



YEAR

2002

CALIFORNIA  
STATE  
UNIVERSITY,  
LONG  
BEACH



ACCOUNTABILITY



REPORT

OCTOBER 2002



# CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

## YEAR 2002 ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	3
Preamble .....	4
Indicator 1: Quality of Baccalaureate Degree .....	4
Indicator 2: Access to the CSU .....	11
Indicator 3: Progression to Degree .....	12
Indicator 4: Persistence and Graduation.....	13
Indicator 5: Areas of Special State Need .....	13
Indicator 6: Relations with K-12 .....	13
Indicator 7: Remediation .....	15
Indicator 8: Facilities Utilization .....	15
Indicator 9: University Advancement .....	16
Campus-Defined Indicator: Quality of Services to Students .....	17
Summary and Conclusions.....	22
Performance Area and Indicators .....	22



Office of the President  
California State University, Long Beach  
1250 Bellflower Boulevard  
Long Beach, California 90840-0115  
562/985-4121

October 15, 2002

Dr. David Spence  
Executive Vice Chancellor  
The California State University  
401 Golden Shore  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4210

Dear Dr. Spence:

I am happy to transmit to you the Year 2002 Accountability Report for California State University, Long Beach.

CSULB takes accountability seriously. This report contains a frank, thoughtful assessment of the available information. It was assembled by a broadly representative team of campus leaders organized by our Director of Strategic Planning, David Dowell. Although this report was prepared in response to an external mandate, we use the accountability process as a driver for our internal campus planning.

CSULB has a commitment to continuously improving the quality of all that we do for students. Faculty and staff have revised General Education, improved the quality of services to students, supported faculty efforts to apply technology, developed strong partnerships with our neighboring public schools and more. The results of these efforts are visible in the accountability data on student preparation, retention, progress to degree and satisfaction with the campus.

CSULB is a thriving campus that has become a magnet for students. We are proud to be “a university of choice for talented, diverse students.”

Thank you for this opportunity to showcase some of our efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert C. Maxson".

Robert C. Maxson  
President

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2002, California State University, Long Beach continues to be one of the most sought-after campuses in the CSU system, receiving a disproportionately large percentage of new applications to the CSU system.

Based on a 2002 visit reaffirming full accreditation, a team from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges recognized the dramatic improvements evident on the campus in the past decade. For quite a few years, the university has been focusing on fundamentals of academic quality and services to students. A reformed General Education program has been fully implemented. As part of that reform, CSULB resequenced courses to ensure that students acquire fundamental skills early and allocated resources to ensure that students can get needed courses in a timely manner. Departments have created learning outcome goals and have begun the work of assessing student skills and knowledge. The campus has a range of successful learning communities and other support programs for students, especially for first-year students. A continued focus on customer service catapulted CSULB student ratings of campus services to a lead position in the most recent survey of Student Needs and Preferences (SNAPS).

CSULB has a campus-wide commitment to a vigorous partnership with surrounding school districts, especially the large, diverse Long Beach Unified School District. Work with eight key feeder high schools supported by the California Academic Partnership Initiative has been vigorous and productive. The partners have focused on improving student readiness for college and the data show evidence of improving student preparation. The reformed Integrated Teacher Education Program has improved quality while expanding the flow of students so that the campus has significantly exceeded its current goals for teacher preparation.

Rapidly rising enrollment is a mission-critical concern. CSULB has implemented all available means of expanding capacity, including a revision to policies on course scheduling to more efficiently utilize facilities, especially Friday classes. In fall 2002, the campus implemented impactation for the freshman class. Despite these measures, enrollment has exceeded the campus physical capacity and California Master Plan maximum size. As a consequence, the campus is examining options for limiting the enrollment of transfer students. As plans for limiting enrollment are carried out, the campus continues its long-standing commitment to maintain the student diversity that so invigorates the campus climate.

California State University, Long Beach is a healthy, thriving campus that has become a magnet for students. Quality education is the “bottom line” for a university and CSULB is proud of its achievements.

## PREAMBLE

Providing the highest quality education for a diverse student population is the primary mission for California State University, Long Beach. The CSU Accountability Process provides a useful framework for assessing the goals and objectives which comprise that mission.

This second CSULB Accountability Report describes the processes and principles that our university uses to assess progress toward CSU and campus goals. As requested, this report provides a narrative regarding the first indicator, quality of undergraduate degree programs. For indicators 2 through 9, commentaries on data compiled by the Chancellor's Office provide contextual information and interpretation for each respective indicator.

One campus-specific area is included in this report: quality of services to students. This reflects a now decade-old campus commitment to ensure quality student services. Our voluntary inclusion of this indicator is evidence that we intend to hold ourselves accountable for the services we provide to students. A second campus-specific area—key indicators of quality undergraduate education—will be addressed in a future report.

This report was prepared by a group broadly representative of the campus including: Wayne Dick, chair of the Academic Senate; David Dowell, director of Strategic Planning and vice provost for Enrollment (campus accountability coordinator); Dorothy Goldish, dean of Undergraduate Studies; Jean Houck, dean of Education; Margaret Merryfield, General Education coordinator; Alan Nishio, associate vice president for Student Services; Ronald A. Lee, associate vice president for Information Management and Analysis; Keith I. Polakoff, associate vice president for Academic Affairs; and Michelle Saint Germain, Assessment coordinator.

Although this report is the result of an external mandate, CSULB uses these indicators to monitor success in meeting its own goals. The data were also used in our recent process of accreditation with the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. The campus aims to continue to develop and refine the processes and measures used to assess progress. CSULB is pleased to offer this report.

## INDICATOR 1: QUALITY OF BACCALAUREATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

**Indicator 1.1 Descriptions of processes for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in General Education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree.**

### LEARNING OUTCOMES IN GENERAL EDUCATION

In spring 2000, CSULB's accountability report described the planned assessment process for general education learning outcomes. The campus elaborated on these ideas in March 2001 by establishing the following goals for the 2002-03 academic year:

1. The General Education Governing Committee [GEGC], in consultation with the departments that teach the courses, will determine measurable student learning outcomes for the four Foundation Areas of General Education at CSULB (written English, oral communication, critical thinking and mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning).
2. The GEGC, in consultation with the Assessment Committee, will determine the kind(s) of assessment for each of the student learning outcomes proposed for the Foundation Areas of General Education (CSULB Campus Accountability Goals, 2001, [www.csulb.edu/web/projects/planning/Acct\\_Goals\\_2001.htm](http://www.csulb.edu/web/projects/planning/Acct_Goals_2001.htm)).

These goals largely have been accomplished. Student learning outcomes in the four Foundation areas have been mapped out by faculty teaching in each of the areas and reviewed by GEGC. In addition to identifying the learning outcomes, each group also was asked to identify the pedagogical strategies that could be used to develop the skills in question and to suggest ways that instructors in classes beyond these Foundations could continue to expand and develop these particular skills.

The full texts of these documents, which include discussions of appropriate pedagogy and assessment, are available at <http://www.csulb.edu/~senate/skills.html> (Position Statements on Foundational Skills). The outcomes in each area are listed next. Each set of outcomes has its own rhetorical style, and some groups chose to present their outcomes in terms of what each Foundation course in the discipline would do, rather than using the typical language of student

learning outcomes. However, in each case the expectations for students are clearly stated.

### *Defining Learning Outcomes for the Four Foundation Areas*

Learning goals have been developed for all four of the Foundation General Education areas of written English, oral communication, critical thinking, and mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning. The listings below summarize these goals.

#### Written Communication Learning Goals

##### 1. Content

- Topic and purpose are clear.
- The essay is focused.
- The essay responds to all aspects of the assignment.
- Claims are supported with appropriate reasons and evidence.
- Supporting details are relevant and necessary.
- Information provided is accurate and consistent with the original sources.

##### 2. Organization

- The essay is coherent.
- Ideas and support are presented in an order appropriate for the writer's purpose.
- All parts of the essay relate to the overarching focus and purpose.
- Transitional devices of some kind guide readers through the text.
- Important ideas are given appropriate emphasis.
- The ending brings the essay to closure by summing up, restating, commenting, evaluating, or by some other appropriate method.

##### 3. Reasoning

- The significance of the topic is clear.
- When appropriate, assumptions are recognized and made explicit.
- Analysis is logical, consistent and well-developed.
- Any visual material is integrated with the analysis.
- Conclusions follow logically from claims and the evidence presented.

##### 4. Rhetoric

- The genre is appropriate for the task and for the writer's purpose.
- The form of the essay is appropriate for the writer's purpose.
- The writer demonstrates awareness of audience.
- The writer acknowledges, respects and represents

accurately other points of view.

- Tone and voice are appropriate for the topic, task and audience.

##### 5. Conventions

- The writing demonstrates control of sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, spelling and mechanics; errors do not impede meaning to any significant degree nor affect the reader's view of the credibility of the writer.
- Sources are appropriately cited and identified according to conventional formats, such as MLA, APA and the Chicago Manual of Style.

#### Oral Communication Learning Goals

1. How to appropriately and strategically structure and organize messages (verbal and nonverbal symbols that have meaning) for ease of audience comprehension.

