's demands with full-time work and personal responsibilities. The requirement to complete fieldwork and lead projects like the Maywood Education Fair while managing other commitments was seen as overwhelming.

Financial Burden: The requirement to attend professional conferences, while beneficial, was seen as a financial burden for some students. Alumni suggested that the program could explore ways to make these opportunities more accessible, such as fundraising or providing

financial support. There is a lack of financial support for student-led initiatives, such as the Higher Education Leadership Organization (HELO), which is expected to fundraise for program-wide events like graduation.

Students feel that **opportunities for professional development and job placement** could be **better structured and formalized**.

Response Rates for Assessments: The program faced issues with low response rates on exit surveys, which are crucial for assessing student learning and program effectiveness. This could impact the program's ability to get a clear picture of student experiences and areas for improvement.

Recommendations

Curriculum

- Consider **increasing the degree to 36 units**, which is still a relatively small total compared to peer programs but provides more space for updating curricula to include emerging issues and more thorough coverage of key issues such as courses and fieldwork relating to **mental health and helping skills, organizational and political contexts of student affairs** within a campus and higher education more generally.
- **Retrospectively evaluate** the recently discontinued **Maywood Project** with a view toward ensuring its successor program aligns with program goals and is designed with accessibility (i.e., planning and execution process, workload demands on leaders and participants, inclusive and accessible location, etc.) for both graduate students and those who will be served by the program.
- Enhance **research preparation** by integrating **third-wave student development theories** more thoroughly into coursework.
- Consider alternatives to the compressed summer format to better accommodate working students.

Faculty

- Increasing **faculty collaboration** and administrative support in leading and executing program changes so the Program Coordinator is not solely responsible for making improvements.

Assessment

- **Increase practice-based assessments**, such as case studies, simulations, and program development projects.

- Ensure earlier exposure to research methodologies and **align assessments with student progression**.
- **Reevaluate the comprehensive exam format** to include practical application components.
- **Improve communication on how survey results impact program changes** to encourage student participation.

Structural Support

- Provide **funding or institutional support** for HELO to alleviate financial burdens on students. Related, consider **structural changes to conference requirements**, such as funding support or alternative professional development options. Expand **financial transparency** for required program components, ensuring students are fully informed about costs **before enrolling**.
- Offer **more structured job placement opportunities** through formalized partnerships with campus departments.
- Program leaders and faculty are encouraged to **increase engagement with alumni, particularly those representing communities of priority**. Such engagement can provide alumni and current students alike with a sense of community, professional networking opportunities, and a platform to share their experiences and insights. Develop an active and sustainable approach to Alumni engagement and record keeping regarding their participation in program activities, student mentoring, advancement and development goals, and networking opportunities.
- Consider **adding short and long-term goals related to marketing and branding** of the program to align with any substantive changes to the program. This includes, social media campaigns, website updates, and any other opportunities to market the program widely.

Program Performance Review

I. Department/Program Mission, Goals and Environment

The mission of California State University, Fullerton is as follows: “Cal State Fullerton transforms lives through innovative and quality education, research, and creative activities. We inspire all members of the Titan community to engage in their lifelong pursuit of critical inquiry and social justice; to become catalysts for equity and inclusivity; and to advance the intellectual, cultural, and economic growth of Orange County and beyond” (California State University, Fullerton, About the University, nd.).

- A. Briefly describe the mission and goals of the unit and identify any changes since the last program review. Review the goals in relation to the University mission, goals, and strategies.

According to the self-study, the mission of the Department of Educational Leadership is: “We help leaders disrupt and transform educational systems so that all students, particularly those who have been marginalized in schools and society, can engage fully in the benefits of education.” The mission of the Master of Science in Higher Education (MSHE) concentration is “to prepare entry-level professionals to assume roles that support student learning and development as well as institutional agents and programs in the holistic development of all students.”

Data from the self-study and interviews all demonstrated the program’s alignment with the institutional mission of “...critical inquiry and social justice; catalysts for equity and inclusivity.” The program faculty are diverse and critical scholars who recruit, educate, learn from, and graduate diverse cohorts of students. Faculty implement myriad ways to connect real world inequities for their students to grapple with through coursework, community engagement project, and their comprehensive final exam.

- B. Briefly describe changes and trends in the discipline and the response of the unit to such changes. Identify the external factors that impact the program (e.g., community/regional needs, placement, and graduate/professional school).

Three trends in the field include a surge in mental health needs, attrition in the field, and the yo-yo of social justice ideology and practice.

Since the start of the global health pandemic, campuses have been faced with more students (and faculty and staff) in mental health crisis. Unfortunately, many

campuses services have not kept pace with the need for increased mental health professionals. While student affairs has roots in counseling, many programs have aligned themselves, over time, with either a counseling focus and/or an administrative/services focus. While the review team is not familiar with the campus resources in this area, it does not appear that the program includes a course on helping skills – which many programs adopted over the last 5 years to address the need for student affairs educators who could provide some level of intervention until students could receive more appropriate mental health services.

Seemingly another trend/issue in the field, paralleled with and exacerbated by the global health crisis, is a higher attrition rate for early and mid-career student affairs educators. Many practitioners are leaving the field for better paying jobs and organizations that better align more consistently with their values. Attrition is a huge issue, as most successful preparation programs rely heavily on alumni to promote the program and send possible undergraduates and working professionals their direction. Faculty in this program seem to be aware of this connection, as they have already begun to foster more substantive relationships with alumni in the last two years.

