REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

California State University Channel Islands

April 26, 2006

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Initial Accreditation

Team Roster
William Plater, Chair; Patricia Patterson, Assistant Chair; Jackie Donath, Sherri
Newcomb, Deborah Olsen

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution
according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional
Capacity and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for
Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and
Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA. Description of University and Visit

California State University-Channel Islands (CSUCI) is the newest campus in the 23-campus CSU system. The formal opening of CSUCI was August 16, 2002, and classes began with an enrollment of approximately 1,320 full-time transfer students. The campus welcomed its first freshmen class in fall 2003 and awarded the first degrees in spring 2005. CSUCI currently offers 17 undergraduate majors, five graduate programs, and both single and multiple teaching credentials.

The campus has experienced tremendous growth in the past four years. As of fall 2005, there were 2,360 undergraduate students and 215 post baccalaureate students. Currently, there are 57 tenure track faculty, 27 full time lecturers, and 143 part time lecturers. Approval for up to 20 tenure track searches was granted for AY 2005-06.

A team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges visited CSU Channel Islands on March 6 – 8, 2006, for its initial accreditation. During the visit, team members met with faculty, administrators, students, and staff who discussed the self-study documents and the campus' ability to fulfill its core commitments to capacity and its preparedness for the Educational Effectiveness visit.

During the visit, the Team established an independent email account. Campus constituents were invited to submit confidential email messages about any issues they wished to discuss. The Assistant to the Team Chair monitored the email account, read all messages and relayed their content to the team. In all cases, the email messages were overwhelmingly positive in their descriptions about the quality of academic programs and professors and about the student-centeredness of the campus.

The Team acknowledges the collegiality and graciousness of all with whom it met during the visit. Their willingness to respond to the team's questions and to provide additional information greatly enhanced the team's understanding of the campus. Senior leadership has clearly been instrumental in supporting campus-wide preparation for the review and for providing a responsive atmosphere for the Team.

IB. Quality of the Capacity and Preparatory Report and Alignment with the Proposal

CSU Channel Islands' Capacity and Preparatory Report used the comprehensive approach, which was described as a "roadmap" for building the University. Each Standard and Criteria for Review (CFR) was addressed and the changes that have taken place since 2002 were described in detail.

The Team found the report to be well organized and well written. It aligns well with the approach described in the letter of intent and the approach used for the candidacy review. In addition, evidence-based decision making is located throughout the document.

IC. Response to Previous Commission Issues

The Educational Effectiveness Report for CSUCI's initial candidacy lists 10 recommendations that the Team should examine for progress. These include organizational structures and procedures; the scholarship of teaching and learning; educational outcomes and assessment; program review; shared governance; RTP guidelines; support for student learning and CSUCI's distinctiveness and interdisciplinarity; filling vacancies for an Assessment Officer, a Chief Information Officer, and a Faculty Development Officer; examining committee effectiveness; and revisiting the Strategic Plan.

CSUCI's Capacity and Preparatory Review Report explicitly addresses these 10 recommendations in the appendix and some recommendations are also addressed in the body of the report. In particular, discussions of progress in organizational structures, student learning assessment, RTP procedures, and the scholarship of teaching and learning are documented and these issues were discussed during the Team visit.

The Team recognizes progress in a number of the recommendations. Section II of this report describes the Team's evaluative comments in regard to a number of these issues. Taken together, the report, visit and the Team's judgments indicate the seriousness with which the recommendations were viewed and the commitment to continued progress. However, as Section III of this report details, there are several areas that remain, and our recommendations are consistent with some of the recommendations set forth in the previous report.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

The Team has prepared its report—as we were encouraged by the President and his colleagues—as a critical friend. Tremendous progress has been made since the initial candidacy visit; yet there are opportunities for improvement as the institution moves from a "start-up" to a fully-realized university.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Institutional Purposes (CFRs 1.1 – 1.3)

CSUCI has adopted a distinctive if not unique mission statement that places student learning at the center of the educational experience (Exhibit 1.1.1). The mission statement has been the subject of considerable discussion and reflection since the founding of the campus in 2000 and its formal opening in 2002. The initial statement of mission and objectives were revised and finalized in 2003.

There is ample evidence of the faculty's embracing this mission statement and endorsing its educational objectives; while not in a position to act formally, the staff has also demonstrated an understanding and appreciation for the mission. Not only is the statement itself widely published and disseminated, but faculty, staff, students, and community leaders (e.g., representatives of nearby community colleges) all reflected an awareness of the distinctive mission of the campus and referred to it as a touchstone of their relationship to the institution. We accept this sincere and genuine display of understanding and insight as evidence of the pervasive nature of the community's commitment to clearly defined core values and purposes.

The central theme of making CSUCI student-centered is likely to endure and shape the future development of the campus. The campus strategic plan is founded on this principle, and each of the division's emerging plans aligns with the central core values. One concern, as reflected elsewhere in this report, is that being student-centered also means, primarily, being centered on student learning. The distinction between being student-centered and learning-centered may be subtle and nuanced, but the actual results of CSUCI's achieving its mission will rest on the extent to which students actually meet the learning objectives.

The mission statement contains the essential elements for assessing student learning. CSUCI has given primacy to the fact that all of its graduates—undergraduate and graduate—will have attained learning that can demonstrate their capacity for multicultural and international perspectives. The key issue for the campus in its Educational Effectiveness Review will be documenting and demonstrating that these educational objectives are being measured, assessed, and the degree to which they are being met. The educational effectiveness of an institution is grounded in its ability to demonstrate that its goals are being met.

There is considerable evidence that the institution continues to undergo intense discussion about the educational objectives and the ways in which these objectives can be determined in actual, individual student learning. The faculty have understandably placed the initial emphasis on defining and measuring Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) at the course and program levels. Course syllabi were reviewed to determine the extent to which SLOs were embedded in course objectives and explicitly identified for students. The reviews suggest that this is a strong but not yet pervasive practice and that some

faculty are willingly and enthusiastically discussing with students the overall learning objectives of CSUCI in the context of individual courses. To be successful, however, there must be more compelling evidence that each course can be related to the mission and objectives.

The campus is taking continued, persistent action to ensure that program-level discussion include SLOs in the expectations for the majors through workshops, special incentives for majors to develop assessment plans, and projects on assessment funded through the Provost and Office of Faculty Development. The burden of this commitment is to be borne by a system of program review, which is yet to be fully defined or implemented. This process is so essential to the future of the institution that there must be clear evidence in place of what a program review will entail, how it will be conducted, and how the results will be used to maintain the institution's commitment to its mission before the Educational Effectiveness Review.

The Candidacy Educational Effectiveness Review identified the need to provide "organizational structures and administrative procedures to maintain and foster the unique character, objectives, and values of CSUCI as expressed in its mission." There is clear evidence of the institution's moving toward fulfilling this recommendation. However, the actual demonstration of the effectiveness of structures and procedures will have to occur in the Educational Effectiveness Review in 2007, when evidence that the SLOs are being met by graduating students can be clearly presented. The Team commends the institution for its persistent work in this area and yet urges that there be a renewed commitment to documenting actual student learning at the time of graduation.