2. How to distinguish among the cognitive, affective and aesthetic content of messages (the levels at which meaning is conveyed).

3. How to deliver verbal and nonverbal messages effectively (the competent integration of content/knowledge with performance/enactment).

4. How to utilize visual, aural, and media aids appropriately.

5. How to analyze and adapt messages to specific audiences (audience analysis) and for specific contexts and occasions.

6. How to solicit receiver or audience feedback to check the accuracy and interpretation of messages.

7. How to engage in speaker self-assessment for the purpose of improving oral communication skills.

8. How to listen actively and analytically as a receiver or audience.

9. How to avoid unethical, non-credible communication practices (what should or should not be done).

10. How to reduce students' communication apprehension and enhance students' communicator confidence.

#### Learning Outcomes for Critical Thinking

Abilities of the ideal critical thinker:

(The first five items involve clarification.)

1. To identify the focus: the issue, question, or conclusion

2. To analyze arguments
3. To ask and answer questions of clarification and/or challenge
4. To define terms, judge definitions and deal with equivocation
5. To identify unstated assumptions  
(The next two involve the basis for the decision.)
6. To judge the credibility of a source
7. To evaluate and judge evaluation reports.  
(The next three involve inference.)
8. To deduce and judge deductions
9. To induce and judge inductions
  - a. To generalizations
  - b. To explanatory conclusions (including hypotheses)
10. To make and judge value judgments  
(The next two are metacognitive abilities involving supposition and integration.)
11. To consider and reason from premises, reasons, assumptions, positions and other propositions with which one disagrees or about which one is in doubt—without letting the disagreement or doubt interfere with one's thinking (“suppositional thinking”)
12. To integrate the other abilities and dispositions in making and defending a decision  
(The next four are auxiliary critical thinking abilities; having them is not constitutive of being a critical thinker.)
13. To proceed in an orderly manner appropriate to the situation, for example,
  - a. To follow problem-solving steps
  - b. To monitor one's own thinking
  - c. To employ a reasonable critical thinking checklist
14. To be sensitive to the feelings, level of knowledge and degree of sophistication of others
15. To employ appropriate rhetorical strategies in discussion and presentation (orally and in writing)
16. To employ and react to “fallacy” labels in an appropriate manner

### Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning Learning Outcomes

While it is expected that [specific] courses will differ in content, it is also expected that the following common elements will appear in all courses meeting the quantitative reasoning requirement:

1. Foremost, since the category is quantitative reasoning, a course should enhance the student's sense of number. This means, among other things, that when exposed to a piece of quantitative data, whether numerical, graphical or geometrical representation, the student should develop enough intuitive insight on what that data represents and its meaning.
2. The course also should enhance the student's ability to model reality by mathematical or statistical quantitative methods. The ability to model requires several ingredients:
  - The skill to translate real world situations into mathematical language and symbolism.
  - The skill of mathematical manipulation and computation in order to solve the posed problem.
  - The skill to interpret the mathematical results back into the real world situation.
3. Finally, the course should enhance to some degree the student's appreciation of mathematical sciences, their proper place in culture and history and their omnipresence in modern civilization.

### *Defining Learning Outcomes beyond the Foundation Courses*

The CSULB General Education policy defines key skills expected of students at each program level. Beyond the Foundation, which students are expected to complete in the first three semesters at CSULB (or prior to transfer), students take Explorations and Capstone general education courses. Explorations encompass 30 units of breadth requirements in the natural sciences, social sciences, arts, humanities and self-integration, and are taken following (in some cases concurrent with) the Foundation. The nine required Capstone units must be taken after the student reaches upper division standing, and also require the Foundation plus at least some portion of Explorations. Students also use Capstone courses to complete remaining breadth requirements.

Each stage is expected to continue to develop Foundation skills, and to add additional skills and attributes to the student's general education experience. At the Explorations level, these skills include ethical reasoning, analytical reading, creativity, respect for differences, awareness of

other cultures, questioning of stereotypes, the values of citizenship, negotiating skills, and other attributes useful in a diverse society. The Capstone focuses on development of “advanced college skills,” including synthesis and application of knowledge, analysis, critique and research.

Finally, the General Education Policy (<http://www.csulb.edu/~senate/Policies/00-00.html>) describes the overall General Education objectives in its introduction. These objectives, as well as the skills listed above, have not yet been cast into student learning outcomes for the general education program. Instead, course developers have been asked to create learning outcomes for their own Explorations and Capstone courses, using guidelines provided by the GEGC and paying special attention to the skills and attributes described above. It has become a campus priority to decide upon a set of core learning objectives for the general education program, and to develop assessments to find out how well the program is doing and to provide the necessary information to allow continued improvement.

To that end, the Provost has convened a Task Force on General Education Effectiveness charged with developing these program-level learning outcomes and designing assessment strategies. The task force is working in the fall 2002 semester and is scheduled to report to the campus community early in the spring 2003 semester, with the goal of being able to implement such measures in 2003-04. This timeline is consistent with the accountability goals developed by the campus, which calls for the establishment of learning outcomes and assessments beyond the Foundation areas by 2004-05.

The task force includes representation from individuals involved in governance of the general education program, experts in assessment, faculty members from Foundation and other general education areas and faculty members from departments that are “consumers” of general education. Moreover, the task force is building on two campus retreats in the spring of 2002. The first was the General Education Winter Institute, at which individuals from across the campus met to draft outcomes and criteria for each of the breadth areas within the General Education program. Using these drafts as a starting point, outcomes in these areas will be refined over the coming year. The second activity was a two-day retreat in which Dr. Peggy Maki, director of Assessment for AAHE, worked with a group of faculty to begin drafting overall student learning outcomes for General Education, starting with policy language, and to take participants through the steps of the “assessment cycle.” The work done in these venues will inform the work of the task force.

### *Measuring Learning Outcomes of General Education*

In all Foundation areas, assessment activities to measure learning outcomes are underway. In addition, each of these areas has worked hard to ensure consistency of standards across the many sections of these courses.

*Composition (Area A1):* The composition program has a designated composition coordinator, who coordinates both the general education-level writing courses and the pre-baccalaureate courses. All composition faculty receive the Composition Faculty Handbook, which includes student learning outcomes and required assessments. These instructors meet prior to the semester to discuss the learning outcomes and writing standards, and subsequently during the semester. At the follow-up session, instructors read (unmarked) anonymous examples of student writing in the “A” to “F” range, assign scores and then explain their scoring.

Beginning with the fall 2002 semester, a second assessment session has been added in which the instructors look at examples of “borderline” (“C” and “D” level) papers and determine whether the outcomes have been met. Some instructors use portfolio evaluation in their own classes; this practice is encouraged but not required. In addition, the composition coordinator plans to add a requirement for an in-class mid-term and final exam. A group of instructors are developing essay prompts to be based on a common reading; initially it will be administered over several sections and scored by the team of instructors. The results from this pilot project will be used to develop a similar requirement for all sessions.

*Oral Communication (Area A2):* The required student performance measures for all oral communication classes include a minimum of four (and typically six) demonstrations of oral communication proficiency, plus an end-of-the-semester assignment that assesses a student’s competence in integrating oral communication skills. The Communication Studies Department has been actively evaluating the efficacy of its general education offerings and modifying the program accordingly. Using standards developed by the National Communication Association, the department collected data two years ago in its four introductory communication classes (Public Speaking, Interpersonal Communication, Voice and Articulation and Small Group Discussion) to determine the degree to which content and skills proficiencies emerged from each of the classes.

What emerged from pre- and post-test measures of students’ self-reports, and through a more qualitative project that

had communication faculty view videotapes of students' "capstone" speech in the public speaking course, was that all students' oral communication proficiencies improved regardless of the course they took. However, students in interpersonal communication and small group discussion classes were not spending enough time developing public/oral communication skills, and in the public speaking class, students' persuasive speeches were weak. In response to these findings, the department has made these changes:

1. Added two public speaking assignments in the Interpersonal Communication classes that integrated interpersonal theory with public speaking opportunities.
2. Added two major public speaking assignments in the Small Group Discussion class.
3. Provided all interpersonal and small group teachers with a packet of information and an instructional unit on teaching public speaking in interpersonal and small group classes.
4. Completely restructured the unit in the public speaking class on persuasion so students would be challenged to apply these concepts more fully in their required persuasive speech.
5. Created Beach Board "course" sites for three of the A.2 courses—public speaking, small group discussion and interpersonal communication. The purpose is for all teachers of these classes to share instructional materials, and also provide students with Web-based information.
6. Assigned a faculty member to supervise and coordinate the content and instruction of each different course. (This is in addition to the coordinator of teaching associates who supervises all teaching associates on a regular basis.)
7. Implemented a persuasive speaking competition on campus each semester. All students in public speaking classes (or any other CSULB student) can compete in a one-day speech tournament. This provides students with an opportunity to move skills outside the classroom.

In addition, several additional projects are underway.

1. With the help of an assessment grant, two faculty members will develop an assessment plan for the department. One of their tasks will be to reassess the A.2 courses to see if the changes have produced demonstrable improvements.