The third trend worth illumination is the yo-yo of social justice and the broader socio-political and socio-cultural landscapes of higher education. Many student affairs preparation programs espouse values rooted in diversity, equity, and inclusion and use valuable program resources (coursework, internships, etc.) to elucidate how practice can be influenced by these ideas. Due to, however, the fluctuation of these values in larger campus cultures (and beyond), it is at times perceived that the efforts of programs are misplaced, leading to perceptions that preparation programs are somehow less focused on teaching students how the university works (structurally and politically). This notion was evident in discussion with some of the program's constituents. The larger implication of this yo-yo is attrition, as well as potential unproductive relationships between academic programs and divisions of student affairs. Graduates leave programs with the hopes of doing justice informed work and are met with the realities of the values and practices of universities which cause them to consider leaving the field altogether. Meanwhile, divisions of student affairs distance themselves from the very programs that provide graduate assistants (i.e., labor to their units), which leads to discontent and loosely coupled relationships that serve no one. Fortunately, this program balances a social justice curriculum with an administrative one.

- C. Identify the unit's priorities for the next three (short term) and seven years (long term).

The program's short and long-term goals are appropriate. One goal that the program may want to consider is revising their program's branding and marketing campaigns (website, outreach, social media, etc.).

The program's self-study materials included the following short-term and long-term goals:

The short-term priorities for MSHE are:

Increase the enrollment of and support for Black and African American students.

The program faculty make a valid argument for focusing their energies on this population given the historical and contemporary contexts. Additionally, it may be worth considering how current Asian diaspora communities are being supported by the program – given the program seems to draw these communities, it may be important to place some emphasis here to combat any complicity in maintaining the model minority myth.

Create support structures so the coordination of MSHE is manageable. This is also an appropriate goal given the number of students being admitted and the number of faculty who are managing/directing the program. For a program of this size there should be at least 3 more full-time faculty (a mix of clinical/tenure-track).

Develop consistent research opportunities for students. This goal may support the long-term research goals of faculty by way of supporting the productivity of the research faculty. The program may also want to consider shifting program outcomes to include discussion of research outcomes so that outcomes align with goals.

Correct course descriptions for courses shared with MSEDAD program. This is necessary!

Reestablish a community-engagement activities for EDAD 505b. Thorough assessment is needed to do this well. Most of the faculty interviewed seemed indifferent about the establishment of a new activity, with at least one stating a need for clarity about how it prepares students for the work of the field. Students discussed the amount of labor as a challenge.

Investigate fieldwork opportunities so they can be in compliance with the UPS requirements. Given the compliance requirements, this is necessary!

The long-term priorities for MSHE are:

Establish a strong alumni network to include annual alumni gathering. This is imperative to maintaining a steady influx of prospective students and creating additional internship opportunities.

Conduct a curriculum audit to (a) ensure diversity of authors of course resources, (b) address corporatization of higher education, and (c) update theory to include theory inclusive of LGBTQ students, campus culture, sense of belonging, and the role of racism and prejudice on the student experience. This is a great goal, as it will also allow the program to review content gaps in the current curriculum.

Investigate and establish a global engagement opportunity. This may be a great opportunity to distinguish this program between others in the area, state, or beyond.

- D. If there are programs offered in a Special Session self-support mode, describe how these programs are included in the mission, goals and priorities of the department/program (e.g., new student groups regionally, nationally, internationally, new delivery modes, etc.).

N/A

II. Department/Program Description and Analysis

- A. Identify substantial curricular changes in existing programs and new programs (degrees, majors, minors) developed since the last program review. Have any programs been discontinued?

N/A

- B. Describe the structure of the degree program (e.g., identify required courses, how many units of electives, expected modalities of courses in the program) and identify the logic underlying the organization of the requirements and alignment of the requirements with the department resources. In particular, please discuss how the curriculum and/or programming reflects the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) or future revisions the program plans to make to address DEI in the curriculum. *Please make connections to the College of Education's focus on JEIE. These connections can occur in section I and/or II.

The current program curricular requirements include 30 units comprising 24 units of coursework and six units of fieldwork, offered via a cohort model. Masters degree programs in the field of student affairs vary in title (e.g., College Student Personnel

Administration, Higher Education Administration, Student Affairs in Higher Education, College Counseling, etc.) and typically require between 30-60 units, placing CSUF among those with the fewest requirements. While this configuration thus affords greater access and lower cost by virtue of a smaller total course requirement, it also limits the available curricular “real estate” for content and experiential learning opportunities.

The program's commitment to social justice and advocacy was a significant strength. Current students and Alumni noted that these principles were intentionally woven into the curriculum, preparing them to advocate for equity and inclusion in their careers. Alumni highlighted the approachability and supportiveness of the faculty. Faculty members were seen as credible, well-prepared, and genuinely invested in students' success. They provided practical advice, mock interviews, and were responsive to students' needs.

The inclusion of diverse perspectives and authors in the curriculum, as well as the hiring of new faculty with specific experience supporting Black students, was appreciated by current students and Alumni. This commitment to diversity and inclusion was seen as a positive step towards creating a more equitable educational environment.

The program requires students to participate in professional conferences, which is a strength for learning while simultaneously a financial challenge for students.

- C. Using data provided by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning to discuss student demand for the unit's offerings. Discuss topics such as over/under enrollment (applications, admissions, and enrollments), retention, graduation rates for majors (FTF and transfer), and time to degree. Address equity gaps in retention and graduation rates (see instructions, Appendices A and B).

N/A

- D. Describe any plans for curricular changes in the short (three-year) and long (seven-year) term, such as expansions, contractions, or discontinuances. Relate these plans to the priorities described above in section I. C (unit's future priorities).

The Maywood Program was transferred to another CSU campus closer to the constituent neighborhood. The program faculty are in the process of identifying an alternative and are encouraged to review findings and recommendations of this external evaluation to inform that project.

