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The review of the Division of Student Affairs’ system of assessment and Comprehensive
Program Review (CPR) process at California State University Channel Islands (CSUCI)
ocurred during February and March, 2009. Advance examination of relevant documents
was followed by a one-day site visit to CSUCI on February 27, 2009.

In order to understand better the approach to student learning undertaken by the division
of student affairs, it was helpful to meet during the onsite visit with the student affairs
leadership, directors, other staff, faculty, and the members of the President’s Assessment
Council. A subsequent telephone interview was held with the provost on March 4, 2009.
The commitment and engagement of President Commander Rush were appreciated, both in
his availability during the visit, and most especially, in his vision and decision to establish
the President’s Assessment Council with its ongoing support of student learning and
development.

A comprehensive Self-study Report with accompanying documentary evidence was
forwarded by the Division in advance of the campus visit (see table of contents for Self-
study Report and documents in Appendix A). In addition, an extensive number of reports,
manuals, studies, and publications related to assessment and the program review process
were available for review onsite (materials listed in Appendix B). The number and
comprehensiveness of the materials provided permitted a thorough understanding of the
infrastructure, process, training, and assessment results of the student affairs assessment
system and program review process as they have evolved to the present time. The
foresight and effort in gathering the information and the responsiveness to questions
and requests for additional materials were appreciated.

Student Affairs Comprehensive Program Review Process at CSUCI

The Student Affairs Comprehensive Program Review Process (CPR) consists of four
articulated phases which occur over a 36-month period:
1) **Preparatory Stage**, in which program staff completes readiness training and begins gathering materials for the self-study.

2) **Self-study Phase**, in which staff engage in a rigorous self-examination using the assessment standards and guidelines of the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education. *(Note: The CAS standards are nationally-available, peer-reviewed statements of good practice for the voluntary use of programs in student affairs. In practice, the standards tend to be used by divisions of student affairs that are the most highly professionalized and assessment-driven. The standards are quite useful in providing a context and comparison for program policies and practices.)*

In the self-study stage, the program under the guidance of the vice president and the ACE coordinator challenges itself to review its system of assessment and results for student learning. The self-study should identify strengths and weaknesses in both the assessment of learning and in the provision of effective services to CSUCI students. Each program is expected to write self recommendations for improvement and complete an action plan identifying timelines, resources needed, and persons assigned to complete action steps.

3) **The Site Review Phase**, in which a team representing a broad range of campus constituent groups from outside of students affairs, including a representative from the local community, reads the self-study and conducts a review to determine how well the program is meeting its goals and objectives with respect to student learning and development and effective service. The review team is expected to use the CAS standards to help it come to an evaluative judgment about such topics as the adequacy of learning resources and staffing, leadership, appropriate goals and objectives, professional development, campus and external relations, and most important, the results of the assessment of student learning and development.

4) **The Outside Professional Review Phase**, in which a national expert with experience in the program under review and possessing planning and assessment expertise, visits the campus to conduct an independent evaluation and review the program’s action plans. The outside reviewer is expected to evaluate the progress and effectiveness of the program and make recommendations in a written report to the vice president.
Introductory Evaluative Observations

The Division of Student Affairs has constructed a thoughtful and scholarly approach to conducting its quality improvement assessment of co-curricular programs. The process is predicated on the principle that student affairs staff are co-educators of students, working in partnership with faculty. While faculty are the recognized experts in intellectual development and knowledge attainment in their academic disciplines, student affairs claims its expertise in the realm of personal and interpersonal development. The collaboration of faculty and student affairs staff comes together in partnership under the rubric of whole person learning. This approach has strong corroboration from research findings.

Faculty have long-established assessment methodology at the course level and increasingly in the last decades, faculty have developed and refined systems of assessment at the program level. Student affairs as a profession, however, has been remiss in failing to design qualitative and quantitative assessment to obtain the empirical evidence to support the claims for student learning and development. Programs and services have been evaluated for satisfaction and sometimes for efficiency, but student affairs has lagged in conducting assessment of learning in the co-curricular environment. In failing to validate its claims for student learning, the profession has missed opportunities to align its work with academic affairs, address university mission and goals directly, and become more intentional in efforts to promote learning.