2. The department continues to pursue a longer-term goal of using an entrance survey to assess students' oral communication proficiencies for the purpose of placement.
3. The department is revising (and adding more sections of) the Voice and Articulation course so that it can function as a public speaking class for students for whom English is a second language.

*Critical Thinking (Area A3):* Several departments share responsibility for the critical thinking requirement, but the two major providers of critical thinking courses are the Departments of Psychology and Philosophy. However, all departments have provided the GEGC with an explanation of how their critical thinking courses include the student learning outcomes described above, and how those outcomes will be assessed. Current assessment-related activities in the Psychology and Philosophy Departments are included as illustration.

The Psychology Department has been developing a comprehensive portfolio of the PSY 130 - Critical Thinking (CT) course. The portfolio contains the standard course outline, statements of teaching philosophy, notes on instructional approaches, sample course syllabi and a wide variety of assignments. The purpose of the portfolio is threefold. First, in its entirety, the portfolio serves as a training/teaching tool for new faculty teaching the CT course or other faculty wishing to incorporate CT skill development into their classes. In this way, too, the portfolio acts as a library for reference materials that can be continually updated. Second, the portfolio is a guidepost for the faculty coordinator across this multi-sectioned course to ensure conformity of instructional standards among all faculty. Third, the portfolio is intended to provide a skeleton for more formal assessment activities. To this point, roundtable faculty discussions have centered on course material improvement based on analysis of the CT principles these materials are intended to convey.

In the Philosophy Department, consistency across sections is managed by having instructors share syllabi and meet as a group during the semester. For the fall 2002 semester, all instructors are implementing an assessment exercise to measure two elements of critical thinking: argument recognition and expression. This exercise follows a pre-and post-test model.

Early in the semester students are given a reading that contains an argument that students in a freshman-level class could reasonably be expected to grasp. They are asked to

state the argument, if they think the passage contains one, as clearly and succinctly as possible. This assignment can be given as part of the course grade or as extra credit.

The papers are evaluated by a team of graders, who record a score and return the papers to the individual instructor. A similar assignment will be made near the end of the semester (using a different passage of similar difficulty). The department will then evaluate the results of this exercise to determine whether students made measurable progress in these critical thinking skills.

*Mathematics (Area B2):* The Department of Mathematics offers all courses at CSULB that meet the B2 Foundation requirement. While these courses differ considerably in content and in many cases were originally designed to meet the needs of specific majors, they all share the objectives listed above. In order to provide consistency within each course, the department has standard course outlines for each; all instructors must follow the outlines for the courses they teach. Quantitative reasoning skills are developed through extensive practice in problem-solving by the students and extensive feedback from instructors. Assignments and test questions are designed to require students to demonstrate their skills. The emphasis across the general education offerings is on value added by particular courses rather than a single standard, a necessity given that some students begin with calculus, while others are not required to go beyond college algebra.

The department is currently engaged in a major project to determine whether the use of WebWorks, an online course management system that allows students to complete homework on the Web and receive immediate feedback, will produce learning gains. Studies comparing traditional and WebWorks sections of several general education courses are underway.

*Other areas:* Over the last several years, the GEGC has reviewed more than 200 courses for inclusion in the General Education program; each course proposal has included its own plan for assessment of course knowledge and skills. When these courses are next reviewed (the cycle is five years), the results of these assessment plans will be a major part of the review. Some departments have already made remarkable progress; for example, see the section of CSULB's WASC Self Study that discusses supporting evidence for educational effectiveness ([http://www.csulb.edu/projects/wasc/Part\\_3/Part-3.html](http://www.csulb.edu/projects/wasc/Part_3/Part-3.html)). In particular, the Department of Political Science, which is responsible for the government requirement (D.1.b), has done an excellent job of first

defining student learning outcomes and then embedding assessments of those outcomes in the required course.

However, the major immediate task will be to carry the work of the Task Force on General Education Effectiveness to conclusion.

## OUTCOMES IN THE MAJORS

Educational effectiveness activities have continued to gain momentum across the CSULB campus. These activities have been supported by several initiatives, including those of the campus Assessment Committee and Assessment coordinator, the instructional innovation and educational enhancement grants, and the individual colleges and departments. Recently, those initiatives have focused more specifically on student learning outcomes in the majors.

CSULB offers undergraduate majors in more than 75 areas through 61 departments organized into seven colleges. For the 2002-03 academic year, the university has three goals concerning outcomes in the majors:

1. All departments will determine at least five measurable student learning outcomes for the majors in all the degree programs in their department;
2. All departments, in consultation with the Assessment Committee, will choose and start implementing at least one, and preferably two, or more kinds of assessment to determine how well their majors have met the student learning outcomes;
3. All departments will identify procedures to utilize assessment results to guide improvements in pedagogy, curriculum and academic support for the undergraduate degree programs that they offer (CSULB Campus Accountability Goals, 2001, [www.csulb.edu/web/projects/planning/Acct\\_Goals\\_2001.htm](http://www.csulb.edu/web/projects/planning/Acct_Goals_2001.htm)).

As part of its responsibilities, the campus Assessment Committee conducted a survey of all departments in Spring 2002 to gather information on what departments were doing to meet these goals, and to ascertain how best to support them in their endeavors. An analysis of the survey data revealed that the university has already made substantial progress, both in the formation of working groups and procedures to meet these goals and in the elaboration of specific outcomes.

Several colleges have established assessment committees and/or assessment coordinators with their own internal resources. This effort, in addition to the campus Assessment Committee of the Academic Senate and the half-time campus assessment coordinator sponsored by the Division of Academic Affairs, has assisted the progress. These college committees and coordinators are providing valuable leadership, resources, coordination and support to both college-level and departmental efforts. Individuals in various departments also are assuming key leadership roles.

A majority of departments have identified measurable student learning outcomes for majors in degree programs. Many of the degree programs that have been accredited by external bodies already have identified learning goals, but many other programs which are not traditionally accredited also have completed this task. The College of Liberal Arts has taken the lead in this area, establishing a Web page ([www.csulb.edu/colleges/cla/assessment\\_goals.htm](http://www.csulb.edu/colleges/cla/assessment_goals.htm)) that gathers in one place the student learning outcome goals for majors in degree programs in the college.

As could be expected, a wide range of student learning outcomes has been identified for the many and diverse undergraduate majors offered at CSULB. However, some common themes emerge again and again. One theme is that students are expected to demonstrate mastery of the knowledge base of the discipline; another is that students are expected to demonstrate skilled application of that knowledge in practice. These application skills build on the learning outcomes identified above for General Education, such as written and oral communication, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning.

Examples of these two themes are provided by the student learning outcome goals of the two departments cited below:

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering:

1. An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science and engineering.
2. An ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data.
3. An ability to design a system, component, or process to meet desired needs.
4. An ability to function on multidisciplinary teams.
5. An ability to identify, formulate and solve engineering problems.

6. An understanding of professional and ethical responsibilities.
7. An ability to communicate effectively.
8. The broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context.
9. A recognition of the need for, and an ability to engage in, life-long learning.
10. A knowledge of contemporary issues.
11. An ability to use the techniques, skills and modern engineering tools necessary for engineering practice.

Department of Religious Studies:

1. Majors will gain an adequate initial knowledge of the beliefs, practices and social forms of various religious traditions.
2. Majors will achieve a deeper knowledge of at least one major religious tradition.
3. Majors will attain a synthetic overview of religion, an understanding of those things religions share in common.
4. Majors will know and be able to use effectively all established methodological approaches to the study of religion.
5. Majors will know the intellectual and institutional history of the discipline, both its past successes and unresolved problems.
6. Majors will be able to use language effectively and think critically.

Some departments also have made progress toward the next goal of choosing and implementing at least one kind of assessment to determine how well their majors have met the student learning outcomes. Departments have identified a broad range of assessments, from nationally normed standardized tests to locally developed instruments; from formative to summative measures; and from particularistic to holistic measures.

The College of Business Administration is adopting a college-wide approach by implementing a number of assessments. The first is a standardized test given to all business majors in their first semester as juniors and again in their last semester as seniors. The second is a survey of employers, asking them to identify and rank the 10 most desired skills in new employees. The third is an alumni satisfaction survey asking how well the college prepares students for employment. Similar strategies and instruments also have been adopted on a departmental level in other colleges.

Additional assessment instruments include such measures as:

- Input from department advisory committees;
- Reports of student performance on statewide licensing examinations;
- Reviews of student portfolios;
- Departmental self-studies for both external accreditation and/or internal program review;
- Student evaluations of instruction;
- Reviews of final products from Capstone courses;
- Surveys of supervisors of recently employed graduates;
- Exit surveys of graduates;
- Evaluations of interns by supervisors;
- Student self-assessments through logs or journals.

In the CSULB 2000 Accountability Report, no programs had successfully “closed the loop” by completing all three of the goals referenced above (defining outcomes, measuring outcomes, and using the results to improve performance). At this point, however, a number of departments have identified procedures to utilize assessment results to guide improvements in pedagogy, curriculum and academic support for the undergraduate degree programs that they offer, and several have conducted at least one iteration of this process.