- E. Include information on any Special Sessions self-support programs the department/program offers.

N/A

III. Documentation of Student Academic Achievement and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

- A. Describe the department/program assessment plan (e.g., general approach, timetable, etc.) and structure (e.g., committee, coordinator, etc.), and if applicable, how the plan and/or structure have changed since the last PPR.

The assessment framework includes multiple key stakeholders. The Director of Accreditation and Assessment, Dr. Rohanna Ylagan-Nicanor, and Research and Data Analyst, Grace Nguyen, provide institutional data support to guide program evaluation. The Department Chair and Program Coordinator oversee the collection of assessment data and generate annual reports, which are submitted to the university's Assessment Management System (AMS) by November 15th each year. Since the last Program Performance Review (PPR), the program has also established a standing department-level Assessment Committee to enhance internal oversight and further strengthen assessment processes.

Student Perspectives on Assessment. As part of the program's commitment to continuous improvement, a focus group was conducted with current students to gather direct feedback on the effectiveness of assessment practices. Students shared both positive reflections on how assessments reinforce learning and constructive criticisms regarding gaps in how assessments align with real-world student affairs practice.

Effectiveness of Assessments in Measuring Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). One of the strengths identified by students was the comprehensive exam, which allows them to integrate and apply theoretical concepts. As one student stated, "*The comprehensive exam process helped me synthesize everything I learned in the program. It made me reflect on how to apply student development theories in real scenarios.*" This indicates that the exam effectively encourages students to connect theory with practice, reinforcing core learning objectives.

However, students also noted that some assessments do not fully reflect the applied nature of student affairs work. Many courses emphasize academic writing and theoretical analysis, but students felt that assessments should be better aligned with

the practical skills required for their careers. One student explained, *"A lot of what we've been assessed on doesn't fully translate to practice. It would be helpful if assessments were more aligned with what we'll actually be doing in the field."* These concerns suggest that while theoretical knowledge is well-developed, the program could benefit from integrating more practice-based assessments, such as case studies, simulations, and program development projects.

Research Preparation and Course Alignment. Students also expressed concerns about the alignment between course sequencing and research expectations. Several students felt underprepared for research projects, particularly when they were expected to apply third-wave student development theories that had not been introduced in prior coursework. As one student explained, *"Our theory class last spring only focused on first- and second-wave theories, so when we were expected to use third-wave theories in our research, it felt like we hadn't been fully prepared for it."* Another student noted, *"It would've been helpful to have more exposure to research methodologies earlier, rather than having to learn it on our own when we got to the research projects."*

The program has already taken steps to address this concern by adjusting the course sequence so that students take EDAD 522 (College Student Characteristics) and EDAD 524 (Diversity, Access, and Equity) earlier in the program. This change ensures that students have more time to process and apply complex theoretical frameworks before engaging in research-heavy assignments. However, continued refinement of research preparation is needed to ensure that students feel fully equipped to engage in independent research projects.

The Need for More Applied and Competency-Based Assessments. Another key theme from the focus group was the disconnect between theoretical coursework and professional competencies needed for student affairs roles. Students emphasized the importance of assessments that reflect real-world student affairs responsibilities, such as relationship-building, program development, and advocacy. As one student described, *"We're assessed on a lot of academic writing and analysis, but student affairs jobs are about relationship-building, program development, and advocacy. I wish more assessments reflected those aspects of our work."* Another added, *"I appreciate the theoretical foundation, but I wish more of our assessments focused on applied skills. We spend a lot of time writing papers and analyzing concepts, but when it comes to real-world situations—like navigating institutional politics or working with diverse student populations—it feels like we're figuring it out on our own rather than building on structured, practice-based assessments."*

To better align with professional competencies, the program should explore incorporating more experiential learning assessments, such as practical case studies, project-based assignments, and hands-on simulations. These types of assessments would provide students with the opportunity to apply theoretical knowledge in a structured and meaningful way, helping them develop the skills they need in their future roles.

Low Response Rates on Indirect Assessments. The MSHE program also relies on exit surveys and alumni feedback as indirect assessment measures. However, student participation in these assessments has remained low, limiting the program's ability to use this data effectively. Some students indicated that they were not aware of how survey responses contribute to program changes, leading to lower engagement. One student remarked, *"I don't think we ever talked about how the exit surveys are used or why they matter. Maybe if we saw actual changes being made from them, more people would respond."*

To address this, the program should increase transparency around how survey results impact programmatic decisions. Providing students with clear examples of changes made based on past feedback may encourage higher participation rates and improve the quality of data collected for assessment purposes.

- B. For each degree program, provide the student learning outcomes (SLOs); describe the methods, direct or indirect, used to measure student learning; and summarize the assessment results of the SLOs.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Measurement Methods

Student Learning Domain	Measurement Methods
Leadership – Application of leadership and organizational theories in student affairs	Case study analysis, practicum, fieldwork experiences
Social Justice & Advocacy – Development of inclusive programs supporting marginalized students	Embedded assignments, program evaluations
Education – Understanding of historical, philosophical, and theoretical foundations of student affairs	Course exams, final research projects
Assessment & Evaluation – Ability to design and implement assessments and evaluations in higher ed	Direct research assessments, fieldwork evaluations
Personal & Professional Development – Development of professional identity through reflection and mentorship	Exit surveys, alumni feedback, faculty evaluations

The assessment structure includes:

- Direct Measures:
 - Embedded assignments in EDAD 524 where students conduct structured interviews on educational equity and institutional responses.
 - Comprehensive Exams evaluating students' ability to integrate knowledge across multiple learning domains.
 - Research projects in EDAD 510 requiring program evaluations or needs assessments of real student affairs offices.
- Indirect Measures:
 - Exit Surveys for graduating students assessing competency in each learning outcome.
 - Alumni Surveys tracking professional placement and perceptions of program preparedness.