Several councils have been developed to support the focus on student learning. The roles of the University Planning and Coordinating Council, the President's Council, and the Assessment Council are distinct, yet coordination exists principally through overlapping membership. The authority and responsibility of these bodies needs to be further defined and articulated. The commitment to move the institution toward realizing its objectives through the work of these bodies is recognized and commended by the Team. *We do recommend, however, that responsibility for ensuring that graduates have met the objectives be clarified with regard to the distinctive roles of the programs and centers*. We understand that additional time will be required to develop the appropriate long-term, sustainable academic structure, but the emergence of the first school, the Martin V. Smith School of Business and Economics, heightens the need to address this centrally important issue sooner rather than later.

CSUCI has effective leaders at the level of President, Provost, center and program directors, and support staff in student affairs, finance and administration. The annual personnel assessment program allows for wide-spread comment on leadership performance. As the institution grows, there will need to be other leadership positions established and there will be an inevitable tension between hiring additional faculty or support personnel at levels of expertise to help support the learning objectives. The Team appreciates the concern with which the institution is approaching resource decisions and balancing the competing demands. The Team was impressed with senior leadership's personal commitment to the mission of CSUCI and its distinctive objectives. Their experience and leadership are evident along with their commitment.

Similarly, the Team was favorably impressed with the leadership evidenced by center directors, program chairs, assessment officers, library, and information technology directors. CSUCI has clearly attracted talented and dedicated leaders of operational areas who understand, appreciate, and value the mission of the campus.

<u>Integrity (CFRs 1.4 – 1.9)</u>

CSUCI demonstrates a fundamental commitment to "sound ethical practices and respect for humanity." The university's formal policies and informal practices reveal the infusion of consistent, positive institutional values in the areas of teaching, scholarship, service, and administrative oversight.

An academic freedom statement, adopted early in the campus' history, was formalized as an Academic Senate resolution in 2003 and is part of the Senate's Constitution. Formal university policies on free speech and assembly, the distribution of written materials, and responsible use of information technology resources have been developed and disseminated. These documents are available electronically on the Faculty Senate website and in the electronic version of the University Policy Manual. Information about this aspect of university life is also accessible to students through references in the *Student Guidebook* and is contextualized as both a student right and a student responsibility.

Multiculturalism is a core component of the University's educational mission and student exposure to, and appreciation of, social diversity is central to the university's developing curriculum and co-curricular activities. One of the particular strengths of CSUCI is the integration of classroom and "real-life" experience--the result of an unusually effective and well-organized collaboration between Student Affairs and

Academic Affairs. In the area of multiculturalism and diversity programming, this relationship is especially fruitful. In addition to funding the Multicultural, Women's and Gender Center, Student Affairs organizes and underwrites a series of campus events and activities that are intended to introduce a variety of cultures, viewpoints and issues associated with diversity.

The University's significant commitment to service learning has also directly benefited from collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. It has led the campus to devote considerable energy to issues of diversity in its service area. *The apparently natural, seamless integration of educational and co-curricular programs in this regard is commendable*.

Other curricular emphases support the university's intention that CSUCI students graduate with "multicultural and international perspectives." The graduation requirements for a semester of university study in a language other than English is a step in this direction and where appropriate, new programs might also consider including language study requirements. The infusion of multicultural content and sensitivity in General Education also logically reinforces this mission-based goal.

Other programs, common to the CSU system, such as the Summer College Program for High School Students, the EOP-sponsored Summer Bridge Program, and the activities of the Disability Accommodation Service have been organized to allow the University to be responsive to the needs of the diverse populations it serves. The creation of the Center for Multicultural Learning and Engagement can offer the University another set of occasions to meet both its educational and outreach goals. Although still in the planning and organizational phase, this center, in particular, can add layers of curricular

support, fund-raising and community outreach to the University's focus on the significance of diversity in American culture. The nascent Center for International Studies may allow CSUCI to expand its definition of diversity beyond the geographical region it serves and create a truly global context for the education of its students. CSUCI needs to give early attention to defining and articulating the characteristics of global citizenship or of the international dimension of citizenship and then to creating the proper means to assess how well graduates are prepared for this role. Both these centers will need focused attention from faculty and the administration in order to reach their full potential as structural supports to student learning, curricular innovation, faculty development, co-curricular planning, and community service.

In service of its mission, CSUCI has studied the diversity of its region and makes a concerted effort to recruit students across the region's various demographic groups. It is clear from the Strategic Plan for Enrollment Management, and the activities of the Enrollment Management and Student Success Committee (EMSSC), which includes representation from across the campus community, that the University is committed to serving the local community.

The University also demonstrates its commitment to diversity in its hiring practices of faculty, staff and administrators, although the institutional portfolio data suggests that the faculty (both full time tenure/tenure track and lecturers) are predominately white. The President has established a Commission on Human Relations, Diversity, and Equity whose mission is to promote and embrace a campus climate and culture that welcomes all forms of multiculturalism and diversity in order to ensure a safe and inclusive campus environment for working, living and learning. Anecdotal

information offered during the Team's visit to campus was uniformly positive when students, staff, faculty and administrators commented on the campus focus on multiculturalism and diversity.

The University provides accurate, updated information to students and the public on campus programs, policies, services, and goals, both electronically and in hard copy format, in publications such as the annual *University Catalog*, the *Student Guidebook*, degree flyers on majors, and the *Class Schedule* published each fall and spring. The catalog and the *Class Schedule* describe grading policies and appeals procedures. The *Student Guidebook* explains the processes and timelines related to the resolution of student complaints and disciplinary issues. Campus policies on refunds are consistent with other such policies and practices in the CSU system. The details of the refund process are available in the *Student Guidebook* and *the Class Schedule*, and described to students during orientation.

The University's explicit concerns about the creation of an institutional culture of civility and ethical, empathetic and respectful behavior extends to the policies CSUCI has put into place for the resolution of grievances and complaints. Policies on course grade appeals, academic dishonesty, and the creation of a judicial process for students demonstrate the campus' commitment to timely and fair responses to student concerns.

Consistent with other campuses in the CSU system, faculty, support and professional staff employees are represented by unions whose collective bargaining agreements include complaint and grievance procedures. Non-represented employees, including members of the Management Personnel Plan (administrators) and confidential employees, may file complaints through a California State University system-wide

process. Additionally, members of the Management Personnel Plan may file for reconsideration of personnel actions through a separate process established by the Chancellor's Executive Order 446. Finally, a Whistleblower Act provides individuals the opportunity to report improper activities of state agencies or employees.

While the energy and community building required by the start-up phase of university building may have precluded much in the way of grievances or complaints, CSUCI has developed the appropriate structures to ensure that should such conflicts arise, they will be dealt with in a fair and timely fashion.

One of CSUCI's most consistently demonstrated strengths is the creation of a committed and inclusive campus community. The team benefited from this atmosphere of wide and deep engagement both in the report prepared by a team of eighty volunteers and during the visit. The team was able to participate in conversations with faculty, staff, students, and administrators on a variety of (often overlapping) topics in number of different contexts. The "honest and open communication" which seems to characterize the campus, has expanded to include the accreditation review process. There is every reason to believe that the candid, careful and collaborative process which has been part of the relationship between CSUCI and WASC will continue.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Teaching and Learning (CFRs 2.1 – 2.7)

The CSU system provides substantial oversight of a number of key academic functions across its campuses. Thus, admissions standards (freshman and transfer), approval of new academic programs and lower level general education requirements are governed by CSU policy and review.