The Department of Nursing has made the most progress, having begun their process in 1993 and having refined it through the extensive experience they have gained. Nursing has defined seven highly detailed student learning outcome objectives for their majors and has adopted a wide variety of assessment measures, including pass rates on licensing exams. Finally, the department has a coordinated assessment strategy that involves on an annual basis:

1. Gathering the data from the assessment measures;
2. Delivering the data to the undergraduate committee for analysis;
3. Annual reporting of the analysis to the council of committee chairs;
4. Presentation of action items to the annual faculty meeting;
5. Adoption and implementation of recommended actions.

Academic assessment has been given a high priority at CSULB, and the campus is actively responding. With the high priority assigned to this area by the new leadership in the Division of Academic Affairs, the campus expects to effectively address the goals for 2002-03 set forth in Performance Area 1: Quality of Baccalaureate Degree Programs.

## INDICATOR 2: ACCESS TO THE CSU

**Indicator 2.1: The number of the following who applied to the university and were admitted: (a) first-time freshmen and (b) upper-division CCC transfers.**

**Indicator 2.2: For campuses that were impacted or had impacted programs, the number of the following eligible persons who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted: (a) first-time freshmen,\*\* and (b) upper-division CCC transfers.\*\***

**Indicator 2.3: For campuses that were impacted or had impacted programs, the number of the following eligible persons who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted, but who were admitted to another CSU campus: (a) first-time freshmen,\*\* and (b) upper-division CCC transfers.\*\***

During the period of this report, CSULB continued to grow at a rapid and, indeed, accelerating rate. For the two-year period of 1997-99, FTES averaged 20,574, an increase of 5.49 percent over the previous two-year period. For the years 1999-2001, FTES averaged 22,659, a two-year increase of 10.13 percent. For the years 2001-03, FTES is projected to average 25,600, a two-year increase of almost 13 percent. This accelerating growth has occurred despite a progressive shortening of the time frame within which students may apply. By 2000-01, first-time freshmen were allowed to apply only during the initial filing period; during the spring admission cycle all undergraduate applicants were similarly restricted. Nevertheless, the number of applications has continued to rise.

During 2000-01 and even in 2001-02, CSULB offered admission to all fully eligible undergraduate applicants who filed within the established deadlines. With campus enrollment approaching the limits imposed by its physical facilities, however, it was readily apparent that this practice would not continue much longer. Not only has the number of qualified applicants been growing, but also a coordinated effort to strengthen the General Education program, improve academic advising and enhance communication with enrolled students has yielded a marked improvement in retention rates, whether measured between the freshman and sophomore years or overall. With a higher percentage of current students returning each fall, the number of new students

\*\* Regularly admitted students only.

who can be accommodated has been reduced below what it otherwise would have been.

After enrolling a record-breaking freshman class of 4,517 in fall 2001 (this freshman class exceeded the previous record by more than 1,000), the campus moved immediately to implement the authorization it had already received to make the freshman class an impacted category. The number of upper-division transfers enrolling each year also has increased rapidly, from 3,987 in 1997-98 to 4,552 in 1999-2000 and to 5,109 in 2001-02, a growth of 28.14 percent in just four years (these figures include returning upper-division students). Consequently, the campus is now engaged in revising the way it handles program impaction.

CSULB has always differed from most other CSU campuses in the way it handles program impaction. The campus community is strongly of the opinion that it is not sound academic policy to ask first-time freshmen to declare a major before they have had any exposure to collegiate-level study. Program impaction, therefore, is implemented only at the point of entry into upper-division courses. Previously, CSULB also has promoted access by offering campus admission to all CSU-eligible applicants, even those who do not meet the supplemental criteria for admission into an impacted program they have designated on their applications. That is the reason no students are reported as having been denied admission after failing to qualify for an impacted program. Beginning with the fall 2003 application cycle, this practice will change. CSULB will henceforth require upper-division transfer students to indicate their choice of a major on their applications. Those who cannot be accommodated in an impacted major will be asked to select an alternative, non-impacted major or a different CSU campus. Similarly, CSULB's own lower-division students will be required to select a major by the time they complete 60 units of study. If they apply unsuccessfully to an impacted program, they will have to select a different major, because they will not be allowed to remain in the undeclared category.

The campus hopes that this revised approach to program impaction will stabilize the number of upper-division students enrolling each year. The campus stopped accepting applications from lower-division transfer students in spring 2001, so it has now implemented all of the available enrollment controls for upper division short of impaction. If enrollment does not stabilize, there will be no alternative but to develop a plan for campus-wide impaction of the upper-division transfer applicant pool.

## INDICATOR 3: PROGRESSION TO DEGREE

### Indicator 3.1 First year continuation rates

- a. First-time freshmen\*\*
- b. Community college transfers\*\*

### Indicator 3.2 Upper division units

- a. Junior CCC transfers\*\*
- b. Native FTF\*\*

CSULB has a comprehensive first-year experience program for first-time freshmen. The program is a cooperative effort among all campus operating divisions and has been under continuous review and development since the early 1990s. It features mandatory academic advising for the first two semesters, the development of learning communities, a restructured General Education program that requires completion of the Foundation skills courses within the first 36 units, and the scheduling of enough sections of courses appropriate for entering students at varying levels of previous preparation that each entering freshman gets a full program of appropriate courses. This significant investment of effort and resources has paid off in a slow but steady increase in first-year continuation rates, especially for first-time freshmen. These increased by about 10 points but then dropped by about 2 percent when the university started active enforcement of the one-year deadline for completing remediation. Even more important, improvement in continuation rate past the first year has been impressive. Of all freshmen who entered in 1990, 57.5 percent were still in attendance two years later. That has increased to 62 percent for those entering in 1995, and was up to 72 percent and 71 percent, respectively, for those entering in 1998 and 1999.

CSULB works actively with the community colleges to facilitate a smooth transition for transfer students. This includes both articulation agreements governing General Education courses and the lower-division courses in all majors that have lower-division requirements and an organized effort to communicate information about recommended programs of preparation for the upper-division major requirements. The effectiveness of these efforts is shown by the fact that transfer students actually have been able to graduate from CSULB after taking on average slightly fewer units as upper-division students than those who entered the campus as first-time freshmen. Furthermore, the data show that the typical graduate of the university completes all degree requirements with only 10 more units than the average

\*\* Regularly admitted students only.

presently required for all campus degree programs. This differential can easily be accounted for by students completing a double major, pursuing a minor, or changing majors relatively late in their careers.

## INDICATOR 4: PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION

### Indicator 4.1 Graduation rates from the campus of origin

- a. Estimated first-time freshmen who eventually will graduate\*\*
- b. Estimated CCC transfers (juniors) who eventually will graduate\*\*

The administration and faculty of CSULB have long been concerned about the relatively low graduation rates of students who enter as first-time freshmen, especially when measured by a standard more realistic than the traditional criteria that use a five-year interval. The average time to graduation has been decreasing, going from 6.30 years for those graduating in 1996-97 to 5.96 years for those graduating in 2000-01. That means that a substantial proportion of our students needs more than six years. The extended time is not due to an excessive number of units, but to the reality that most CSULB students are unable to devote full time to their studies. Many students are fully or partly self-supporting and may be working 30 hours or more per week. For these students the eight-year graduation rate gives a more realistic picture of the number who graduate. On the other hand, students who wish to graduate in four years and who are able to attend full time can and do graduate in four years.

It is anticipated that the improvement in retention rates that has followed the implementation of programs to improve freshman success and continuation will be reflected in an increase in the number of students who persist to graduation.

## INDICATOR 5: AREAS OF SPECIAL STATE NEED

### Indicator 5.1 First Time, New-Type Credentials recommended by the university (excluding interns)

- a. Multiple-subject
- b. Single-subject
- c. Special education

CSULB has met and exceeded its goals for teacher preparation. In the 2000 Accountability Report, the campus reported a modest, yet positive upward trend in the number of credentials recommended. The university stated that while the increase in the number of credential completers at the campus had been slower than anticipated, significant efforts that were made were more long term in nature (i.e., comprehensive curriculum redesign, strengthening undergraduate preparation, moving resources to Liberal Studies). “The approach has resulted in a noticeable enrollment increase already, and we anticipate by 2000-2001 that we will see a substantial increase in the number of credentials recommended,” the report stated. Based on that belief, CSULB submitted a goal of 752 new teachers for 2002-03, a 25 percent increase over the baseline year in the number of credentials produced. According to the CSULB Credential Center, the campus produced 821 new teachers in 2001-02, comfortably surpassing the goal of a 25 percent increase by 2002-03, one year early. The growth trajectory is maintaining, and even higher numbers for the coming year of record are expected.

## INDICATOR 6: RELATIONS WITH K-12

### Indicator 6.1: The number of each of the following involved in outreach efforts:

- a. CSU faculty involved
- b. CSU students involved
- c. K-12 schools involved
- d. K-12 students involved. (Some schools, students and faculty may be involved in more than one program, and so they may be counted more than once.)