Student Perceptions of Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods. Student feedback from the focus group provided valuable insights into the effectiveness of Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessments, highlighting both strengths and areas for improvement. One of the key strengths identified by students was the comprehensive exam, which many found to be a meaningful tool for synthesizing their learning. As one student noted, *"The comprehensive exam process helped me synthesize everything I learned in the program. It made me reflect on how to apply student development theories in real scenarios."* This reflection suggests that the exam

successfully challenges students to integrate theoretical knowledge and apply it to professional contexts.

However, students also raised concerns about the extent to which assessments measure applied learning. Several expressed that while coursework emphasizes theoretical discussions and analysis, assessments do not always align with real-world student affairs practice. One student remarked, *"A lot of what we've been assessed on doesn't fully translate to practice. It would be helpful if assessments were more aligned with what we'll actually be doing in the field."* This feedback indicates a need for more experiential and practice-based assessments, such as case studies, simulations, or program development projects.

Another challenge that emerged was the lack of structured preparation for research projects, particularly in relation to the introduction of third-wave student development theories. One student shared, *"We were expected to use third-wave student development theories in our research, but we hadn't been fully prepared for them. More structured exposure earlier would have helped."* This suggests that earlier integration of advanced research methodologies and theoretical frameworks into coursework could better equip students for their culminating research assignments.

Additionally, students pointed to a disconnect between theoretical coursework and professional competencies needed for student affairs roles. While they acknowledged the importance of theoretical foundations, some expressed frustration that assessments focus heavily on academic writing rather than practical skills. One student explained, *"We're assessed on a lot of academic writing and analysis, but student affairs jobs are about relationship-building, program development, and advocacy. I wish more assessments reflected those aspects of our work."* This feedback suggests a need to balance theoretical rigor with competency-based assessments that mirror professional expectations.

Finally, students highlighted concerns about the low response rates on indirect assessments, such as exit and alumni surveys. Many felt that they were not adequately informed about how these surveys contribute to program improvements. One student admitted, *"I don't think we ever talked about how the exit surveys are used or why they matter. Maybe if we saw actual changes being made from them, more people would respond."* This suggests an opportunity for the program to increase transparency about how survey results inform curriculum and programmatic decisions, which could, in turn, encourage greater participation in these assessments.

Overall, while the MSHE program's assessment plan provides a strong foundation for evaluating student learning, focus group feedback highlights opportunities to refine assessments to better align with professional competencies, enhance research preparation, and improve student engagement with indirect assessment measures.

Summary of Assessment Results and Adjustments. Recent assessment data highlights strong student competency, but also underscores areas for improvement, particularly in research preparation, applied assessments, and survey participation rates.

- Direct Assessments:
 - Overall, students met or exceeded expectations, with an average score of 95.4% across all direct assessment components.
 - The comprehensive exam pass rate is 93%, with students demonstrating strong theoretical understanding, but some concerns about the limited applied focus.
 - Indirect Assessments:
 - Exit surveys indicated high confidence in leadership, advocacy, and professional development, but lower scores in assessment & evaluation skills.
 - Alumni feedback suggests that graduates feel prepared for student affairs roles, but some assessments could better reflect job competencies.
- C. Describe whether and how assessment results have been used to improve teaching and learning practices, inform faculty professional development, and/or overall departmental effectiveness. Please cite specific examples.

Assessment results from student evaluations, faculty feedback, and external reviews have directly informed changes to teaching practices, faculty development, and overall program effectiveness. The MSHE program has actively used these results to refine curriculum sequencing, strengthen student support structures, and improve faculty coordination to ensure alignment between coursework and real-world student affairs practice.

Curriculum Adjustments Based on Assessment Data. One of the most significant applications of assessment findings was the restructuring of course sequencing based on student feedback regarding workload distribution and research preparation. Beginning in Fall 2024, EDAD 522 (College Students' Characteristics and Cultures) and EDAD 524 (Diversity, Access, and Equity) were moved to the spring semester, allowing students more time to process these foundational theories in a 16-week format instead of an accelerated 8-week course. Additionally, EDAD

523 (Student Learning and Development) and the first EDAD 568 (Higher Ed Fieldwork) course were shifted to the summer, with the summer term being extended from 8 to 10 weeks and fieldwork hours reduced from 150 to 100. These changes were implemented in response to students' concerns about managing intensive coursework while completing fieldwork hours. *"We were expected to use third-wave student development theories in our research, but we hadn't been fully prepared for them. More structured exposure earlier would have helped."* The curriculum shift ensures that students receive adequate preparation before engaging in high-level research projects, reducing the disconnect between theoretical instruction and applied learning assessments.

Enhancing Applied Learning Assessments. Student feedback indicated that while the program effectively teaches theoretical frameworks, assessments did not always align with practical skills needed in student affairs roles. Several students expressed a need for more experiential assessments that mirror professional responsibilities.

"We're assessed on a lot of academic writing and analysis, but student affairs jobs are about relationship-building, program development, and advocacy. I wish more assessments reflected those aspects of our work."

In response, faculty are exploring alternative assessment formats, such as case study-based evaluations, fieldwork-driven projects, and competency-based rubrics that measure both conceptual understanding and professional skill application. Additionally, the comprehensive exam format is being reevaluated to ensure that it incorporates practical components, such as co-curricular learning reflections.