The division of student affairs at CSUCI therefore makes a significant contribution to the profession in implementing a comprehensive program review process that is centered so strongly on student learning and development. There are surprisingly few exemplars in the profession of student affairs for effective program review and assessment, although there is widespread interest and some beginning efforts. Once the system of program review is fully implemented at CSUCI, there will be a model from which other institutions can learn.

A major paradigm shift is required to re-orient student affairs staff from traditional approaches of program and service delivery to that of co-creators of the educational environment and facilitators of intentional learning experiences for students. At CSUCI, this shift was accomplished largely through a carefully-designed training program of some 30 hours in length and through the ongoing guidance of the vice president and ACE (Assessment and Co-curricular Education) coordinator. It was clear from the presentation of the student affairs directors to this reviewer on February 27 that the directors have learned from their training a new mental model for their work and that they also simultaneously had to unlearn more traditional ways of thinking about the purpose of their daily activities. The training has facilitated greater understanding of program goals and enabled directors to share approaches and learn from one another. The University is to be
commended for the conceptualization and implementation of the training that supports the professional development of its staff and facilitates the shift from service providers to educators. The ACE Coordinator is viewed by staff as the credible, knowledgeable, and supportive teacher in this process.

Finding: The CSCUCI training model developed by Dr. George Morten is best practice within the profession of student affairs. This reviewer recommends that the training model be documented for publication and its approach and materials shared with other universities.

The results of the assessment of student learning in each program are and will continue to be requisite to ongoing program improvement. Of equal importance at this point in CSUCI’s trajectory, however, is the collateral learning that shifts staff to co-participants in the facilitation of learning. There is evident generative energy and excitement in mastering the design of student learning opportunities and in understanding how to assess results and further align one’s work with University learning goals. Participating in this complex learning process is difficult. The student affairs directors who co-presented the comprehensive program review model are to be commended for their adoption of the model, willingness to put themselves in the stance of “The Learner,” current understanding of assessment, and the guidance they are providing to their own staff.

Observation: The following directors should be commended for their achievements:

- Damon Blue, University Registrar
- Cindy Derrico, Director of Housing and Residential Education
- Tracie Matthews, Director of Financial Aid
- Damien Pena, Director of Student Access, Orientation and Transition Programs
- Ginger Reyes, Director of Admissions and Recruitment

Observation: Also to be commended are Dr. Wm. Gregory Sawyer and Dr. George Morten for their leadership in prioritizing this work and for their insistence that putting learning first is the responsibility of everyone in an institution that prides itself on student centeredness. The collective continued progress on facilitating learning in student affairs will be marked by the results of the program reviews to come.

Review of the CPR using the Assessment Council’s Self-Study Review Elements

As requested, the evaluation of the comprehensive program review process follows the elements of the review rubric designed by the President’s Assessment Council. The placement of the Division of Student Affairs at this point in its development is indicated by highlighting in yellow with explanatory comments following each element.
Element 1: The administrative structure, staffing, and budgetary allocations in support of assessment in the division:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisonal Assessment Plan Element</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Structure, Staffing and Budgetary Allocation</td>
<td>Administrative assessment responsibilities loosely defined with staff duties unclear in some units. Budgetary requires unidentified.</td>
<td>Administrative responsibilities clearly identified within division and within most units. Budget and staff identified for assessment in most units.</td>
<td>Divisional administrative structure for assessment fully established. Staffing, training, and budget available in all division units.</td>
<td>Divisional administrative structure for assessment fully established. Staffing, training, and resources sufficient to sustain activities available in all division units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the self-study notes that many student affairs programs are as small as one or two staff members, the infrastructure model adopted for assessment is quite robust. The oversight of the process by the knowledgeable members of the Vice President of Student Affairs’ Assessment Council led by the vice president and ACE Coordinator provides guidance and quality assurance to division-wide efforts. The approach of bringing student affairs leadership across programs to serve on the Council creates greater awareness of the progress on assessment, facilitates knowledge sharing, and underscores the importance of the work effort. The formalized training program strengthens the relationships among directors and facilitates sharing of approaches. Linking the Student Affairs Assessment Council to the President’s Assessment Council through the participation of Dr. Morten further extends the opportunity to share what the Division is learning about learning.