CSUCI has done an outstanding job of building upon the standards mandated by the system, working to insure the high quality of its burgeoning programs as well as the unique mission of the campus. The Academic Master plan provides an orderly if somewhat daunting schedule for initiation of new academic programs. Faculty have been recruited from very large pools of qualified candidates. They are selected not only for their academic credentials but also for their ability to embrace and carry forward the unique campus culture of collaboration, interdisciplinarity, inclusiveness and civility.

CSUCI has made progress in assessment of student learning outcomes since the last WASC visit. The General Education Assessment committee has several strands of research it is pursuing: (1) examining alignment of course objectives with mission and baccalaureate outcomes; (2) pilot testing a new standardized measure of general education competencies; and (3) a student attitude survey.

The campus is working to blend the system level GE goals and requirements with their own baccalaureate mission; focused efforts are just starting. CSUCI is currently evaluating the extent to which courses in math and science reflect the CSU GE objectives in their syllabi. The campus has both a GE committee and a GE Assessment committee, and one of their immediate tasks is to establish baccalaureate-level student learning outcomes that can be assessed. The mission of the University suggests that the campus will want to incorporate fairly complex dimensions into learning outcomes, including experiential and service learning as well as multiculturalism and interdisciplinarity. In this context, it is worth noting that faculty have worked to craft courses along these dimensions, the "zoo" course and the "museum" course being frequently mentioned. The campus has made good use of upper-level general education requirements to introduce

multiculturalism and interdisciplinarity into the curriculum. Moreover, students spoke about opportunities within almost all courses to apply what they are learning. For example, one student described going to Catalina Island with a class to plant native grasses and learn about the environment and ecology through hands-on methods.

Defining general education goals in specific terms has proven difficult on many campuses. CSUCI may have greater capacity to do so, given the thought they have already put into their student-centered curriculum. Assessment should thus provide them with important evidence about the efficacy of their educational approach and better enable them to demonstrate its utility to new faculty, the CSU system and the public at large.

At the program level, the campus is working on important initiatives like the assessment of the self-placement project in English, the critical thinking course in Liberal Studies and assessments in Biology and Business. The Smith grants have encouraged and enabled all departments to select and assess one learning outcome by next year. The campus has initiated two new committees, the Program Review and Assessment Committee and the Assessment Council, to oversee assessment activities. The campus is undoubtedly in a better position for the Educational Effectiveness Review now than at the time of the last review. Yet, the team is unclear about the roles these committees play in student learning assessment and how their activities will come to fruition in Program Reviews.

Notwithstanding the progress that has been made in assessment, there is much work still to be done. Assessment efforts need greater direction and coordination. The committees just put in place are helpful but do not provide the kind of centering that a

project of this magnitude requires. It may also be helpful to bring in someone with

substantial expertise in assessment to hone organizational structures as well as individual

projects to make sure that faculty efforts produce important and meaningful data they will

want to use in their instruction. Faculty attitudes toward assessment are generally positive

but clearer directives and purposes—particularly about the need for a feedback loop and

use of data—are needed. Because of close positive faculty-student relations on the

CSUCI campus, it may be in a unique position to partner with students in carrying out

assessment. Thus, while acknowledging the progress that has been made in defining

learning outcomes, the campus is still in the nascent stages of gathering evidence of

student learning and using it for program improvement. Therefore, the Team makes the

following recommendation:

Recommendation 1:

CSUCI must take steps to ensure by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review that the institution will have clear evidence of the extent of student achievement in Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program (major), and degree levels. At the degree level, there should be evidence of student achievement in regard to learning within and across disciplines; interdisciplinary learning; experiential learning; multicultural perspectives; and international perspectives. In addition, CSUCI should have in place a system that can assess student learning in these areas and procedures to ensure that evidence is used for program improvement.

We would like to take this opportunity to recognize how well other extra-

curricular areas interface with—and support—the academic curriculum and student

learning. We were impressed with the efficiency and enthusiasm of the small advising

staff and recognize the critical role they play on a campus with many first-generation

college students. The Advising Office sends out numerous reminders about their services

and offers timely advising sessions to freshmen and transfers. The Office helps students

meet their academic goals by fulfilling the academic requirements needed to attain those goals.

The Team's meeting with students underscored the synergy between the academic curriculum and student affairs co-curriculum. In particular, students cited the co-curricular transcript and how it allowed them to relate and document key learning experiences inside and outside of class. Expectations of students have been disseminated through the *Characteristics of CSCUI Graduates* and the University mission statement which are available on the website and at many places on campus. The strong consistent values of the administration, faculty and staff have permeated the environment and students are able to articulate the key features of undergraduate education at CSUCI after only a few weeks of attendance.

CSUCI maintains that students receive feedback on their performance through the self-placement process in English at the lower undergraduate level and through experiential courses at the upper level (e.g., some of the upper level general education courses). In addition, new academic support services should help students recognize and address weaknesses in basic academic skills. Based on what we know of the campus, however, it is likely that the close frequent contact between students and faculty is an important source of performance feedback. This approach may prove to be a challenge as the student body escalates in coming years. While this may be inevitable, it is our sincere hope that the campus is able to find ways to maintain the esprit de corps so evident among student and faculty now.

It is not possible to address the issue of the attainments of graduates given the one class graduated to date. This said, we do not feel that it is ever too soon to collect data

and to muse over its meaning. In fact, small numbers of students may offer opportunities for collection of an array of data not available otherwise. Graduate students and others could be recruited to help in such efforts. As one CSUCI faculty said, this information can provide the basis for important mid-course corrections.

Perhaps the most important venue for insuring the coherence of the curriculum, the quality of instruction and scholarship, and the extent of student learning is Program Review, which provides units with an internal and external review every five years. Program Review will be conducted for the first time at CSUCI next year. Despite this, we remained somewhat unsure of how the review will be conducted or what components it would entail. It may be both possible and desirable to borrow and modify a methodology from other CSU universities. One particular issue that must be considered in program review is the role it will play in outcomes assessment. Our meeting with the Academic Affairs staff indicated that assessment activities would be conducted on an annual basis but culminate in the program review. Yet, the Team is unclear about the relationship between the Program Review and Assessment Committee and the Assessment Council. *We recommend that by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review committee responsibilities will be clearly delineated.*

Scholarship and Creative Activity (CFRs 2.8 – 2.9)

CSUCI has provided evidence that research, scholarship, and creative activity are essential to the University mission. In light of the amount of energy that must be expended to build the university and expand the curriculum, faculty productivity in scholarship and creative activity is extraordinary. To accomplish this, faculty at CSUCI have received reassigned time, internal grants, Office of Faculty Development Grants,

support from the Library and other University divisions and travel funds. The 2004 Faculty Support Task Force report asserts that "most" tenure track faculty members were granted reassigned time for scholarly and creative activities and for university and program development. Similarly, the 2005 report update mentions that "support for professional travel was provided to all tenure-track faculty."

The collection of specific and clearer data and the development of reporting policies and procedures would be helpful and would strengthen the evidence the University presents to meet CFR 2.8. These strategies might include developing reporting requirements for assigned time, campus-based research and creative activity forums and award programs, and tracking faculty activities in these areas to determine where campus resources might best be used to ensure the development of a rich and expansive culture of scholarship and creative activity.