Improvements in Faculty Development and Coordination. Faculty development has also been influenced by assessment results, particularly regarding communication and curriculum alignment. Adjunct faculty reported that they were often unaware of programmatic changes, which impacted their ability to effectively mentor students. *"I have heard more from the program in the last few months under Lissa's leadership. This is the first semester I've been invited to review a course and give feedback on restructuring."* To address this, the program has implemented structured faculty meetings to discuss curriculum updates and student feedback, ensuring greater coherence between courses. These meetings also allow for cross-course coordination, preventing unnecessary content repetition and improving alignment with Student Outcomes.

Addressing Student Workload and Fieldwork Barriers. Assessment findings revealed that students, particularly those working full-time, struggled to balance fieldwork

requirements with employment and coursework expectations. *"It was just too much for us to do 200 hours of fieldwork each semester while working full-time. It felt impossible."*

To mitigate this challenge, the program reduced the total number of required fieldwork hours to 250, redistributing hours across multiple semesters while preserving the integrity of experiential learning components.

Strengthening Student Engagement with Indirect Assessments. Indirect assessments, such as exit surveys and alumni feedback, have been underutilized due to low response rates. Students expressed that they were unaware of how their survey responses contributed to program changes. *"I don't think we ever talked about how the surveys are used or why they matter. Maybe if we saw actual changes being made from them, more people would respond."* To improve engagement, the program is implementing a transparency initiative that provides students with annual assessment reports detailing how feedback has been used to shape curriculum and policies. Additionally, faculty will communicate the importance of survey participation during orientation and advising sessions.

- D. Describe other quality indicators identified by the department/program as evidence of student learning and effectiveness/success other than student learning outcomes (e.g., number of students attending graduate or professional school, job placement rates, community engagement/leadership).

Beyond direct assessments of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), the MSHE program evaluates student success, career readiness, and community impact through several key indicators. These include job placement rates, graduate school attendance, community engagement initiatives, professional conference participation, and research contributions. These measures provide a holistic view of student development and help assess the program's long-term impact on student affairs professionals.

Job Placement and Career Advancement. MSHE graduates secure a variety of leadership roles in higher education, with many pursuing careers in student affairs administration, academic advising, and institutional leadership. The program's strong emphasis on fieldwork and professional development has directly contributed to high employment rates and career mobility. Notable alumni include:

- Matthew Smith, Ph.D. – Associate Vice President of Student Life and Dean of Students

- Danielle Garcia – Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff, California State University
- Dr. Alisia Kirkwood, Ed.D. – Associate Vice President, Pacific Coast Campus, Long Beach City College

Students also benefit from mentorship and networking opportunities with alumni, which facilitate job placements and internship connections. One student described the collaborative nature of the program, stating: *"We share a lot of resources, and I've never felt a sense of competitiveness in this program. It's about supporting each other, not gatekeeping."* To further enhance job placement support, the EDAD 568 (Fieldwork) course has been updated to include expanded career preparation modules, covering resume development, networking, and interview skills.

Graduate and Doctoral Program Enrollment. A significant number of MSHE graduates continue their academic journey by enrolling in doctoral programs in higher education leadership, policy, and administration. The program's emphasis on research competency and professional scholarship prepares students for advanced study and faculty members actively mentor students on doctoral program applications. As a result, many graduates have successfully enrolled in Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs across the country.

Community Engagement and Leadership Development. For over 15 years, the Maywood Education Fair has served as a signature service-learning project, providing MSHE students with hands-on experience in community outreach, scholarship fundraising, and educational advocacy. Each year, students collaborate with local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and educators to promote college access for historically underserved communities. In 2024, students raised \$43,000 in scholarships, marking a record-breaking year for the initiative. The fair fosters leadership, event planning, and advocacy skills, helping students develop competencies aligned with student affairs roles focused on equity and access.

Due to evolving institutional priorities, responsibility for the Maywood Fair will transition to California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA). As a result, MSHE will develop a new community engagement initiative in Orange County, ensuring that service learning remains a core component of the program.

Professional Conference Participation. The MSHE program requires students to attend at least two professional conferences, such as NASPA (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) and ACPA (American College Personnel Association). While students recognize the value of networking and professional

development, financial constraints remain a challenge. *"Attending two national conferences is a huge financial burden. If it's mandatory, there should be built-in funding support or alternative options."* To address financial accessibility, the program is exploring alternative funding models, such as alumni-sponsored travel grants. Additionally, the conference requirement has been expanded to include regional and virtual conferences, making participation more accessible for working students.

Research and Scholarly Contributions. The MSHE program has increased its emphasis on research, leading to greater student participation in academic conferences and publication efforts. In Spring 2024, students in EDAD 510 (Educational Research) conducted a qualitative Photovoice study examining Black student experiences at CSUF. This project provided students with hands-on experience in data collection, analysis, and public scholarship and included:

- A campus-wide research dialogue with over 80 attendees
- A library exhibit showcasing research findings
- A national conference presentation at NASPA
- A collaborative research paper in development

These initiatives align with the program's long-term goal of expanding research opportunities and ensuring that students engage in meaningful scholarly contributions.

- E. Many departments/programs offer courses and programs via technology (e.g., online) or at off-campus sites and in compressed schedules. How are these courses identified, and how is student learning assessed in these formats/modalities?

The Master of Science in Higher Education (MSHE) program is primarily a face-to-face program, but it strategically incorporates hybrid courses, asynchronous learning components, compressed summer sessions, and co-curricular professional development opportunities to enhance accessibility and accommodate the needs of working students. While the program does not currently offer fully online or off-campus degree pathways, it has integrated flexible learning modalities that allow students to engage in fieldwork, research, and professional networking beyond the traditional classroom setting. These adaptations have been continuously refined based on student feedback and assessment data to ensure optimal learning experiences.