To date, only one program review has been completed, and that was some years ago. There will be significantly greater challenge to the system that has been developed once the process and timeline of program review are fully implemented and more than one review is underway at the same time. A particular challenge will be to identify faculty to serve on and, especially, to chair the review committees. It is usually easier to induce staff participation on review teams.

Finding: Element 1 is highly developed at present. Recommendations are made for continuous improvement.

Recommendations:

1. Consider asking the director of institutional research to join the Vice President of Student Affairs Assessment Council to help review assessment design and analysis of results.
2. Find ways to shorten and streamline the period of time for the onsite review. The one onsite review that was completed took five months before a report was submitted, which is a considerable time commitment, especially for the faculty on the review team. Clarify that the role of the review team is to review the thinking of the program staff and make recommendations from their outside perspective; their role should not have to be to develop additional assessment evidence. One way to make it easier for the report to be written would be to provide a report template to the team chair that follows the CAS standards, makes possible the assignment of team members to different standards, and focuses the report on strengths, challenges and commentary.

3. Provide dedicated administrative staff support to the review team from the vice president’s office since faculty chairs cannot usually command flexible staff support.

4. Consider whether to combine the third and fourth stages of the review process by inviting the external reviewer to join the onsite review team in some capacity. The team would benefit from having expert knowledge about the program under review and the external reviewer could understand more readily the campus context. If budget is a problem, it is also possible to use the external reviewer as an offsite reviewer and commentator, connecting with the onsite review team through phone or video conference. The longer the third and fourth stages take, the more difficult it is to manage a more impacted schedule of one or more reviews each year. Perhaps this suggestion would help simplify the process.

5. Find ways to incentivize and reward onsite review team members, especially the faculty chair. One suggestion provided by the team chair of the disabilities program review was to arrange an appreciation and information lunch with the president and/or provost and vice president of student affairs. This suggestion is not only financially feasible but also informative for all concerned and could be easily implemented.

Element 2: The identification of the division and unit goals and their alignment with the University mission statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional Assessment Plan Element</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Goals and University Mission</td>
<td>Divisional goals under development within division’s strategic planning process.</td>
<td>Divisional goals developed. Division in the process of aligning goals with University mission.</td>
<td>Divisional goals developed and aligned with University mission. Goals disseminated to some units within the division.</td>
<td>Divisional goals developed and aligned with University mission. Goals are widely disseminated and evident across all units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Self-study Report provides a comprehensive comparison that reveals strong, direct alignment between the University Mission Pillars and the goals of the Division of Student Affairs. The only item that appeared to be missing from the student affairs goals was international students.

While not further reviewed, the self-study states that all student affairs units have program goals that are aligned with those of the Division and the University. The self-study also provides full rationale for additional program goals unique to each unit that address student needs relevant to that unit.

Finding: Element 2 appears to be highly developed with the addition and implementation of the Division’s self recommendations in the self-study.

Recommendation: If it is true, as stated during interviews, that there currently are not adequate resources to recruit, admit, and support international students, the University may wish to consider whether this goal belongs in the University goals at the present time. This recommendation falls somewhat outside of the scope of this review, but it seemed appropriate to highlight, given the intention of the assessment rubric.

Element 3: The development of measurable outcomes and assessment tools for divisional and unit goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes Assessment</td>
<td>Division developing relevant, observable and measurable outcomes.</td>
<td>Observable and measurable outcomes are developed for most divisional goals. Division in process of developing assessment tools corresponding to each outcome.</td>
<td>Observable and measurable outcomes and assessment tools are developed for all divisional goals. Division in process of developing methods for collecting and analyzing data.</td>
<td>Observable and measurable outcomes and assessment tools are developed for all divisional goals. A periodic timetable for the assessment of each outcome has been prepared and implemented. Division has collected and analyzed data for each outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The self study indicates that division units are in the process of developing their learning outcomes. A wide variety of assessment tools are referenced in the self study and many materials were available onsite for review. While time did not permit careful scrutiny of all of the tools, this reviewer has had opportunity to see additional assessment tools in other settings at conference presentations made by the ACE Coordinator.