There are several resource centers in place at CSUCI to support a variety of faculty activities. The Office of Faculty Development (OFD) and University Library have provided funding opportunities to faculty in various forms. These grants have been a major form of support for teaching innovation and for creative and scholarly activity, and the total amount allotted for these initiatives has increased. The OFD has sponsored a number of workshops on a variety of topics, including the scholarship of teaching, classroom assessment techniques, and program and course evaluation and anticipates continuing its ongoing series of faculty presentations based on scholarship and teaching. The library is a significant support source for faculty's instructional, creative and scholarship needs. It provides services to develop innovative instructional materials such as web sites and video materials and maintains a webpage devoted to faculty services.

From this site, faculty can access the collection's electronic journals, request new journals, request software for instructional use, and sign up for faculty workshops held by the library and other services. The library has also developed web pages for each academic program that link to specific relevant resources, which is accessible by both students and faculty.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (ORSP) has a clear mission of education, support and fund-generation which has begun to serve the faculty as individuals and the university mission in an effective and energetic way. Should this office be able to grow and take on staff with the special skills necessary to more efficiently serve the needs of grant-seeking faculty, staff and students, it might also be the developer of, and logical center for, programs to provide regular funds for other sorts of research, scholarly, and creative activities.

Particularly as the faculty and administration can begin to shift the bulk of their energies from program building to program delivery and assessment, the "scholar" element of the CSU system ideal teacher/scholar faculty member should receive increasing attention. This potential shift in emphasis may be comfortably tied to the RTP process and the operationalization of the components of retention, tenure and promotion at both the program and university level. The development of the General Personnel Standards (GPS) and the opportunities for the creation of more specific Program Personnel Standards (PPS) has given the RTP process a significant and necessary beginning. These activities are treated in more detail as part of a discussion of Standard 3.

The preliminary information on the strategic plans for four mission-based centers suggests that these initiatives may provide a rich environment for developing innovative

and meaningful linkages between scholarship, learning, teaching, and service. For example, the Center for Integrative and Interdisciplinary Studies has developed long term plans to promote interdisciplinary scholarship among both faculty and students. In the summer of 2004, CIIS supported 14 stipends to assist in the creation and development of new interdisciplinary courses. Similarly, the strategic plan for the Center for Multicultural Learning and Engagement has an explicit goal of tying service and experiential learning to classroom work and new course development.

In addition to the creation of the mission-based centers, faculty members at CSUCI have made consistent and serious efforts to provide experiential learning options within the more "traditional" academic programs. Most programs offer service learning and/or internships for credit. There are opportunities for undergraduate students to work outside the university, either with companies, government agencies, or not-for-profit organizations on projects that are related to the student's academic discipline. Similarly, many courses have integrated service learning into their curricula to strengthen the academic service linkages between the campus and the surrounding community. Students are able to do undergraduate student research for credit, which allows students to work with faculty on projects of scholarly or creative merit in the field of expertise of the faculty member. University students have also participated in a number of undergraduate research symposia and conferences such as the Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research and the Southern California and Nevada Section of the Mathematical Association of American Annual Conference.

<u>Support for Student Learning (CFRs 2.10 – 2.14)</u>

The enthusiasm and commitment to supporting student learning was palpable in every unit the Team met during the visit. This level of engagement is likely due to the close relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, two units with leaders who work well together and understand that student learning occurs both inside and outside the classroom.

The Academic Advising unit is committed to a proactive approach to reaching students to ensure their success. Materials describing all academic requirements for freshmen and transfer students are clearly written and available both in print and on the web. All appointments are tracked and all advising activities are assessed by the students. The four-person advising team regularly meets to review how well their programs are working and makes adjustments when feedback, either from themselves or the students, indicates areas for improvement. Satisfaction with advising services is very high and approximately 75% - 80% of all students see the advisors. It was also evident to the Team that this unit is committed to working in concert with the faculty advisors to ensure that students receive consistent messages about requirements. Their participation in the first year seminar is additional evidence of their role in ensuring student success.

During the Team's meeting with the librarians it was clear that they think beyond the traditional library role to support the CSUCI mission and student learning. The unit is committed to having the library become a cultural and social center for students. They provide one-on-one opportunities to assist students with research skills and to enhance information literacy skills. They also play an integral role in assisting students with understanding ways to approach interdisciplinary projects. Student learning is also

enhanced with the library's role in managing the Blackboard system. The librarians work with faculty to integrate and use pedagogical approaches that increase active learning. In addition, the librarians play active roles on committees, ensuring that they are "kept in the loop" about academic matters.

As noted earlier, Students Affairs is committed to working closely with Academic Affairs to ensure that each unit develops and offers a set of co-curricular experiences that complement the mission of CSUCI. The Division is organized into two service components: Student Life (consisting of housing and residential education, personal counseling, career services, disability accommodations, new student orientation, student health, judicial affairs, student clubs and organizations, activities and events, student government, student programming, recreation and leisure services, outreach, and EOP) and Enrollment Services (consisting of admissions, recruitment, records, registration, and financial aid).

The Division is committed to assessment and to continuous improvement. This is evident in the development of the Comprehensive Program Review (CPR) model, which requires each program within the unit to undergo a four-phase, 24-month review process. The phases include an Advanced Planning Phase, a Self-Study, a Campus-wide Review, and an Outside Professional Review. Thus, immediate and continuous feedback is provided at each phase and changes can be implemented at that time. This model ensures that evidence is used to modify policies and practices with student learning and student success at the center of decision-making.

One final activity developed by the Student Affairs Division that was particularly impressive and germane in providing support for student learning was the co-curricular

portfolio. The portfolio includes a description of the activities and roles students have engaged in along with a listing of the competencies they gained from the experience as well as the courses that are aligned with the competencies. The importance of the portfolio to student learning was evident during the Team meeting with students. The students were enthusiastic and articulate about their experiences and demonstrated a deep understanding of the link between co-curricular and curricular experiences to their development and learning and the alignment of these activities with the mission of CSUCI.

Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Faculty and Staff (CFRs 3.1 – 3.4)

Faculty are truly the cornerstone upon which the campus has been built. They continue to employ a recruitment procedure that brings faculty from all over campus into the selection process and assessing hands-on candidates' ability to work in an interdisciplinary, team-based culture. This exhaustive recruitment strategy has been maintained despite the fact that the campus has attempted to fill 15-20 new positions a year every year since its inception. Because faculty are encouraged by the President "not to settle" for faculty who will not fit into the distinctive culture of Channel Islands and because of housing prices, spousal hiring and other issues, far fewer than 20 are actually hired each year. This is important because, while standards remain high, faculty do report feeling somewhat overwhelmed (as well as energized) by the enormous tasks associated with building the University as they teach and carry out their scholarship. Faculty praise the professional opportunities they have at Channel Islands but also want more full-time

tenure-track colleagues to share the service load. Temporary faculty, lecturers in particular, are highly valued and included in the academic life of CSUCI to a much greater extent than on most campuses. In fact, a number of tenure-track faculty have been drawn from lecturer ranks. But faculty feel that the current ratio of tenure-track and tenured faculty to temporary faculty is still skewed too far in the direction of temporary faculty who have no contractual obligation to participate in service.