Seamless education continues to be an outstanding model for K-16 collaboration with the Long Beach Education Partnership by combining the efforts of CSULB, the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) and Long Beach City College. CSULB hosted the 2002 California K-16 Partnerships and Student Success Conference, attracting about 900 California K-12 and higher education teachers and administrators over four days. Bringing K-12 teachers and faculty members from the California educational community onto a CSU campus demonstrates the commitment of the system to work with K-12 schools and to raise student achievement in a visible manner.

\*\* Regularly admitted students only.

Another example of K-12 relations is the university's participation in the Precollegiate Academic Development Program (PAD). A comprehensive approach provides reading, writing, science and math tutoring for K-12 students, as well as service-learning opportunities for CSULB student tutors. The following data are from the 2001-02 annual PAD report.

**Precollegiate Academic Development Activities**

<i>University Participation</i>		<i>Public School Students Served in 2001-02</i>	
Faculty	30	High School	1,677
CSULB Student Tutors	1,299	Middle School	2,341
		Elementary School	16,618

CSULB also hosts the Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI) project with eight area high schools, providing 7,317 students with tutoring, workshops, and diagnostic testing in reading, writing, and math during 2000-2001. Forty-three CSULB student tutors worked with high school students, while 129 K-12 teachers collaborated with 19 CSULB faculty in professional development workshops that focused on the alignment of curriculum between high school and college.

The campus provides a number of summer programs for children and teenagers. The South Basin Writers Camp and South Basin Readers Camp bring hundreds of elementary and high school students to CSULB every summer for their four-week academic camps. CSULB also offers "Summer Math Camp at the Beach," an algebra camp for 105 middle school students funded by the LBUSD federal GEARUP grant. The campus also operates a "Science at the Beach" camp for school-age youth each summer. The MESA-funded "Summer Marine Institute" focused on marine biology activities, including trips to Catalina and the Bolsa Chica Wetlands for 120 middle school students.

CSULB hosts a number of professional development activities for teachers in the summer months. The South Basin Writing Institute brings hundreds of elementary and high school teachers onto the Long Beach campus for professional development activities focused on writing. This summer, the Writing Institute also hosted several sessions of professional development funded by the Governor's Special Initiative in Reading and Writing, bringing about 277 teachers to CSULB. In collaboration with the LBUSD, CSULB hosted a weeklong institute for math teachers and another for English teachers supported by Collaborative Academic Preparation Initiative (CAPI) funds.

CSULB continues to have a large and active traditional outreach program through the office of University Outreach and School Relations. College advisors visit high schools and middle schools to provide college preparation information to students, counselors, parents, and teachers.

As CSULB remains dedicated to increasing outreach efforts, K-12 students' reading, writing, and math skills continue to improve, as well as student readiness to enter college at CSULB, another university, or a community college.

**Indicator 6.2: Fully prepared new freshmen: Mathematics and English**

The number of students entering CSULB fully proficient in mathematics and English has increased as the enrollment has increased in recent years. More important, the percent of students who are proficient in these areas has continued to increase slightly. A substantial improvement for fall 2002 is expected due to the increase in admission standards.

The campus has actively encouraged students to complete any required pre-baccalaureate work in the summer before first attendance. All admitted students are notified of the opportunity to take care of remedial course requirements in the summer before entering as freshmen, resulting in a reduction in the cost of taking the summer remedial courses to a nominal level. Despite these efforts, only a limited number of new students have been willing to commit time during the summer to attend these courses. Students who do take the summer option almost always begin their first semester fully proficient, even if that is not reflected in the reports based on ELM/EPT test scores.

The California Academic Partnership Initiative (CAPI) and the Pre-collegiate Academic Development program fund CSULB efforts to work with eight area high schools on mathematics and English preparation. These efforts include placing college students as tutors in high school classrooms, professional development activities with teachers, and university faculty members co-teaching college preparation courses on the high school campuses. Several important discoveries have informed this work.

First, despite CSU efforts to communicate English Placement Test and Entry Level Math results to high schools, these tests are largely unknown in the secondary schools. A significant part of CSULB's CAPI effort has been to educate principals, teachers and counselors about the content of these tests and the role they play in the CSU.

Second, a key issue for mathematics is disuse and decay of skills students have in fact learned in secondary schools. Students who take a math course in their last year of high school seem to be more likely to succeed on the Entry Level Mathematics examination. Mathematics test performance often can be improved with workshops to refresh learned but disused skills.

Third, a key issue for English is reading. Although the English Placement Test is usually thought of as a writing assessment, in fact, experience suggests students have the greatest difficulty with the reading component. Reading informational text appears to be the most significant hurdle for students. Unlike mathematics, improving reading and writing performance does not appear amenable to brief interventions.

## INDICATOR 7: REMEDIATION

### Indicator 7.1 Remediated within one year

The university continues to offer programs to assist students in completing their remediation within the required time frame. Students are repeatedly reminded of the importance of achieving full proficiency before the second year. Summer programs are available before the first semester of attendance and, for those still needing to meet the requirement, in the summer after their first year. The results are reflected in the increasing percentage of students fully proficient at the time they begin the second year.

Ninety-five percent of the fall 1999 regularly admitted first-time freshmen who re-enrolled in fall 2000 no longer required any further remediation. For the fall 2000 entering class, only 3 percent who enrolled the following year still needed some remediation. Some of those who continued to require remediation had encountered problems beyond their control, such as an illness that required them to be out of school for a semester. Others were allowed to enroll because they had made significant progress toward completing their remediation and had developed approved learning contracts to enable the completion of their remediation during their second year of enrollment. Unfortunately, similar results will not occur for the class entering in fall 2001 because the campus was not able to offer enough class sections to accommodate 276 of the students who need two semesters of mathematics remediation. Those students have been given an additional semester to allow them to enroll in the required courses.

## INDICATOR 8: FACILITIES UTILIZATION

### Indicator 8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus

At CSULB traditional Monday-Wednesday-Friday and Tuesday-Thursday scheduling patterns were relaxed with the lessening of enrollment demand 10 years ago in the early 1990s. During this period many classes were scheduled into a Monday-Wednesday pattern with a corresponding reduction in the numbers of Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes. This seemed to follow the popular demand of both students and faculty for courses having two class meetings per week instead of three. This trend resulted in Friday scheduling accounting for only 4.3 percent of the FTES generated in 1998-99.

A revised Academic Senate class scheduling policy went into effect beginning with the fall 2000 term. This was a response to the now rapidly growing enrollment demand of the late 1990s and the very low level of Friday scheduling. The new policy requires that classes scheduled prior to 2 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays either have to meet on Fridays as well or be balanced with Friday-only classes. By 2000-01, 5.7 percent of the FTES generated was on Friday. This low level of Friday class scheduling will improve as the classroom capacity limits of the two-day per week patterns are reached. Additional improvement in the level of Friday class scheduling will result from the setting of one day per week hybrid classes on Fridays.

Weekend scheduling of upper-division and graduate classes has grown each year. This growth from 117 FTES (.6 percent) to 253.5 FTES (1.1 percent) by 2000-01 reflects response to the needs of non-traditional students. Students who may be working full time and have family responsibilities are ideal candidates for compressed format weekend educational opportunities.

### Indicator 8.2 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via CPEC-approved center

Not applicable.

## INDICATOR 9: UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT

**Indicator 9.1: For each university, an annual Voluntary Support Report with indicators for funds raised via alumni, parents, other individuals, foundations, corporations and other organizations**

**Indicator 9.2: For each university, an annual Special Revenue Report with indicators for funds raised via sponsorships, bequests, revocable trusts, pledges, contracts, grants, property transfers and endowment income**

Despite the environment of economic uncertainty that preceded and then was magnified following the tragic events of Sept. 11, in 2001-02 philanthropic giving to CSULB was nearly \$24.3 million, exceeding revised internal projections. In addition, more than \$17 million in endowment-directed gifts also were received, as well as more than \$38 million in special revenues. Considering current sentiments, the past year's giving patterns indicate support for the university remains strong, with donors often opting to utilize wills, trusts and other testamentary giving methods as a means to offer financial support. At this time, \$56 million of testamentary gifts committed to the university are under active stewardship.

Endowment development efforts will continue through charitable gift planning seminars and conferences, and individual counseling with prospective donors. Classes offered through Senior University and Leisure World Seal Beach generate increased interest in charitable gift planning, establish relationships with the Long Beach senior community and develop good will and support for CSULB. Training and support to directors of development regarding planned giving opportunities to current and prospective donors will continue. Marketing charitable gift annuities through direct mail, promotional literature and seminars is a primary focus for planned giving development for 2002-03.

Annual Giving raised more than \$1.5 million in cash in 2001-02, with \$1.2 million attributed to the Annual Fund Telefund and Direct Mail programs. A 50 percent increase in first-time donors and a 10 percent increase in contacts were accomplished through the first-year use of SmartCall, a computerized telefund management system. More than \$300,000 was raised to benefit the President's Scholars program by the individual and corporate giving unit.

In its effort to support the university, the Alumni Association completed its \$1 million commitment to the CSULB Alumni Association President's Scholars Founding Endowment with a cash contribution of \$150,000. Through the Alumni Grants program, more than \$30,000 was distributed to various campus programs.