Hybrid and Asynchronous Learning. One of the key ways the program incorporates alternative learning modalities is through the EDAD 568 (Fieldwork) course, which follows a hybrid structure. In this format, students meet in person every other week, while completing asynchronous coursework on the alternating weeks. This blended learning approach allows students to integrate theoretical coursework with hands-on professional experiences, while also providing flexibility for those who work full-time.

Student learning in hybrid courses is assessed through:

- Weekly reflections and discussion posts where students analyze their fieldwork experiences in relation to course concepts.
- Supervisor evaluations from fieldwork site mentors, providing direct feedback on students' professional growth.
- Applied learning projects that require students to demonstrate competencies in student affairs practice, leadership, and advocacy.

This hybrid format has been particularly beneficial for students balancing work, academic coursework, and professional development. Program faculty continue to monitor and adjust the structure based on ongoing assessment data and student feedback.

Compressed Summer Sessions. To support student learning progression and ensure program completion within five semesters, the MSHE program offers two summer courses in an accelerated format:

- EDAD 523 (Student Learning and Development)
- EDAD 568 (Higher Ed Fieldwork)

Initially, summer courses were structured in an eight-week format, but student feedback indicated that the workload was difficult to manage. In response, the program extended the summer session to ten weeks, providing students with more time to engage deeply with course material while balancing professional obligations. Additionally, fieldwork hours were reduced from 150 to 100 to further alleviate workload concerns.

To ensure that learning objectives remain rigorous despite the compressed format, courses are assessed through:

- Frequent, shorter assignments to maintain engagement and accountability.

- Case study analyses and applied learning projects, helping students connect theory to practice.
- Final research projects that assess students' ability to synthesize and apply course concepts.

Students have reported that the extended summer schedule and adjusted fieldwork hours have made a significant difference in their ability to manage coursework, while still maintaining the high academic standards of the program. One student noted, *"The summer semester was even harder than my undergrad quarter system. Alternative pacing would help."* This feedback reinforced the need for continued evaluation of course pacing and assessment strategies in compressed formats.

Professional Development and Co-Curricular Learning. The MSHE program requires students to engage in professional development activities, such as attending at least two professional conferences, including NASPA (Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education) and ACPA (American College Personnel Association). These experiences provide valuable networking opportunities and exposure to emerging trends in student affairs. However, financial constraints have been a barrier for some students, as conference travel and registration costs can be significant. One student shared, *"Attending two national conferences is a huge financial burden. If it's mandatory, there should be built-in funding support or alternative options."* In response, the program has expanded the definition of conference participation to include regional and virtual conferences, allowing students to engage in professional development at a lower cost. Additionally, the program is exploring alumni-sponsored travel grants to provide financial support for students attending national conferences.

Assessment of Student Learning in Alternative Modalities. Across hybrid, compressed, and co-curricular learning experiences, student learning is assessed through multiple direct and indirect measures, ensuring alignment with the program's Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).

Assessment methods include:

- Embedded assignments that require students to apply theories to real-world student affairs scenarios.
- Supervisor feedback and evaluations for fieldwork-based courses.
- Reflection papers, case studies, and portfolio submissions demonstrating mastery of key competencies.
- Exit surveys and alumni feedback to assess perceived preparedness for student affairs roles.

Despite these structured assessments, low response rates on indirect assessments, such as exit surveys, have posed a challenge in fully capturing long-term student learning outcomes. Some students indicated that they were not aware of how their feedback contributes to program improvements, with one student commenting, *"I don't think we ever talked about how the surveys are used or why they matter. Maybe if we saw actual changes being made from them, more people would respond."* To address this, the program is implementing a transparency initiative that will provide students with annual reports detailing how assessment data has informed curriculum changes, policy updates, and student support services.

IV. Faculty

- A. Describe changes since the last program review in the full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) allocated to the department or program. Include information on tenured and tenure track faculty lines (e.g., new hires, retirements, FERP's, resignations) and how these changes may have affected the program's or department's academic offerings and the department's long-term goals. Describe tenure density in the program/department and the distribution among academic rank (assistant, associate, professor) [see instructions, Appendix C]. Attach faculty vitae (see Appendix D).

There are currently three full-time faculty dedicated to the MSHE program. All three faculty are research-active (although to varying degrees – as they are all at different points of their careers), tenured faculty. While three faculty were hired two years prior, recent retirements essentially put the team back in a deficit for the program's size. Albeit, in the hiring of new faculty members, the percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty increased (%wise), the advising load is unsustainable. While the program has attempted to address the advising imbalance (i.e., staff member advising, group advising, etc.), these are band-aids, in a field that needs both group and one-to-one advising by faculty (for academic and career development).

- B. Describe priorities for faculty positions. Explain how these priorities and future hiring plans relate to relevant changes in the discipline; student enrollment and demographics; the career objectives of students; the planning of the University; and regional, national, or global developments.

It is unclear whether there is a plan to hire new faculty or simply a desire to do so. If requests haven't been made to the Dean to add more faculty, it should happen soon

as the current faculty need this information as they seek to make substantive curricular and co-curricular changes to the program.

- C. Describe the role of tenure line faculty, lecturers, and graduate/student assistants in the program/department's curriculum and academic offerings. Indicate the number and percentage of courses taught by part-time faculty teaching assistants. Identify any parts of the curriculum that are solely or primarily the responsibility of part-time faculty or teaching assistants.