The RTP process has been articulated and clarified in useful ways since the last visit. CSUCI has asked each program to tailor the RTP standards to reflect and reward faculty activities that forward disciplinary and university goals. Some programs, like English, have done this and have received the requisite campus approval. English now insures that the scholarship of teaching, interdisciplinary teaching and research, scholarly activities around multiculturalism and other facets of the CSUCI mission are considered in the RTP process. A number of other programs have not yet completed this exercise and they rely upon the campus' General Personnel Standards instead. It was not entirely clear whether all programs will ultimately be expected to generate their own standards. Nor was it clear what faculty's affiliation with the new Centers would be. Will faculty be able to obtain tenure in a Center? Will faculty have to have some affiliation with a Center to be tenured elsewhere at the University? Will the Centers play a role in building the dossier of faculty? Evaluating their performance? What role will centers play in assessing student learning? Without a clearer definition of the role Centers will play in the lives of faculty and students Centers will not be able to actively promote the interdisciplinary mission assigned to them and the campus may end up structured around the disciplinary

silos they hope to avoid. For these reasons, the Team provides the following

recommendation:

Recommendation 2:

By the time of the EE review, CSUCI needs to clearly identify the structural role of the Centers in achieving the University Mission and student learning outcomes.

The accreditation report indicates that teaching is the centerpiece of the faculty

dossier and faculty must obtain a teaching rating of "exceeds standards" to be tenured or

promoted. While faculty would all agree that the institutional focus is on students and

teaching, faculty remain concerned that RTP standards will not be able to adequately

account for the heavy service load they have assumed in order to bring the University to

life. At least one chair indicated that the service opportunities on the campus can lure new

faculty into doing more than their schedules can accommodate, with negative effects on

research and scholarship. In the midst of this very real press of responsibilities, however,

faculty and administration seem reluctant to reduce the service burden on faculty by

establishing smaller representative committees (Please see Recommendation 3 for the

Team's thoughts about this issue). Laudable though it is to have so many faculty

involved in all aspects of governing the institution, the increasing size of the institution

makes this approach less tenable each year. The University is justifiably proud that

faculty attrition has been so low (only 5 faculty have left), and the overwhelming turnout

at the faculty and staff WASC Team's sessions further attests to the high level of morale

and commitment among members of the CSUCI community. However, the issue of time

for teaching and research will become more pronounced as more junior faculty are hired,

faculty who must have time to develop professionally and academically. The future of the

University will ultimately reflect the quality and productivity of the faculty and, while intensely committed to the University, faculty are showing signs of wear and tear.

In this environment, the role of the Office of Faculty Development is particularly critical. One development since the last visit is that the Director of Faculty Development retired and the position has been assumed by the interim Dean of the Faculty, who has many other responsibilities. Given the high aspirations for remaining a teaching focused, student–centered campus and serving nontraditional as well as traditional college-going student populations, it may be that a full-time faculty development officer or equivalent position may be needed. The campus recently generated a report on support for faculty and so clearly recognizes the strategic importance of faculty development to its mission. It may be that the newly established position assisting faculty with technology is sufficient with outside speakers, workshops etc. supplementing on other topics. Whatever organizational structure is adopted it will be important to insure good lines of communication between faculty development and assessment so that the support provided connects teaching with demands for assessment of student learning.

<u>Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources (CFRs 3.5 – 3.7)</u>

CSUCI appears to optimize the allocation of its limited resources in a manner to promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives, the center of which is a high quality environment for student learning. The University's organizational structure is sound and comprised of academic, administrative, student affairs and institutional advancement operations headed by strong and capable leaders and staffed by a talented and dedicated personnel. Planning is done collaboratively

through a number of representative committees and the allocation of resources is made in accordance with the mission and goals of the institution.

The CSU budget allocation model provides new funding based almost exclusively on enrollment growth. CSUCI is well-positioned to benefit from this marginal funding model as it is forecast to grow rapidly over the next several years. The CSU enrollment-funding plan, based on the funding "compact' agreed to between the CSU and California's governor, calls for CSUCI to grow by nearly 400% over the next 10 years. There is evidence of significant and continuing student demand for CSUCI to achieve these enrollment projections; indeed, this year CSUCI exceeded its enrollment expectation by more than 30%.

Despite the relatively positive funding outlook from enrollment growth, CSU Channel Islands faces a serious fiscal challenge related to fixed costs as there has been no assessment or funding resource available to fund the fixed costs associated with starting the university. CSUCI has garnered some additional operating funding support on an ad hoc basis, but largely must plan to cover fixed operating costs from within its marginal funding allocations. This lack of funding presents what seem to be almost insurmountable odds in realizing the wonderful potential of this innovative and vibrant University. However, faculty, staff, students and administration have expressed no concern that a lack of resources will be an obstacle. Their tremendous success thus far suggests that they are correct. Over and over again, however, there is evidence of plans delayed or placed on hold until funding is available. There is no question that funding is an impediment to the progress that could be made based on institutional plans. It certainly appears that a relatively small sum of money for fixed operating costs for CSUCI would result in a

tremendous return on investment in the future of the campus. Plans and budgets would suggest that even $5 million, with perhaps $3 million of that in one-time funds, would have an exponential impact in realizing the campus' future (Please see Recommendation 5 in regard to this issue).

If such funding is not available, the campus will continue its good work, albeit at a slower and more difficult pace. The limited resources available are universally perceived to be equitably allocated to the highest priorities of the institution and the various budget and planning committees ensure a comprehensive and collaborative budgeting process. There is no lack of morale, optimism or commitment on the part of any of the faculty, staff, students or administrators with whom we spoke. The question cannot help but arise as to how long this will last. It seems a small amount of funding would nurture the wonderful culture that defines CSUCI and the absence of such funding may well lead to a "burnout" which once started, may engulf the campus. The reality is that funds are limited at most institutions and certainly funds are limited in the CSU. Perhaps an alternative to be considered would be a long-term, low interest loan plan of some sort which would make more funding available to the campus in these early and tender years.

CSU Channel Islands consists of 670 acres and over 1 million square feet of building inventory from the conversion of the Camarillo State Hospital to CSUCI. These buildings were constructed in the 1930's through the 1960's and, although beautiful, require extensive adaptation to meet university needs. CSUCI is developing plans for the campus which include identifying where programs can be housed, where buildings can be renovated and where new construction is needed. CSUCI has received priority placement

from the CSU for two major capital outlay projects both of which are dependent upon passage of State of California general obligation funds, yet to be placed on the ballot. It is expected that funding will eventually be secured; however, completion of these projects will take several years. CSUCI also receives funding for capital projects from the CSUCI Site Authority. The Site Authority, established in 1998 by special legislation in the State of California, borrowed approximately $72 million to finance the new library and other campus projects. CSUCI also generates some lease income that is applied to capital project costs.

CSUCI has an Office of Operations, Planning and Construction staffed by experts in capital planning and design and this staff, in conjunction with the CSU Chancellor's Office staff, has completed sound work in determining their building and renovation plans. For example, one of the major capital projects is a major renovation plan which includes smaller project components that can be accomplished quickly and at a small cost for big gains. Another project will replace the aged utility infrastructure and will be constructed in a manner to expand with the campus as it grows. CSU Channel Islands will be space-challenged for the next few years but solid capital plans, continued priority status in the CSU's capital planning process and forecast capital funding will adequately meet the campus' needs.

CSUCI has a very impressive university advancement operation, for which the President provides direct operational leadership for fundraising and related functions. The staff in this area is proficient and the breadth of the operation is noteworthy. The essential infrastructure is in place and CSUCI, although small, has achieved a model operation. CSUCI has a very dedicated community of supporters and students are extraordinarily

committed to the future. As the University matures and its alumni increase in numbers and establish careers, it is easy to foresee (many years from now) a very successful fundraising program at the University, one capable of providing significant financial support to the University.

