

**FINAL REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW**

To CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

March 4-6, 2009

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

**Judith A. Ramaley, Chair
President, Winona State University**

**Irma Guzman Wagner, Assistant Chair
Dean/Professor of Education Emerita, California State University, Stanislaus**

**Jená Burges
Vice Provost, Academic Programs and Undergraduate Studies
Humboldt State University**

**Milton D. Hakel
Professor of Psychology, Bowling Green State University**

**Marilyn E. Miller
Associate Professor, DPT Program
University of St. Augustine for Health Sciences (San Diego Campus)**

**Jacqueline M. Mimms
Associate Vice President, Enrollment Management
California State University, Bakersfield**

**Leroy M. Morishita
Vice President/CFO Administration and Finance, San Francisco State University**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	Page 1
A. Description of the Institution and Visit	
B. Quality of the CPR Report and Alignment with the Proposal	
C. Response to Previous Commission Issues	
SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS	Page 5
A. Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness	
B. Core Commitment II. Staffing for Effectiveness	
C. Core Commitment III. Assessing Student Success	
SECTION III. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	Page 24
SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW	Page 28
APPENDICES	Page 30
Appendix A. Ed.D. in Educational Leadership	(pages 1-2)
Appendix B. Distance Education Report	(pages 1-3)
Appendix C. Off-campus M.S. Criminal Justice Program	(pages 1-6)

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Visit

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) opened its doors in 1949 as Los Angeles-Orange County State College with a student population of 169 juniors and seniors. Now, sixty years later, the university serves close to 38,000 undergraduate and graduate students who represent the vast diversity of the surrounding region. CSULB is a beautiful institution where the architecture and landscaping blend inside and outside spaces to encourage a feeling of spaciousness on a human scale. The physical environment creates a student-friendly, family-like setting for study and work. Applications for admission far outnumber available seats attesting to a campus that is a popular destination for potential students living, for the most part, in Orange and Los Angeles counties and neighboring communities. Eligible students have access to baccalaureate and master's degree programs, concurrent or post-baccalaureate certificates, education credentials or, most recently, an independent Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) degree in Educational Leadership. Instruction occurs, mainly, on the campus in traditional settings, although some instruction is provided in alternative ways in off-campus or distance education (online) programs. A Master of Science (M.S.) degree in Criminal Justice can be earned off-campus in Whittier. A distance education master's degree in Engineering Management is currently offered online, and an accelerated distance learning Master's in Public Administration (MPA) taught largely online has recently enrolled its ninth cohort. A number of certificate programs are also available through technology. CSULB, often referred to as The Beach, is located within the large coastal city of Long Beach, home to one of the nation's largest seaports. The city is a thriving hub for oceanic and land transportation and an active center for numerous industries, services, and public institutions, including the Office of the Chancellor of the California State University System. The university has created many strong partnerships with

local schools, hospitals, communities, and businesses with plans to expand and intensify the presence of CSULB in downtown Long Beach. The campus is an integral part of the regional public school network with a longstanding partnership which has been an institutional priority and a model for community projects. Connections with the community are enhanced by the great number of resources available within the geographic area surrounding the institution. The proximity of the Chancellor's Office to the campus provides a strong connection between the two entities. As a public institution and member of the CSU system, California State University, Long Beach operates within the common purposes and directives that shape instructional priorities with that system while maintaining a distinctive campus culture and academic portfolio and appropriate connection with the community. A clearly-defined mission statement depicts CSULB as a "diverse, student-centered globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly-valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service for the people of California and the world."

California State University, Long Beach is one of the largest universities in California and the nation and, during the past several years, has assumed a role as a leading institution in the CSU system evolving as a model of a 21st century university where teaching and scholarship are intertwined.