Finding: Element 3 is under development and this reviewer agrees with the self study recommendations for continued guidance and training.
Element 4: The utilization of data and analysis to inform improvements in the division and within units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional Assessment Plan Element</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to Inform Improvements</td>
<td>Feedback loop under development.</td>
<td>Feedback loop established and implemented in some units.</td>
<td>Feedback loop established and operational within all units. Evidence and analysis are used to inform improvements as appropriate in most units.</td>
<td>Feedback loop established and operational within all units. Evidence and analysis are used to inform improvements. Division has documented assessment used to inform improvements in all units. Assessment structure reviewed periodically for effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was apparent in review of the disability services program review that data and analysis informed the self study and that many useful recommendations resulted from the review. Because the program review process is so nascent, and there is only the single program example that has been completed, it is difficult to determine the adequacy of existing feedback loops in the program review process.

The Self-study Report does provide a number of very significant examples of assessment informing recommendations and leading to changed practice within the Division, so it is clear that the concept of the feedback loop is well understood and acted upon. It is also clear that the Division is operating under evidence-based decision making, so commendations are in order for these examples.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to focus on designing programs and specifying outcomes that provide direct evidence of student learning and development (as well as indirect evidence).
2. Find ways to make available to the University, but also to the public, in lay persons’ terms, what CSUCI is learning about learning. In particular, learning results should be shared with students and parents at Orientation and on the website. Everyone in higher education is looking for good models of how to do this and CSUCI has the opportunity to make a significant contribution in this area.
Summative Comments and Recommendations
CSUCI Student Affairs Model of Assessment and Program Review

The Division of Student Affairs has appropriately concentrated its efforts thus far on building infrastructure and delivering training and professional development, so that staff understand and endorse the mental model of whole person development and are equipped to undertake assessment in their own programs. These efforts have been best practice. There are many examples of good assessment across programs.

The comprehensive program review process overall is in the development phase with one review having been completed five years ago and housing and residential education in the self-study phase at the present time. Ramping up the review process to full implementation will be a worthy challenge for the student affairs staff because to move to full implementation, it will be required for the Division to participate in advance planning, prepare program staff to undertake their reviews, guide the writing of the self studies, extend invitations and orient the review team, select and invite the external reviewer, respond to team reports, develop action plans, and simultaneously, manage multiple reviews at different stages in the 36 month review process. There will be many moving parts to manage in order to meet the division goals of a model of review that demonstrates validity, reliability, flexibility, and sustainability.

The success of the process will lie in the ability of the student affairs staff to conduct meaningful learning experiences for students, ask thoughtful questions of their efforts in the assessment process, manage effectively the complex multi-year program review process, and use the data and recommendations in constructive ways for improvement.

Some comment needs to be made here about the perceived isolation of student affairs assessment at CSUCI. There is evidence of a strong partnership relationship between the provost and the vice president for student affairs. There is also, however, frank acknowledgement that faculty do not seem to be very familiar with the role of student affairs in student learning, nor are they familiar with the commitment of the Division to assessment of that learning. The provost is to be commended for the position she has taken in beginning to break down this silo. She and the vice president for student affairs are also to be commended for their plans to co-present a paper on academic and student affairs collaboration at the annual WASC conference and for the plans to make more public the collaboration on learning in a poster for the library.

There may be a role for the President’s Assessment Council in helping CSUCI to understand research in the last two decades that undergirds such collaboration and the role that
university partnerships may take in facilitating integrated learning. A thoughtful academic-student affairs partnership for learning has several distinct advantages:

1. **Enhanced retention**: Research by Noel (1985) and Tinto (1993) indicate that non-cognitive variables like participation in co-curricular activities and support services better predict academic performance (as well as improving retention) and have a stronger predictive value than academic variables, such as SAT scores.

2. **Maximized potential of time spent outside the classroom**: In an influential Carnegie Foundation Report, Ernest Boyer noted, “As we looked at colleges it became clear that their most powerful influence is felt outside the classroom.” (Marchese, 1986, p. 7). Pascarella and Terenzini’s comprehensive synthesis of research on how college affects students concludes that students’ achievement and development were most strongly impacted by the interpersonal process of student-student, faculty-student and staff-student interactions and “the extent to which an individual student exploits the people, programs, facilities, opportunities, and experiences that the college makes available” (1991, pp. 610-611).