The CSU Channel Islands Library provides access to the information resources necessary to support its academic offerings. In addition to printed materials, partially in storage until the construction of the new Library is completed, the Library has implemented systems to provide both on-campus and off-campus access to information resources. In addition, the Library does not subscribe to printed journal publications, thus avoiding the associated overhead costs, and devotes its resources to electronic subscriptions to journals and databases. In fact, due to the small size of the campus, the CSUCI Library is able to afford subscriptions to many databases that larger campuses are unable to afford. The CSUCI Library staff has also developed databases to serve its academic programs and uses it membership in the CSU library consortium as leverage to provide access to electronic journals and databases comparable to larger campuses.

The Library is represented on the CSUCI Academic Senate Curriculum and Fiscal Policies Committee and thereby is involved in the planning of programs from their inception. In addition, the Library has a developed a 5-year strategic plan in support of the academic program plan.

CSUCI has recently hired a new Chief Information Officer (CIO) and as a result has implemented an extensive reorganization of IT. The CIO, reporting to the Vice President for Administration and Finance, is a member of the President's Cabinet, facilitating service to the entire university. Key academic and administrative IT functions

are supported including course management, desktop, web, and administrative HR, finance and student information systems. A help desk and IT training are also supported.

Like other university operations, IT is resource-challenged. Security is a high priority and concern. The new CIO is implementing a balanced scorecard approach to performance management and is also implementing a zero-based budget project to insure that IT resources are maximized and put to their highest priority use. IT services have been defined into three tiers: 1) a basic level needed to insure security and basic service demands; 2) a tier defined as comparable to other CSU campuses; and 3) a tier defined as consistent with the University's 21st century vision. At the present time all available IT resources are required at the tier 1 level.

IT is an area that would benefit from an infusion of resources as described earlier under this standard. The new CIO is taking the right steps to assure that IT resources are optimally allocated and deployed to support the University's highest priority academic and administrative needs.

When the University was established and as it grew in these early years, prior to the arrival of the new CIO, some areas of IT services began to emerge in the academic units, e.g., the Library. It appears that the new IT organization, and its leadership, is in the best position to oversee and manage decentralized services. Centralization for these services under the CIO would maximize the university's IT resources and also enable the University to more effectively address critical IT security issues.

Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes (CFRs 3.8 – 3.11)

As noted previously, the University has a sound organizational structure. Academic Affairs has a rather unique organizational model reflective of the university's

mission and objectives. At the present time, academic affairs continues to avoid traditional schools/colleges and departments and the faculty are headed by a single Dean of the Faculty. Academic programs are headed by Chairs. The University understands how crucial the proper academic affairs organization is to realizing its vision and continues to discuss the future of this organization. The most recent organizational discussions have concluded that the present organization should remain in place for approximately the next three years and that four "centers" in support of the university's mission should be established.

The CSUCI faculty is deeply engaged in the shared governance of the institution as evidenced by the service of all faculty on the Academic Senate and its various standing committees. In addition, faculty participate in all search committees and all tenure track faculty participate in the recruitment of new tenure-track faculty. The quality of the institution and the execution of the University's mission are of paramount importance to the faculty and they work in great harmony with each other and with the administration to govern the institution. All faculty members visited expressed satisfaction with their level of participation, albeit the sheer workload is becoming difficult due to the resource constraints discussed previously.

Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Strategic Thinking and Planning (CFRs 4.1 – 4.3)

In many ways, planning is at the heart of CSUCI's development and emergence as an institution of higher learning. Beginning with a vision reflected in its distinctive mission statement, the faculty and leadership of the campus have moved deliberately and intentionally through a series of coordinated steps to implement the vision. At the center

of this work is the CSUCI 2003-08 Strategic Plan, which was prepared in 2002 and which has been revised as necessary. The most recent iteration of the plan is consistent with the institution's stage of development. The plan has been widely disseminated and most of the academic and service units of CSUCI have prepared their own plans consistent with the overarching campus plan. Those considered as part of this review include: Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Finance and Administration, University Advancement, Extended Education, University Library, and Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

The responsibility for reviewing, revising, and monitoring progress in implementing the overall institutional plan and the related, coordinated unit plans rests with the University Planning and Coordinating Council (UPACC). Consisting of some 18 members and co-chaired by the Provost and a faculty member, UPACC provides the necessary oversight for this fundamental process at the most critical stages of the institution's emergence. Clearly, the centrality and importance of UPACC is reflected in the comments made by faculty, administrators, staff and students—all of whom understand the role the Council is playing—as well as the documentation supporting the work of this body. It addresses alignment in two ways. Quantitative alignment allows the Council to look at data regarding the various aspects of the campus plan, to assess progress, and to help make decisions about use of resources; plans to assess prior decisions and investments of resources are underway. Qualitative alignment allows the Council to coordinate the various programs and divisions and to ensure that they are both working well together and toward the same goals. *UPACC is maturing its processes and by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review should have in place clear time-lines for the cycle of planning and budgeting, a routine process for assessing prior*

investments, and a clear statement of the relationship of UPACC with the Academic Affairs' Budget Committee and both the President's Cabinet and the President's Council. It is the Team's understanding that UPACC is the principal body for ensuring that CFR 4.1 is met in fact as well as spirit, and this understanding needs to be apparent by practice and policy at the time of the Effectiveness Review. The Team also notes the high value placed on transparency of deliberations by the Council and acknowledges that this commitment contributes to its current effectiveness.

The Team noted that there is one community representative on UPACC and understands that this body is the proper forum to consider community needs with regard to program development in the context of overall priority setting for the institution. The Team did not meet with the President's Community Advisory Board or other committees broadly representative of the community. *However, the Team recognizes the importance of communication and coordination of University and community interests and recommends that President Rush include within the Team's Recommendation 3 a review of community participation to ensure that it is timely and effective. As is the general case for all councils and committees, steps should be taken to establish terms of service for community members and to provide for regular, systematic rotation of members so as to ensure broad participation and representation of multiple views.* Both the policies of the Academic Senate in setting term limits and the President's Council offer cogent, current examples of good practice within the CSUCI context.

The Team also commends CSUCI for establishing its Assessment Council as a central coordinating body for all assessment activities, which support the institutional reflection and planning processes. Indeed, there is compelling evidence that the "culture

of assessment" is broadly established at CSUCI with a deep understanding across faculty, staff, and students of the inherent importance of relying on assessment to ensure continuous improvement. However, there appears to be an important gap in the overall assessment plan in that there is no single place where the assessment activities of separate divisions and programs are themselves reviewed. The Assessment Council would appear to be the appropriate body to undertake this centrally important mission and to make its recommendations to the President (perhaps through the President's Cabinet or President's Council) regarding the practices and results of the unit-specific assessment activities.

Because of CSUCI's commitment to transparency and because of the inherent interlocking committee memberships due to the size of the faculty and staff, the need for such a central authority may not yet have become apparent. As the institution grows in size and complexity, however, this need will exist. As one example, the assessment of how academic programs are meeting their responsibilities to mission with regard to student learning outcomes is entrusted to the Program Review and Assessment Committee. This Committee, in turn, will ensure that programs are meeting their mission objectives though periodic program review, including external visitors. The Team applauds this approach but notes that there is no apparent plan for the assessment of the program reviews at the campus level so that adjustments can be made if a program review reveals a deficiency. Should a program decide that some aspect of the mission-determined student learning outcomes is not necessary or relevant to a major, for example, there does not appear to be a place in the overall institutional assessment processes where this decision can be reviewed and affirmed or corrected. The Assessment Council does not believe that this responsibility falls within the scope of its

charge nor does it believe it has the authority to make corrections. *The Team recommends that this seeming gap be addressed, whether authority and responsibility is invested in the Assessment Council or some other body.*

Further, the Team expects the Program Review and Assessment Committee to have in place a clear template for program review by the time of the site visit for the Educational Effectiveness Review. The procedures and standards for the reviews should be delineated, the processes for conducting the reviews should be committed to writing as a policy, and the lines for reporting, reviewing, and accepting the program reviews needs to be delineated so that there will be institutional level accountability for educational effectiveness.