Constituent Type	Giving	Percentage
Alumni	\$1,401,928	5.8%
Corporations/ Corp Foundations	16,428,066	67.7%
Foundations	1,531,423	6.3%
Friends	4,289,203	17.6%
Organizations	356,638	1.5%
Parents	281,487	1.1%

**Indicator 9.3: For each university, an annual report on alumni participation as measured by formal membership in alumni associations and alumni program activity**

CSULB Alumni Relations, in conjunction with the Alumni Records Office, continued its ongoing efforts to update and maintain the alumni database. Of the 199,788 Long Beach alumni on the system, 177,631 are addressable, 126,712 have phone numbers and 108,726 have full or partial business information on record.

Focusing attention on enhancing and increasing membership in the Alumni Association continues to be a top priority. With a full-time membership/marketing coordinator on board, membership and marketing materials were updated. Campaigns targeting recent graduates surpassed the new membership goal and total membership now exceeds 25,500. The current membership policy is a one-time \$25 fee for graduates and an annual \$25 fee for associate members (alumni who have not graduated.) The success of the membership program is based on Alumni Relations' philosophy of servicing and cultivating alumni and treating them as members of the university family.

As always, Alumni Relations has continued to enhance traditional events and create new ones to encourage alumni involvement. The creation of an "Alumni Night at ..." series has brought donors back to campus, many for the first time since their graduation. This series has proved very successful in the donor cultivation and stewardship process. Serving more than 15 chapters and two affiliate groups, the Chapters and Clubs unit cultivated over 2,5000 members, worked with more than 180 volunteers and raised over \$37,000

in scholarships. In its first year, recent alumni programming offered networking opportunities at special events and receptions, life skills workshops and organized interaction between recent graduates and current students through guest panels.

**Indicator 9.4: For each university, a goal to raise in private funds a sum equal to or greater than 10 percent of the university's net general fund allocation**

Because the economic environment that drives fund-raising potential has changed so drastically in recent months, CSULB has set identical goals of \$25.5 million for 2002-03 and 2003-04. Given the economic macroforces affecting the university's donor base, the Division of University Relations and Development has established implementation of a strategic planning process that is major gift focused as its highest priority. This process would encompass a comprehensive review of the development function inclusive of prospect management, college-based gifts and endowment-directed campaigns designed to address faculty needs. CSULB recently announced the launch of the Edge of Excellence Endowment for Teaching and Learning, with a five-year, \$10 million goal to support faculty endeavors.

Endowment development efforts will continue through teaching, charitable gift planning seminars and conferences, and individual counseling with prospective donors. Marketing charitable gift annuities through direct mail, promotional literature and seminars is a primary focus for planned giving development for 2002-03.

Using SmartCall management software, a goal of increasing contacts via the Annual Fund Phonathon by 10 percent was set for the current year. A cash goal of \$1.25 million was established for the Annual Fund Phonathon and Direct Mail programs. The Individual and Corporate Giving unit will continue to seek corporate sponsors/donors to match individual giving to the President's Scholars, with a goal of \$500,000 to be raised this year.

## CAMPUS-DEFINED INDICATOR: QUALITY OF SERVICES TO STUDENTS

A student's educational experience is affected not only by the classes taken and the faculty who teach them, but also by a variety of support services provided by the university. In recent years, CSULB has put a great deal of effort into identifying areas that need improvement and into remedying those deficiencies that have been identified. The

university believes that these changes have resulted not only in greater student satisfaction but also in higher rates of student retention and a reduction in their time to graduation.

### *Advising and Academic Support*

Over the course of their academic careers students receive academic advising first from specially trained peer advisors at SOAR (the Student Orientation, Advising and Registration Program), then from professional advisors in the Academic Advising Center or in a number of special programs and finally from advisors in the major departments.

To coordinate the work of these different groups, an inter-divisional university Academic Advising Council was established with membership that includes representatives of all offices that conduct academic advising, a representative from each college to provide liaison with the departmental advisors in the colleges, and key staff members from Enrollment Services. The charge to the council is to examine current advising practices and to develop action plans to strengthen advising. The council meets monthly to share information and to identify issues related to advising that affect the entire campus community.

The Academic Advising Council has provided an effective way to share information. Among its many practical achievements, it has addressed the need for all offices to give students consistent and accurate advice, has developed a system for assuring that students who receive advising through special programs (such as the Educational Opportunity Program) also receive appropriate major advising, has developed and adopted uniform guidelines for academic advising, has called attention to places where the University Catalog provided insufficient or unclear information and has instituted faculty training programs. In addition, the council has initiated new CSULB programs, including mandatory advising for freshmen. A subcommittee of the Academic Advising Council worked with Enrollment Services to identify problems and to assist in major projects.

### *The Student Orientation, Advising and Registration (SOAR) Program*

When students are admitted to CSULB, they are asked to attend SOAR. Numerous sessions of SOAR are provided each summer and winter, with programs designed specifically for entering freshmen, transfer students, athletes and President's Scholars. Of the students entering CSULB in fall 2001, 94 percent of the freshmen and 80 percent of the transfers participated in SOAR. Freshmen who do not attend a SOAR session have a hold placed on their

registration until they seek advising from the Academic Advising Center. In addition to this primarily academic program, SOAR participants are invited to a general introduction to campus life, either in June or just before fall classes begin.

SOAR provides orientation and advising information and actively assists students in registering for classes. Initially, the primary focus was on general campus orientation, but ongoing review of the SOAR Program has resulted in strengthening the advising component. This advising is especially tailored to the level of preparation of each student to assure that they enroll in any required remedial courses, in General Education Foundation courses, and in other appropriate General Education or major courses. Faculty involvement in SOAR advising has increased, particularly in the SOAR sessions for transfer students, who meet with faculty from their intended majors.

#### *Mandatory Advising for Freshmen*

Although freshmen who attended the SOAR program received academic advising before they enrolled in classes for their first semester, there were still two serious problems. First, the SOAR program could not guarantee that freshmen enrolled in the appropriate classes. Sometimes, recommended classes were not available or were not available at the hours the student chose to attend. Sometimes, students chose not to enroll in the recommended classes. Students often dropped classes they should have retained, sometimes because they did not want to take classes at particular hours, sometimes because they wished to avoid subjects like mathematics. To make matters worse, they often enrolled in classes they were not prepared for—sometimes at the urging of parents who wanted them to take advanced classes—with unfortunate academic consequences. The second problem was that students really needed advising before their second semester at the university. In addition to the usual reassessment required by adjustment to the demands of college, students felt they could not retain all the information they had received in the short time available at SOAR.

To correct both of these problems, the university instituted mandatory advising for freshmen. They are not permitted to enroll for either their first or second semester until they have received advising. For the first semester, they are not permitted to change their programs without seeing an advisor.

For the second semester, most students meet this mandatory advising requirement by attending small-group sessions conducted by the Academic Advising Center, which provides

General Education advising to most undergraduate students. Other students see advisors in special programs, including Disabled Student Services, Educational Equity Services, the Intensive Learning Experience, Learning Alliance, Liberal Studies Program, Center for Student Athlete Services, Student Access to Science and the University Honors Program. Each of these programs uses a similar approach but tailors its sessions to particular populations.

#### *Advising for Continuing Students*

Once students have chosen a major, they also seek advising from departmental advisors. This advising addresses the requirements and appropriate course sequencing for their specific major. Training for faculty advisors is provided in workshops conducted by the Faculty Center for Professional Development and by the Academic Advising Council, and in meetings with college Advising Council liaisons. The Academic Advising Center provides training for its own advisors and for advisors in the Center for Student Athlete Services, Disabled Student Services, Intensive Learning Experience, Learning Alliance, Student Access to Science, the University Honors Program, directors of the SOAR Program and some undergraduate faculty advisors. Ongoing support resources for all advisors are available through an academic advising handbook available on the Web.

#### *Academic Preparation of Entering Students*

Fifty-one percent of freshmen entering CSULB in fall 2001 were identified as requiring remediation in English and/or mathematics. In complying with the requirements of Executive Order 665 regarding successful completion of pre-baccalaureate coursework, the university thus has the double challenge of helping these students achieve the required level of proficiency as rapidly as possible, and also helping all students adjust to the demands of college classes.

A number of efforts have been initiated to respond to these needs. Both the Department of English and the Department of Mathematics have been experimenting with various teaching strategies to help students achieve the required level of proficiency. The Learning Assistance Center has increased staff and extended hours to respond to growing demand. Specialized assistance is provided for international and immigrant students with limited English proficiency, both in preparing for work at the freshman level and in preparing for the required junior-level Writing Proficiency Examination. A Supplemental Instruction program is offered for lower-division courses that have been identified as particularly difficult for students, and some academic areas, including English, mathematics, natural sciences and nursing, are now offering additional tutorial services.

In addressing the need to improve the basic skills of entering students, the Departments of Mathematics and English and the Division of Student Services share responsibility for implementing the CSULB High School Outreach and Academic Preparation (HSOAP) grant. The grant is part of the CSU system's initiative to work with high schools and those among their students who have been identified as CSU-bound. This program initiates faculty-to-faculty collaborations on curricular standards, team-teaching, tutorial support, and academic advising prior to enrollment at CSULB. It is intended to help teachers better prepare their students for university-level achievement and a successful academic experience.