3. **Facilitated seamless and integrated learning**: Summative learning assessments are revealing that students often experience their learning to be disjointed and unconnected. Where student affairs and academic affairs have joined to help each another realize their educational objectives, a more coherent university curriculum may be experienced by students. Learning environments where the co-curriculum is articulated with the curriculum reveal logically consistent educational purposes, comprehensive policies and practices consistent with students’ needs and abilities, and a shared “ethos of learning.” (Kuh, et. al., 1991, p. 136)

4. **Shared resources and expertise**: Cross-functional, interdepartmental linkages enable educators inside and outside the classroom to help each other, build campus community, and share responsibility for educational quality and student success.

Two key reports of research on how institutions organize themselves for student learning and success were published in 2005. A study by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities examined twelve universities with high retention rates and another study by George Kuh and associates analyzed factors leading to student learning and success. The studies shared two strong conclusions: leadership from the top creates a critical culture for student success and persistence. That quality of engaged leadership CSUCI has. The second finding was that student affairs and academic affairs at the most successful institutions collaborated closely in reinforcing a culture and strategies that holistically improve student learning, success and persistence.

Some of the shared approaches that have proven to be effective facilitators of integrated student learning at other universities have not yet been fully explored by CSUCI; these
included shared participation in/responsibility for Orientation, robust First Year Experience programs, and university-wide experiential learning. Both student affairs and academic affairs need to own such opportunities jointly or they will not fully develop.

Student affairs staff can help academic affairs in encouraging student reflection on the relevance of classroom learning and its application to the world of work and community. Student affairs co-curricular programs should be planned to compliment and extend emphases in the curriculum. In addition, student affairs needs the support of academic affairs in coordinating, encouraging, and valuing student participation in co-curricular learning opportunities.

**Recommendations for enhancing student and academic affairs partnerships:**

**Beginning collaborations with the provost and vice president of academic affairs should be expanded and extended to include student affairs leadership and faculty.**

**Student affairs and academic affairs should explore shared learning outcomes and targeted learning programs for students.**

**Student affairs and academic affairs should partner to help students understand their strengths and opportunities as learners.**

**Student affairs should share with faculty results of case studies and best practice co-curricular learning results both at CSUCI and from other universities.**

**Student Affairs should be held to the same standards of assessment, accountability, and improvement for co-curricular learning as the faculty is held accountable for curricular learning.**

It was a pleasure to have this opportunity to work with CSUCI again and to learn from the many good things that are occurring under the excellent leadership of the University.
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Appendix B

Self-Study Exhibits Available On-Site

1. **Members of the Vice President for Student Affairs Assessment Council Members**: this set of exhibits include resumes of Assessment Council members:
   - Wm Gregory Sawyer, Vice President for Student Affairs
   - Ed Lebioda, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
   - George Morten, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
   - Jane Sweetland, Dean of Student Enrollment
   - Toni Rice, Special Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs

2. **Members of the President's Assessment Council and the Council's charge**: this set of exhibits include brief descriptions of the members of the President's Assessment Council and its charge:
   - Dennis Muraoka, Interim Associate Provost and Chair of PAC
   - Bob Bleicher, Professor of Education
   - Tia Clarke, Administrative Coordinator, Office of the President
   - Marti De La O, Director of Advancement and Foundation Operations
   - Caroline Doll, Director of Special Projects, Finance and Administration
   - Ed Nuhfer, Director of Faculty Development
   - Steve Lefevre, Associate Vice President for Academic Programs & Planning
   - Nelle Moffett, Director, Institutional Research & Assessment
   - George Morten, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

3. **Division Information and Staff Demographics**
   - Document 3A: Brief History of Student Affairs
   - Document 3B: Division Organization Chart
   - Document 3C: Staff Hire Dates
   - Document 3D: Student Guidebook
   - Document 3E: Division of Student Affairs Resource Guide
   - Document 3F: Division of Student Affairs General Information Sheet
   - Document 3G: Division of Student Affairs Strategic Plan 2002-2007