As noted, the planning processes are appropriate for this stage of the institution's development and the commitment to transparency and involvement insure that alignment with priorities is occurring. However, as the institution matures, the relationship of various councils and committees needs to be clarified, hierarchy determined, and authority for actions delineated. At the present time, the Steering Committee for WASC accreditation appears to be informally fulfilling some of the necessary alignment activities, and this responsibility needs to be shifted to permanent councils and committees with clearly defined procedures and policies. The Team is not concerned about the overlapping roles of committees at this stage of development, but recommends that there be further refinement and clarity by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review. Therefore, the Team makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 3:

CSUCI should review and restructure mission-critical councils and committees to achieve institutional goals, ensure rotation of committee memberships, to reduce redundancy, and to clarify authority.

In its December 2004 report, the Candidacy Review team noted ". . . the urgent need to: (1) begin data collection on student learning; (2) establish a feedback loop that enables faculty and other campus members to use data collected to improve teaching and learning; and (3) coordinate assessment efforts vertically and horizontally." The present Team acknowledges progress on all of these fronts, but does not believe that the institution has yet met the expectations of the previous review team.

The Team appreciates the efforts of the Office of Institutional Research to meet the myriad institutional needs for data and to develop protocols, procedures, and best practices to serve a large number of units and committees while meeting the expectations of WASC. Given resource constraints, the efforts may be considered heroic. However, more needs to be done since the use of accurate, timely, well-formed data must determine the decisions the institution is making to plan its future and to insure its integrity.

The Team recommends that the institution better leverage the recent developments in its information technology and management systems. We are not recommending any changes in reporting lines or integration of services but noting that there can be some greater efficiency of operations. *Further, we strongly recommend that CSUCI forego its practice of creating unique operational solutions to match its unique mission and objectives by seeking out best practices from across the country, adapting*

effective practices to the CSUCI environment, and using these practices to enable and facilitate decision–making in a more timely manner.

One of the most apparent needs, and one that needs to be addressed by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, is the establishment of high-level indicators of institutional progress and achievement. Often called "dash board indicators," these measures need to reflect the institution's mission and objectives and provide to the President, the President's Cabinet, external constituents (including CSU and WASC), the UPACC, and the Assessment Council with simple, clear, and direct measures of progress on an annual basis in each of the key areas. The Team acknowledges the inherent difficulty of simplifying complex and seemingly endless measures of interest. However, it is necessary for any and all institutions to have beacons to guide progress and to establish pathways that depend on priorities. The clarification of these key indicators will require the institution to make judgments about how it will balance competing demands and respond to widely divergent calls for attention and resources. The last Review Team's concluding observation stated that "fledgling assessment efforts are hampered by a lack of coordination and professional support. There is simply *no center* [emphasis added] to the enterprise." The present Team notes progress and commends the efforts that have been made, but concludes that there is still no center. There may be other ways to demonstrate the institution's commitment and capacity, but in the absence of other demonstrated effectiveness measures, the Team will expect a set of key indicators to be in place for each critical area of institutional management, including most urgently the indicators of students' having met CSUCI's stated learning objectives at the time of graduation but also the measures necessary to ensure operational and fiscal integrity.

Accordingly, the Team makes the following recommendation:

Recommendation 4:

By the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, the system of collecting, analyzing, coordinating, and using data should be in place even if longitudinal data may not yet be available. Data need to support the mission and drive decision-making.

<u>Commitment to Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.4 – 4.8)</u>

At the Team's meeting with the President, he stated that CSUCI is a university of values and out of its values come the aspiration for excellence. As described throughout the report and experienced by the Team during the Visit, it is evident that the CSUCI Mission is indeed a "lived" mission, well understood by all and used as the cornerstone for decision-making. The commitment to learning and improvement permeates all units and levels.

It is clear that faculty, staff, and administrators are strongly committed to a culture of evidence. Assessment projects have been funded through the Provost's office and the Office of Faculty Development. The Smith Family Assessment Plan Preparation Program was critical in engaging faculty in working sessions to develop assessment plan blueprints for their degree programs. The Provost has asked each academic program area to identify an assessment coordinator who is given reassigned time to begin implementing student learning assessment. The President's appointment of a Special Assistant for Institutional Effectiveness is yet another indicator of the commitment to a culture of evidence.

CSUCI has made excellent progress in setting up policies and procedures for quality assurance. Curricular proposals are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, which also ensures that student learning outcomes are a part of all proposals. New

programs are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate, the administration, and the CSU Chancellor's Office. In addition, the Academic Planning Committee was established to review the academic master plan annually and to establish timelines for new degree or program development.

Program review will occur for the first time during AY 2006-2007, a process that is overseen by the Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC). As noted elsewhere in this report, however, *the Team recommends that the policies and procedures for this process be more clearly delineated to ensure both accountability and program improvement.*

The Team was told that student learning assessment would take place annually but would be reviewed within the context of the 5-year Program Review cycle. It will be difficult to maintain a culture of evidence and "close the loop" by using evidence for program improvement without more frequent reviews of student learning. *The Team encourages CSUCI to consider an annual or bi-annual process to examine program student learning outcomes and assign this authority and oversight to either the Assessment Council or PRAC.* The Division of Student Affairs has a well developed 24-month four-phase assessment process that could be used as a model to be adapted for academic units. A meaningful, manageable, and sustainable assessment process can occur when faculty are engaged in student learning assessment on a regular basis—gathering evidence of program learning and using it for program improvement.

The General Education Committee also contributes to quality assurance through its review of courses for GE designation and alignment with the CSUCI mission. The Team commends the plans and progress the committee has made but it too has much

work to do in gathering evidence and using it for program improvement.

Recommendation 1 (in Standard 2) describes the Team's expectations by the time of the

Educational Effectiveness Review.

The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) plays a critical role in educational

effectiveness. This unit is responsible for gathering and presenting data on student,

faculty, and staff demographics, application and enrollment statistics, retention and

graduation rates, and other data as required by IPEDS. It is also responsible for

administering and evaluating survey data including the CIRP and graduating senior

surveys. The Assessment Council has developed policies that have been adopted by the

President and require all units conducting institutional research to provide completed

reports to OIR and to inform the Assessment Council of their intention to conduct

surveys for institutional research purposes. These policies will provide coherence to

campus efforts for data gathering.

The Team commends OIR for the progress it has made in creating protocols and

gathering data. However, as the campus grows and initiates more ambitious assessment

efforts it will become increasingly difficult for this unit to respond in a timely fashion to

increasing requests. As described elsewhere in this document, key indicators need to be

developed and benchmarks need to be established to ensure that the institution has the

capacity to examine its educational effectiveness at all levels. *Therefore, the Team*

recommends that the University explore increasing the analytical and personnel capacity

of OIR. The Team's concerns regarding this matter are also expressed explicitly in

Recommendation 4.