### **Beyond the Classroom**

An important part of a student's university experience occurs outside the classroom. CSULB wants all students to feel a sense of community, to feel connected to the university and to gain the benefits of interaction with their fellow students. This represents a challenge at a large urban comprehensive university that is primarily a commuter campus, but to characterize CSULB simply as a commuter campus is an incomplete representation of its students. In addition to the 1,800 students who live in on-campus residence halls, many more—probably thousands of students—live near the campus but not with their parents. Some students live with their parents, but others are adults with jobs and families, coming to campus only for classes. CSULB students represent one of the most ethnically and culturally diverse student populations in the nation.

In addition to activities directed toward student life and development, the university provides assistance in coping with the variety of personal challenges facing young people.

#### *Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)*

This center provides educational, psychological, career and life-skill development services to students. As the primary psychological services unit on campus, it also coordinates and provides campus crisis intervention services. The center operates an extensive consultation program for other campus units, focusing especially on program development and student retention. Organizational consultation and conflict resolution services are provided upon request.

In response to growing student demand, CAPS has introduced a number of initiatives to extend services to a larger number of students despite the limited number of professional staff available. These include reintroduction of an APA-accredited internship program that enables qual-

ified doctoral interns to provide supervised counseling services to students; designation of a staff member to respond to emergency walk-in traffic and initiate a prompt intake process; expansion of outreach efforts and programs co-sponsored with other campus units; and increase in participation of students in group counseling sessions and workshops. The center collaborates with faculty to provide resources and support for handling challenging situations with students.

#### *Student Health Center*

The Health Center provides full-time physicians, a part-time psychiatrist, a part-time gynecologist, nurse practitioners, nursing staff, health educators and a fully staffed laboratory, x-ray facility and pharmacy. Current services provided to students include direct treatment of sudden or moderate illness or injury; specialty treatments indicated by staff assessment of dermatological, orthopedic, or psychiatric needs; immunizations for a variety of illnesses; laboratory testing and prescriptions; and referrals and resource information for special needs. The remodeled Health Center facility provides improved access to students with disabilities and includes a new Health Resource Center.

#### *Student Residential Housing*

With an increasing freshman class, Housing and Residential Life has experienced a steady increase in demand for on-campus housing. Since 1999-2000, campus residential space has been fully occupied with a waiting list. Because of this, additional steps were taken to provide timely information and to assist students with off-campus housing options.

#### *Support for Students with Disabilities*

Concomitant with the increased enrollment of all students has been the continued growth in the enrollment of students with disabilities. The Disabled Student Services program has worked to provide educational access for all students with disabilities to a range of services and accommodation support. The number of students identified as having disabilities has grown from approximately 750 in 1990-91 to over 1,200 in 2000-01. It has been a challenge to find the resources to meet the needs of this increasing number of students.

In responding to the needs of students with disabilities, the university has provided budget support to ensure that mandated services are provided. In addition, the program has engaged in a successful fund-raising campaign to establish an operating endowment to complement state funds, and measures have been undertaken to reduce costs. These efforts have helped the program to respond to growing student demand.

*Sports, Athletics and Recreation*

As with other student services, the increase in student demand and limited budget resources have required changes in the Department of Sports, Athletics, and Recreation, the administrative unit that supervises intercollegiate athletic programs, the intramural program, sports clubs, recreation clubs and recreational fitness for students, faculty and staff.

The Center for Student Athlete Services, which reports to the Provost's office, has expanded its activities. In addition to advising designed to assure that student-athlete academic programs conform to NCAA regulations, the center schedules workshops designed to improve student-athletes' academic success and to assist them with career planning. Student-athlete academic success also has improved dramatically with student athlete six-year graduation rates increasing from 17 percent in 1991 to 45 percent in 2000.

CSULB offers 19 sports and recreation clubs, open to all students, staff and faculty. More than 1,200 students participate in these programs. Although this is only a small fraction of the total student body, the intramural program has reached maximum capacity due to limited facility space.

*Student Life and Development*

The university encourages students to become involved in campus clubs and activities. It's believed that these interactions with other students and with faculty are an important part of the life of the campus and complement the academic curriculum. Most departments and colleges have student associations. There are fraternities and sororities, interest groups, religious groups, and cultural groups. The Office of Student Life and Development provides advice and programming assistance to these groups and promotes leadership education for students, in conjunction with the faculty and community. The recently established Swanson Leadership Center will become more active in reaching out to all students in the development of their leadership potential.

**Support Services****1. Current Efforts**

The university has made a number of changes to improve the integration of support services and thereby improve service quality.

*Fee payments.* The university has implemented new methods for fee payment, including an installment program that allows students to make fee or tuition payments over a six-month period. Credit cards are now accepted

in person and via the telephone and kiosk. University College and Extension Services transactions were added to the student billing and receivables system to allow students to make a single payment for all services, regardless of the provider.

Students may now pay for enrollment-related service fees, such as ordering transcripts or filing for graduation, at the Enrollment Services windows; they no longer need pay at one window and then go to another window to receive the service.

*Extended office hours.* Resources have been committed to increase the number of student service windows at both the Business Office and Office of Enrollment Services during peak periods and to extend the hours of operation. Access to Voice Response Registration (VRR) and the University Automated Service Kiosks (U-ASK) has recently been extended to 10 p.m., Monday through Friday.

*Referral Center.* Students are seen by "general services" student relations staff at the windows where most questions can be answered, forms provided and transactions conducted. Those students who require more detailed or "expert" consultation are referred to staff with expertise in a specific area, such as a financial aid counselor or a transfer credit evaluator.

**2. Use of Technology to Improve Services**

*Imaging Financial Aid and Admissions Documents and Transcripts.* The Office of Enrollment Services implemented a state-of-the-art document imaging system in 1994-95 to make financial aid processing paperless. With all data online in the student information system, financial aid documents are easily accessible to staff, rarely lost, and never need to be alphabetized or filed.

Two additional projects use imaging to archive student records that previously were kept on paper or on microfilm or microfiche. One stores permanent record cards for all CSULB students for the years prior to 1988, and the other stores the academic records, such as change of grade forms, waiver letters, and other written information, for currently or recently enrolled students.

*Self-Service and One-Stop Service for Students.* Voice-response, touch-tone telephone service provides students with access to their own record information from both on-campus and remote locations. Voice Response Registration is used by more than 30,000 students a semester for

initial registration in courses and to adjust their schedules by adding and dropping classes. As part of the registration process, students may use the touch-tone payment system, which accepts credit card payment for fees. Students also may verify the current status of an admissions or financial aid application or receive information on their financial aid awards via voice response.

Students also can use a self-service electronic kiosk (U-ASK) for general information, course registration, fee payment and a printout of their own schedules. Kiosks are located throughout the CSULB campus and one is located at Long Beach City College.

*Transfer Credit Articulation Online.* The course-by-course list of articulated community college courses is available to campus faculty and advisors online. It is available also to students from the information kiosks (U-ASK) so that they can easily determine which courses will transfer to CSULB.

*Letters to Students.* Utilization of a high-speed laser printer and a folder-sealer machine has made it possible to provide more frequent and complete communication to students through specially tailored letters. These range from acknowledgments of admission applications to tentative financial aid award letters and specialized notices regarding registration or graduation.

*Distribution of Financial Aid Awards.* Financial aid processing has been streamlined through a combination of increased campus automation and a reduction in federal requirements for documents, so that financial aid awards are now made in April and May to new students and in June and July to continuing students each year.

Through electronic transfer of funds, CSULB is able to apply the loans directly to the students' accounts payable and then distribute any excess funds to the students either by mail or in person. This arrangement has greatly improved service to students who previously had to come to campus to receive their loan funds. More than 80 percent of all financial aid checks are mailed, allowing the staff to concentrate on those students who need personalized services.

*Downloads of Student Data.* University administrative offices needing student data for particular groups of students (currently enrolled students or students admitted for a particular term, for example) can download

information from the Student Information System. These data can then be used to create student identification cards for the One-Card system or to verify eligibility for services such as those provided by the Student Health Service, the University Library, or the Career Development Center. Electronic data exchanges with external agencies also streamline the task of providing student record information. For example, student enrollment information is provided three times each semester to the National Student Clearinghouse, which in turn forwards the data to student loan agencies for updating loan deferments.

### **Service Improvements Related to Time-to-Degree**

*Projects to Make Information More Accessible to Students.* Working with faculty and staff members who do undergraduate advising, the Office of Enrollment Services made major revisions in the format of the *Schedule of Classes* and of the degree audit report to make both of them more informative and easier to understand.

The revision of the *Schedule of Classes* was designed to make information easier to find, to provide information in "student-friendly" language, and to be visually more attractive. In response to suggestions from many people around the campus, an index was added and there was extensive reorganization of information.

Under a new schedule of review, students who have filed timely applications for graduation receive a copy of the degree audit printout before they register for their final semester.