4. **Comprehensive Program Review (CPR)**
   - Document 4A: CPR Guide—this document describes the 36-month review process and provides detailed instructions for carrying out the four phase process;
   - Document 4B: Program Review Schedule—this is a table that shows the review dates for all division programs;
     - Phase-specific reports and documentation—these phase-specific documents include executive summaries, documentary evidence, and recommendations for improvements;
     - Document 4C: Preparatory Phase for Housing and Residential Education
     - Document 4D: Self-Study Phase for Recruitment and Financial Aid
     - Document 4E: Site-Review Phase for Disability Accommodation Services
     - Document 4F: Site-Review Phase Financial Aid (FA Site-Review was started but temporarily halted because of director's retirement; see letter included in this exhibit)
5. **Quality Improvement Reports**: These exhibits include survey and comparison information on three division programs. The results reported in these documents led to improvements in each of the following programs:
   - Document 5A: Housing and Residential Education Quality Improvement Reports
   - Document 5B: Career Development Services Quality Improvement Reports
   - Document 5C: Student Health Services Quality Improvement Reports

6. **Staff Training and Preparation**: These documents describe several training opportunities that enhance staffs’ abilities to fulfill the division’s mission;
   - Fall and Spring Staff Development Training— general training involving the entire division;
     o Document 6A: January 2009 Staff Training—this document is a copy of the presentation script for fall training. This training was a recap of the last 4 division trainings. It provides a good overview of division staff training since 2006;
     o Document 6B: Spring 2008 Staff Training: Living Out our Mission—this document, a PowerPoint presentation from division spring training 2008, offers insights into how the division views the role and function of the University’s mission in the work of Student Affairs.
     o Document 6C: CPR Staff Training Notebook: This document is used for training and preparation by directors and review committee members
   - Professional Development Workshops: several division staff members participated in a workshop done by Katherine Crowley and Kathi Elster, authors of the book, “Working with You is Killing Me”. The participating staff members developed a similar workshop and presented it to our staff.
     o Document 6C: A copies of staff workshop content page, goals, and strategies
   - Directors’ Training Seminar—train-the-trainer
     o Document 6D:
       o Directors Training Needs Assessment: Examples of Training Needs Assessment Survey
       o Document 6E: PowerPoint Presentation: a handout that summarizes the 6-step training model
       o Document 6F: Directors Training Seminar Manual: This is a training manual and workbook. It is used to guide directors through the six steps of program planning, implementation, and assessment
     o Document 6G: Seminar exams: examples of completed seminar exams
   - Document 6H: Staff Training Needs Assessment Rubric

   Inter-department staff training
   - o Document 6I: PowerPoint Presentation: copies of directors presentation on training their staff

7. **Assessment Data**: This group of exhibits include data collected to identify student needs and program satisfaction
   - Document 7A: NSSE Survey and Results
   - Document 7B: Student Union Data and Analysis
   - Document 7C: “Back to Basics” Leadership Development Training Data
   - Document 7D: Career Development Center Survey
8. **Learning Outcomes:** This group of exhibits document the division’s learning outcome imperative and some examples of learning outcomes developed by division programs.

- **Document 8A:** SLO Core Competency: This document describes the division’s plans to train all staff on developing learning outcomes.
- **Examples of learning outcomes:**
  - **Document 8B:** Orientation and Transition Program—this document describes this program and outlines its aims and learning outcomes.

9. **Program Improvements**

- **Document 9A:** Annual Reports: This group of exhibits includes all division annual reports since the division was started in 2002. These documents include information on the annual accomplishments of division programs.
- **Document 9B:** Mid-year Reports: this group of exhibits includes examples of division biannual reports for 2008. These documents include information of the most recent accomplishments of division programs.
- **Document 9C:** Sample Co-curricular Portfolio: The co-curricular portfolio serves as an official compilation of documentation of a student’s involvement and achievement in co-curricular activities and learning experiences. Students can demonstrate their co-curricular learning and proficiency by providing evidence of each co-curricular activity and organizing these documents into a single record of accomplishments. This exhibit includes several examples of co-curricular portfolios.
- **Document 9D:** Judicial Affairs Data and Statistic: These documents provide examples of improvements made in the way data was collected and reported for this program.
- **Document 9E:** WASC Capacity and Preparatory Report 2005: this document includes information on the Division of Student Affairs programs and services and its contributions to fulfilling the University’s mission.