Informed changes have been made to who teaches in which terms. In speaking with some part-time faculty, they indicated often part-time faculty are invited to teach courses at the last minute. They also noted, that in the last couple of years under the leadership of Dr. Lissa Stapleton, there has been better communication with them, and she has invited them to the table for input on curricular changes – where previously, they were informed of changes they were required to make to their classes. This shift in philosophy (i.e., all faculty should have an opportunity to take part in this effort) is important for community building across the faculty and ensuring that folks' voices are heard and respected as colleagues. Additionally, the part-time faculty who are full-time administrators, noted a concern that the program may not be preparing students for the current and on-going dynamics of the field and political realities of higher education writ large. Suggestions regarding adding courses like helping skills and writing seminars to support their academic development were suggested.

- D. Include information on instructor participation in Special Sessions self-support programs offered by the department/program.

N/A

V. Student Support and Advising

- A. Briefly describe how the department advises its majors, minors, and graduate students and the effectiveness of this advising structure. Describe the support from outside the department that is necessary for students to receive additional information that they need.

The Master of Science in Higher Education (MSHE) program provides a comprehensive advising structure designed to support students throughout their academic journey. The advising model incorporates multiple layers of support,

including faculty advisors, department advisors, structured orientation programs, and online resources. This multi-tiered approach ensures that students receive academic, professional, and logistical guidance, helping them navigate coursework, fieldwork requirements, and career development opportunities.

Faculty Advising and Departmental Support. Upon matriculation into the program, each student is assigned a faculty advisor, who serves as a primary point of contact for academic and professional guidance. Faculty advisors meet with students at least once per semester and provide support in course selection, research projects, and career planning. Additionally, faculty members often assist students in preparing for doctoral applications, identifying fieldwork opportunities, and connecting with professional networks.

Alongside faculty advising, the Student Affairs Advisor for the Department of Educational Leadership provides general advising support related to course registration, university policies, and graduation requirements. This dual-layered system ensures that students have access to both academic mentorship from faculty and institutional support from administrative advisors. To facilitate ongoing communication and resource access, the program maintains an MSHE Community Page on Canvas, where students can find:

- Program policies and requirements, including information on fieldwork, conference participation, and the comprehensive exam.
- Writing guides and academic resources, covering APA formatting, research strategies, and Microsoft Word tools.
- Handouts and presentations from orientations, retreats, and workshops.
- Information about the Higher Education Leadership Organization (HELO), a student-led professional development and networking group.

Structured Orientation and Community Building. Newly admitted students participate in a mandatory, day-long orientation that introduces them to the MSHE program's structure, expectations, and available resources. This orientation is designed to foster a sense of belonging while preparing students for the academic and professional demands of the program. Additionally, the program hosts an annual retreat, providing further opportunities for students to engage with faculty, network with peers, and develop their professional identities.

Faculty also engage in proactive and intrusive advising practices to monitor student progress. Weekly department meetings include discussions about student academic

performance and professional development, allowing faculty to intervene when students require additional support.

Advising Effectiveness and Student Perspectives. The advising structure has been positively received by students, particularly in comparison to advising models in other graduate programs. One student remarked, "*Faculty are always available and willing to help. I've heard from friends in other programs that they don't get this kind of support. It makes a big difference knowing that faculty here care about our success.*" Despite these strengths, some students expressed a need for more proactive advising regarding programmatic requirements, such as fieldwork and conference attendance. Several students indicated confusion about the financial expectations associated with professional development and suggested clearer communication about funding options. One student noted, "*We were told during orientation that attending two national conferences was mandatory, but it wasn't clear that we had to fund them ourselves. A clearer advising guide would help.*" In response, the program is working to enhance transparency in advising communication, particularly regarding financial support for professional development. Efforts are also underway to expand career advising resources, including formalized job placement pipelines and structured alumni mentorship opportunities.

External Support and Cross-Departmental Collaboration. While the MSHE program provides robust internal advising, students also rely on external campus resources to navigate their academic and professional journeys. The Pollak Library's Education Librarian offers dedicated research support, guiding students in literature reviews, citation management, and scholarly research strategies. The Center for Research on Educational Access and Leadership (C-REAL) provides graduate assistantship opportunities that allow students to engage in institutional research and program evaluation projects. Additionally, the program collaborates with CSUF's Career Center to offer resume workshops, job search strategies, and interview preparation sessions tailored to student affairs professionals. However, student feedback suggests that further integration of career services within the MSHE advising model could enhance post-graduate career outcomes.

- B. Describe opportunities for students to participate in departmental honors programs, undergraduate or graduate research, collaborative research with faculty, service learning, internships, etc. How are these opportunities made available and accessible to students? List the faculty and students participating in each type of activity and indicate any plans the department has for increasing these activities.

The Master of Science in Higher Education (MSHE) program provides students with a variety of opportunities to engage in research, service learning, internships, and faculty collaborations. These experiences are designed to enhance academic learning, strengthen professional skills, and support students in developing expertise in student affairs and higher education leadership.

Research and Scholarly Engagement. The MSHE program actively encourages student research, offering structured opportunities through coursework and faculty-led projects. The EDAD 510 (Educational Research) course serves as a foundation for graduate research, where students design and conduct program evaluations or needs assessments for university programs. A requirement of the course is that students report their findings to campus professionals, ensuring that their research has real-world applications and impact.

In Spring 2024, students engaged in a qualitative Photovoice study examining Black student experiences at CSUF. This project provided a hands-on introduction to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) process, data collection, and analysis. The study resulted in:

- A campus-wide research dialogue with over 80 attendees.
- A library exhibit showcasing student research findings.
- A presentation at a national NASPA conference.
- A collaborative research paper currently in development.