Advisors reported that student response was extremely positive, both to the new degree audit format and to the revised *Schedule of Classes*. Whereas there used to be large numbers of students confused by the information they were given, now students need assistance only for solving identified problems.

*Transfer Credit Evaluation.* The new degree audit format is now used to provide new transfer students with information on their standing at the time they enter the university. Most students now receive transfer credit evaluation information in time for the SOAR workshops they attend prior to enrollment. Students who do not participate in SOAR receive their evaluation of transfer credit during their first term of enrollment.

## Challenges for the Future

The university is in the midst of converting its administrative computing from a set of obsolete applications run on a large IBM mainframe to state-of-the-art software developed by PeopleSoft. The conversion is part of the CSU Common Management System. The Human Relations and Finance components went online in the summer 2001. This campus was selected to be one of the early group of campuses implementing the much larger and more complex Student Administration component. We now expect to phase in the system beginning fall 2002, with a target date to be in production by fall 2003. The university will continue high levels of customer service while at the same time implementing the new Student Administration software and its crucial Student Financial Information System.

New functions will include prerequisite check expanded department authorization, academic policy enforcement, differential GPA monitoring and a Web-based access. The PeopleSoft Student Administration component will allow CSULB to give students Web-based access to their records. It will provide student information that is not now available, and will allow the campus to enforce policies in ways that are not possible now.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

California State University, Long Beach continues to be a healthy, thriving campus and a magnet for students. In recent years, the campus has paid attention to quality. Curriculum has been reformed to strengthen academic quality. Many initiatives have been undertaken and resources have been realigned to support quality of services to students. Vigorous efforts have been made to work with the university's K-12 partners and strengthen the preparation of prospective students. These changes have improved the quality of the student experience and strengthened the quality of the education provided to the university's diverse students. Quality education is the "bottom line" for this university and CSULB is proud of its achievements.

PERFORMANCE AREA AND INDICATOR†‡	
1.	<p><b>Quality of baccalaureate degree programs</b></p> <p>1.1 Descriptions of processes for establishing and assessing student learning outcomes in general education and in the majors and for assuring that students are achieving core competencies for the degree. (Due in 2002 only)</p>
2.	<p><b>Access to the CSU</b></p> <p>2.1 The number of the following who applied to the university and were admitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) First-time freshmen</li> <li>(b) Upper-division CCC transfers</li> </ul> <p>2.2 For campuses that were impacted or had impacted programs—The number of the following eligible persons who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Impacted Programs Aligning Dates</li> <li>(a) First-time freshmen**</li> <li>(b) Upper-division CCC transfers**</li> </ul> <p>2.3 For campuses that were impacted or had impacted programs—The number of the following eligible persons who applied to the university as their first choice during the open filing period and were not admitted, but who were admitted to another CSU campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See Impacted Programs Aligning Dates</li> <li>(a) First-time freshmen**</li> <li>(b) Upper-division CCC transfers**</li> </ul>
3.	<p><b>Progression to degree</b></p> <p>3.1 First-year continuation rates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) First-time freshmen**</li> <li>(b) CCC transfers*</li> </ul> <p>3.2 Upper-division units</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Junior CCC transfers**</li> <li>(b) Native FTF**</li> </ul>
4.	<p><b>Persistence &amp; graduation</b></p> <p>4.1 Graduation rates from the campus of origin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Estimated first-time freshmen who eventually will graduate**</li> <li>(b) Estimated CCC transfers (juniors) who eventually will graduate**</li> </ul>
5.	<p><b>Areas of special state need</b></p> <p>5.1 First time, new-type credentials recommended by the university (excluding interns)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Multiple-subject</li> <li>(b) Single-subject</li> <li>(c) Special education</li> </ul>
6.	<p><b>Relations with K-12</b> (Some schools, students, and faculty may be involved in more than one program, and so they may be counted more than once)</p> <p>6.1 The number of each of the following involved in outreach efforts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) CSU faculty involved</li> <li>(b) CSU students involved</li> <li>(c) K-12 schools involved</li> <li>(d) K-12 students involved</li> </ul> <p>6.2 Fully prepared new freshmen**</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Mathematics</li> <li>(b) English</li> </ul>
7.	<p><b>Remediation</b></p> <p>7.1 Remediated within 1 year**</p>
8.	<p><b>Facilities utilization</b></p> <p>8.1 State-supported course annual FTES occurring via the main campus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Evenings (after 4 pm)</li> <li>(b) Fridays</li> <li>(c) Weekends and term breaks (except summer break)</li> <li>(d) Summers</li> <li>(e) Distance learning****</li> <li>(f) Off-site (excludes CPEC approved off campus centers)</li> <li>(g) Overall non-traditional course offerings (formula: Add sub-indicators a through f)</li> <li>(h) Overall instruction in the college year</li> <li>(i) Percentage of non-traditional instruction (formula: g divided by h)</li> <li>(j) Number of CPEC-approved off-campus centers</li> </ul>
9.	<p><b>University advancement</b></p> <p>9.1 Voluntary support</p> <p>9.2 Special revenues</p> <p>9.3 Alumni participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Formal association membership***</li> <li>(b) Total addressable alumni</li> <li>(c) Total addressable graduates/credentials</li> </ul> <p>9.4 Ten percent private fund goal</p>

PERFORMANCE FOR 1998-99	PERFORMANCE FOR 1990-00	PERFORMANCE FOR 2000-01	GOALS FOR CY 2002-03	GOALS FOR CY 2004-05
Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Not applicable*	Not applicable*	11,610 4,317	Not applicable	Not applicable
Not applicable*	Not applicable*	0 0	Not applicable	Not applicable
Not applicable*	Not applicable*	0 0	Not applicable	Not applicable
<b>Fall 1998 to Fall 1999</b>	<b>Fall 1999 to Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2000 to Fall 2001</b>		
82.9%	80.1%	79.9%	84.0%	85.0%
83.6%	84.8%	86.8%	84.0%	85.0%
<b>Graduated CY 1998-1999</b>	<b>Graduated CY 1999-2000</b>	<b>Graduated CY 2000-2001</b>		
74	76	77	74	73
76	74	75	75	74
<b>Entering classes: Fall 1993 freshman; Fall 1996 CCC transfers</b>	<b>Entering classes: Fall 1994 freshman; Fall 1997 CCC transfers</b>	<b>Entering classes: Fall 1995 freshman; Fall 1998 CCC transfers</b>		
49.2%	49.0%	50.1%	53%	56.0%
67.5%	70.1%	71.9%	69.5%	70.0%
<b>CY 1998-1999</b>	<b>CY 1999-2000</b>	<b>CY 2000-2001</b>		
306	318	405	440	462
183	216	191	233	244
68	24	23	80	84
<b>CY 1999-2000</b>	<b>CY 1999-2000</b>	<b>CY 2000-2001</b>		
155	155	75	175	185
924	924	1,197	1,200	1,500
391	391	627	400	400
22,917	22,917	28,546	30,000	35,000
<b>Fall 1998 entering class</b>	<b>Fall 1999 entering class</b>	<b>Fall 2000 entering class</b>		
41.0%	46.0%	48.55%	48.0%	52.0%
47.0%	49.0%	48.87%	52.0%	54.0%
<b>Fall 1998 to Fall 1999</b>	<b>Fall 1999 to Fall 2000</b>	<b>Fall 2000 to Fall 2001</b>		
82.0%	79.0%	82.0%	85.0%	88.0%
<b>CY 1998-1999</b>	<b>CY 1999-2000</b>	<b>CY 2000-2001</b>		
6,191.2	6,581.9	6,909.5	7,722.0	7,870.5
907.5	1,026.9	1,305.3	1,690.0	1,987.5
117.1	134.0	253.5	275.0	300.0
0	0	0	1,605.0	1,900.0
Not available	Not available	Not available	100.0	200.0
281.7	289.2	274.2	275.0	275.0
7,497.5	8,032.0	8,742.5	11,667.0	12,533.0
20,916.1	22,261.7	23,091.1	27,605.0	28,400.0
36%	36%	38%	42%	44%
0	0	0	0	0
<b>FY 1998-1999</b>	<b>FY 1998-1999</b>	<b>FY 1999-2000</b>		
\$ 26,781,188	\$ 22,152,957	\$ 26,627,400	\$ 27,000,000	\$ 28,000,000
\$ 36,682,986	\$ 47,463,942	\$ 45,598,844	\$ 34,000,000	\$ 36,000,000
23,598	23,598	25,042	†	†
148,741	158,880	158,901	158,000	164,000
142,699	151,448	154,493	151,000	156,000
23.5%	18.0%	20.0%	22.0%	21.0%

†† Performance data are provided by the Chancellor's Office, and each campus sets its own goals.

\* Data first reported for 2000-2001. \*\* Regularly admitted students only. \*\*\* Base year data are CY 1999-2000; no prior data were collected.

\*\*\*\* These data will first be available for CY 2000-2001.

† CSULB requires a one-time registration fee for Alumni Association membership, which is part of a long established annual alumni donation solicitation program. Membership goal for 2002-2003 is 25,600 and for 2004-05 is 28,000. The CSULB Alumni Association board of directors is reviewing the annual dues membership model.