"Fulfilling our Core Commitment to Capacity:" A Special Comment and Recommendation

The Team was impressed with both the institution's statement on fulfilling its core commitment to capacity (Part II of its Capacity and Preparatory Report—2005) and with our own observations of the institution's work. The efforts of faculty and staff to establish CSUCI not only as a university worthy of WASC accreditation but as a distinctive place of exceptional quality within its defined mission impressed and concerned the Team. The passion, commitment, and tireless energy of the members of this special academic community are apparent—even tangible—in every aspect of our observations. If the Team were grading for effort, this group of people would get an A+. But capacity requires more than effort and commitment. Some things simply cannot be achieved by determination and effort alone.

At no time did we hear a single faculty member, staff member, or student complain about the work and effort they are expending. There were honest and compelling responses to our frequent questioning and probing about sustainability and impact on the long-term health and capacity of so few people to do so much. But there was no whining or lamenting or transferring of responsibility to others. Given what is happening at CSUCI—and what needs to happen—we were, and remain, in awe. Despite our presenting repeated opportunities for faculty, administrative officers, staff, and students to make a claim for new resources or to fault someone—anyone—for not endowing them with all of the resources they might need to create a new campus, we did not receive a single request for money or special consideration or exemption from

expectations. Under the circumstances, this ethic and commitment require notice and comment.

Because of our responsibility to assess the capacity of the institution to meet the standards for WASC accreditation, we are compelled, therefore, to make a special recommendation:

Recommendation 5:

With full appreciation for the determination of faculty, staff, and administrative leaders to build a 21st Century university with only the resources and time they have available, the effort and cost required to begin a wholly new institution can never fully be recovered through enrollment funding and, therefore, we recommend that the State of California make a strategic investment of special funding at this critical stage of capacity-building to ensure that the vision for CSU Channel Islands can be realized.

The Team understands that this recommendation transcends the ability of CSUCI officials to implement it directly. Nonetheless, it is a necessary and important issue to be addressed directly and fairly as the State, the California State University system, and the people of the region being served by CSUCI create a new university. There are costs associated with starting any new enterprise, and these must be honestly assessed and addressed. We understand the urgent need to begin the campus, and we applaud the determination of the faculty, staff, and administration for undertaking this challenge without the investment of resources that are actually required to begin at a reasonable level of probable success. We also understand and appreciate the fact that CSU leaders have taken steps to protect CSUCI at a particularly challenging time fiscally in the State. Nonetheless, the need for an investment of start-up funding remains if CSUCI ever hopes to overcome the deficit it has created by undertaking necessary projects without adequate funding. There are significant issues related to infrastructure (information technology,

library, electrical systems, utility costs, and the like) that cannot adequately be covered from current operational budgets. There are special remodeling needs to adapt a wonderful facility from its original purposes to an academic mission. Space is at such a premium that without assistance in addressing these special remodeling projects, the capacity of the campus will be constrained physically despite all human efforts to adapt and cope. Most importantly, there is a need to assign faculty and staff time to the pressing business of beginning an institution, freeing them from fundamental duties—such as teaching—by allowing some temporary replacements. And, as recommended throughout this report, there should be funds to secure consultants who can help jump-start policies and procedures by bringing knowledgeable and experienced experts to CSUCI for substantive engagements with the faculty and staff to help adapt national best practices to the unique CSUCI environment and mission.

We have no doubt that the will of the faculty, staff and administration is such that a fully accreditable institution will be developed at CSUCI without special funding, but we also believe that the institution will be less than it might have been without an investment at this critical juncture in the institution's future. We urge the President to confer with the CSU System Chancellor regarding the best way to seek the investment of the State of California in the creation of CSU Channel Islands for the benefit of the citizens the University must serve.

SECTION III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CSUCI has experienced considerable growth and change since its inception in 2002. Efforts have been directed toward putting policies and procedures in place,

building infrastructure, and building community, all necessary components to creating a new campus with a clear vision and mission.

In the midst of all the activities required at the "start up" phase of a university, the Team finds the energy and commitment to CSUCI and its mission to be exceptional. The degree to which all of its members understand and believe in the values promulgated in the mission is unusual and noteworthy. Clearly this is a community dedicated to fulfilling CSUCI's commitment to student success and excellence.

The Team's advisory statements are italicized within the text. The Team's major findings and recommendations, located in bold throughout the text, fall into the following categories:

 Assessment. Considerable progress has been made in creating a culture of evidence, defining learning outcomes, and developing student learning assessment plans. However, the Team notes many areas for improvement. Assessment efforts need greater direction and coordination. General Education learning outcomes need to be clearly defined and measurable. In addition, gathering evidence and using it for program improvement is in the nascent stages and clear steps need to be taken by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review to ensure that evidence has been gathered to determine the extent of student learning at all levels. Finally, "dash board indicators" need to be developed that reflect the mission and educational objectives of CSUCI to provide clear and direct measures of progress in key areas. See Recommendations 1 (page 17) and 4 (page 41).

Committee Structures. The Team found the authority and responsibility of the University Planning and Coordinating Council, the President's Council, the Assessment

Council, and the Program Review and Assessment Council to be unclear. CSUCI need to re-examine its committee structure to ensure achievement of its mission. See Recommendation 3 (page 39).

Role of the Centers. The Team was unable to ascertain to its satisfaction the role of the Centers in curriculum development, faculty and student research, or student learning assessment. The Team recommends a more clearly defined structural role to ensure that the Centers promote the interdisciplinary mission assigned to them. See Recommendation 2 (page 27).

Special Funding. The Team was impressed and concerned about the efforts of faculty and staff to establish CSUCI as a university not only worthy of accreditation but also as a campus of exceptional quality as defined by its mission. Passion, commitment, and boundless energy, which the Team witnessed over and over, can only take a university to a certain point. To sustain these endeavors and insure that CSUCI fulfills all that the Team knows it is capable of achieving, we recommend discussion about special funds to increase the physical and human resources they deserve. See Recommendation 5 (page 45).

SECTION IV: PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW

When the WASC team returns to CSU Channel Islands in 2007, the Team will look for evidence of the effectiveness of the programs and structures of the campus described in the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. The Team offers the following advisements regarding how CSUCI might refine and improve its preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review:

Assessment. As described throughout this Report and as specifically delineated in Recommendations 1 and 4, the Team asks for evidence of student learning at all levels, with particular regard to using assessment results for program improvement. Evidence of the extent of student learning should be presented at the program level, within the General Education program, and how student learning has been assessed in relation to the CSUCI mission. In addition, the team asks that CSUCI document its progress toward developing key indicators of student learning and its preliminary plan for creating a central coordinating body for all assessment activities.

Committee Structures. The Team asks that CSUCI present a preliminary plan for describing clearly defined procedures and policies for its councils and committees. This plan should include an articulation of the oversight, responsibilities and authorities of each of these bodies, particularly in relation to student learning. In addition, the Team asks that the Program Review and Assessment Committee delineate its policies and procedures for the Program Review process to ensure that outcomes of the process lead directly to program improvement.

Role of the Centers. The Team asks that CSUCI present a preliminary plan for defining the role of the Centers in the lives of faculty. These Centers seem to be natural structures that could actively promote interdisciplinarity but unless their functions, responsibilities, and authority are clearly articulated CSUCI may have a more difficult time avoiding disciplinary silo structures.