A subset of students chose to continue the project beyond the course, attending faculty-led research training sessions on data analysis, literature review development, and publication preparation. Five students ultimately presented at a national professional conference, and some are contributing to a peer-reviewed journal article.

Faculty members also invite students to engage in collaborative research projects, allowing them to co-present at conferences and co-author publications. Notable student-faculty collaborations include:

- Ramirez-Stapleton, L.D., Towery, Z., *Guzman, S.*, Banuelos Herrera, V., & *Ambriz, J.* (2024). *Through Black Eyes: Using Photovoice to Assess Black Student Life at Hispanic-Serving Institutions.* NASPA Regional Conference, San Diego, CA.

- *Lundberg, C.A., Kane, G., Bisson, K., & Brown, T. (2021).* Giving Voice to Silenced Groups: An Imperative to Disaggregate Data.* NASPA National Conference, Virtual.
- *Gutierrez Keeton, R. & Robinson, A. (2024).* Uncertainty Led to Virtual Global Engagement Opportunities for Graduate Students.* NASPA Annual Conference, Seattle, WA.

While research opportunities have increased in recent years, the program aims to further integrate student research into professional development, providing more support for conference presentations and publications. Future initiatives include formalizing research mentorship programs and increasing funding for student travel to present at national conferences.

Service Learning and Community Engagement. Service learning is an integral component of the MSHE program, providing students with experiential learning opportunities that enhance their understanding of educational access and student advocacy. For over 15 years, MSHE students have led the Maywood Education Fair, a large-scale community outreach project designed to promote college access for historically underserved populations. Each year, students:

- Partner with local businesses, nonprofit organizations, and educators to coordinate the fair.
- Raise scholarship funds to support Maywood-area students in their pursuit of higher education.
- Organize educational workshops and informational sessions to provide college preparation resources.

Due to evolving institutional priorities, responsibility for the Maywood Fair will transition to California State University, Los Angeles (CSULA). Moving forward, MSHE will develop a new community engagement initiative in Orange County, ensuring that service learning remains a central component of the program.

Internships and Fieldwork Experiences. Internships and practical fieldwork experiences are required for all MSHE students, allowing them to apply classroom knowledge in professional settings. Students must complete 250 hours of fieldwork, distributed across multiple semesters, in various higher education offices and student affairs departments.

Common fieldwork placements include:

- Academic advising and student success programs
- Cultural and identity-based resource centers
- Career services and leadership development programs
- Residence life and student engagement offices

To better accommodate students who work full-time, the program recently reduced the required fieldwork hours from 200 per semester to 150 and expanded options for summer fieldwork. These changes were made in direct response to student feedback, as many students found it challenging to balance full-time employment with intensive fieldwork requirements.

Additionally, graduate assistantships are available for students interested in gaining paid, professional experience in student affairs. While assistantships remain optional, they offer critical hands-on training and networking opportunities, particularly for students seeking career advancement in higher education administration.

Professional Development and Conference Participation. The MSHE program places strong emphasis on professional development, requiring students to attend at least two professional conferences during their graduate studies. Participation in NASPA, ACPA, and other higher education leadership conferences allows students to network with professionals, attend workshops, and present their research.

However, students have expressed concerns about the financial burden of attending national conferences, stating: "*Attending two national conferences is a huge financial burden. If it's mandatory, there should be built-in funding support or alternative options.*".

To address this, the program has expanded the definition of conference participation to include regional and virtual conferences, making participation more accessible for working students. Additionally, faculty are exploring alumni-sponsored travel grants to help offset costs.

VI. Resources and Facilities

- A. Itemize the state support and non-state resources the program/department received during the last seven years (see instructions, Appendix E).

N/A

- B. Identify any special facilities/equipment used by the program/department, such as laboratories, computers, large classrooms, or performance spaces. Identify changes over the last seven years and prioritize needs for the future.

The recently discontinued Maywood program was held at a community site provided by a partner. The development of its successor will likewise require identifying a suitable partner and site, which will require support from the college and university.

- C. Describe the current library/research resources for the program/department, the priorities for acquisitions over the next seven years, and any specialized needs such as collections, databases, etc.

The program identifies its alumni network as a substantial resource for students, both during and after the program, with their involvement as guest speakers, mentors, and possibly donors. This suggests that Alumni have opportunities to stay connected and contribute to the program's mission and current students. Participants among the small sample of program graduates interviewed spoke positively about their experience but did not mention invitations for engagement, nor initiation on their part following completion.

VII. Long-Term Plans

- A. Summarize the unit's long-term plan, including refining the definitions of the goals and strategies in terms of indicators of quality and measures of productivity (see instructions, Appendix F)

Much of this has been addressed in previous sections of this report. It should be noted here, however, that the long-term plan is appropriate for the goals of the program, department, and institution.

- B. Explain how the long-term plan implements the University's mission, goals, and strategies, as well as the unit's mission and goals.

Again, the long-term goals align well with the University's mission and goals.

- C. Explain what kinds of evidence will be used to measure the unit's results in pursuit of its goals, how the unit will collect and analyze such evidence, and the timeline against which progress toward those goals will be measured.

In the thorough assessment sections of this report are substantive suggestions for additional opportunities to gather evidence of student learning and engagement.

- D. Describe the resources (internal and external) that may be necessary, available, and/or attainable to meet the unit's priorities. Describe new funding that may be needed to maintain educational quality. Discuss the appropriate balance between state-supported and external funding. Discussion in this section should address the needs identified in areas I-VI above, with the understanding that the ability to meet strategic goals depends on available resources.

As noted in previous sections, to realize many of the program's goals elucidated in their self-report, they will need additional faculty lines, stronger relationships between the Division of Student Affairs and the academic unit, and additional fiscal resources.