Recent Accreditation History. CSULB received reaffirmation of accreditation in 2002 followed by self-study activities designed to prepare for an Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) in October 2010. The Institutional Proposal for Reaffirmation of Accreditation was submitted to WASC in October 2006, followed by the December 2008 self-study report– the CSULB Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) for Reaffirmation of Accreditation that tells the institution's story since the previous review. The WASC CPR Team, during its March 2009 visit, focused on bringing the story up to date. More specifically, the purpose of a CPR visitation is multi-fold: 1) to examine evidence supporting assertions and conclusions contained in a self-study report, 2) to

evaluate evidence and provide reflections about whether the institution meets WASC Accreditation Standards, and 3) to assess progress in addressing themes or core commitments chosen by an institution. The visiting team to CSULB observed progress at this point in the accreditation self-study process and provided comments regarding institutional readiness for the next phase of the self-study, the Educational Effectiveness Review. The team explored the extent to which mechanisms, evidence, and actions in the various parts of this large, decentralized campus were leading to on-going educational effectiveness. This focus is essential as the campus moves toward the Educational Effectiveness Review in 2010.

As part of the Capacity and Preparatory Review, a site visit was made to the off-campus Master of Science (M.S.) in Criminal Justice Program offered in Whittier. This program was found to be a replica of the on-campus program subject to the same requirements for admission, faculty appointments, and assessment activities. Online courses for the online Master of Science (M.S.) in Engineering Management and the accelerated distance learning Master of Public Administration (MPA) were also reviewed along with online certificate programs that included the popular Global Logistics Specialist Certificate. New Program Review policies and procedures apply as well to off-campus and distance education programs. Separate reports on off-campus and online programs are found in the Appendix of this report, along with an update on the Ed.D.

B. Quality of the CPR Report and Alignment with the Proposal

The California State University, Long Beach Capacity and Preparatory Review, or self-study, submitted to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in October 2008 was informative and reflected the work of many people, including faculty, staff, administration, and student representatives. The CSU Long Beach Academic Senate was charged with forming the WASC

Self-Study Steering Committee and remained actively involved throughout the different stages of developing the self-study. The report was organized by three key themes which the institution named: Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness, Core Commitment II. Staffing for Effectiveness, and Core Commitment III. Assessing Student Success. Work plans for each core commitment team were detailed in the Appendix of the self-study report. The first and third core commitments were developed in direct response to recommendations made by WASC in its last accreditation review. The institution added the second core commitment regarding “Staffing for Effectiveness” in recognition of challenges connected with recruiting, retaining, and supporting highly-qualified personnel. Research questions were developed for each of the core commitments and used as the basis for collecting data. Although the 2008 self-study contained statements indicating intentions to provide evidence at the time of the EER visit, the team had hoped to see, within the CPR Report, more discussion of varied measures of effectiveness and more preliminary evidence. Team members also expected to see more discussion regarding assessment planning and implementation in administrative units besides Academic Affairs.

C. Responses to Previous Commission Issues

When California State University, Long Beach received reaffirmation of accreditation in 2002, the WASC Commission Action Letter brought three issues to the University’s attention.

(1) Student Learning and Educational Effectiveness. The campus “Culture of Collegiality” was seen as a basis for expanding to a “Culture of Evidence.”

CSULB was urged to initiate actions to responsibly and systematically evaluate the effectiveness of its programs.

(2) General Education. WASC commended the institution for creating a new General Education program but noted that the GE program needed a mechanism through which changes and improvements could be made.

(3) Structures to Support and Sustain Decision-Making. The Commission recognized, at that time, that CSULB valued its decentralization but urged it to review its systems and structures and to strengthen and systematize them to support the ability to make and evaluate decisions.

Campus responses to the first and second recommendations were combined and included a major revision of Program Review policies and learning outcomes, establishment of guidelines for program assessment, and endorsement by faculty of timelines to assess student learning outcomes. Funding for assessment activities was made available to the colleges and annual assessment reports from departments became a requirement. In response to the third recommendation, the Division of Academic Affairs and Academic Senate were reorganized with structural re-alignments occurring in other CSULB units for the purpose of increasing communication and decision-making.

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness

CSULB is a large, complex urban institution that has experienced rapid growth in recent years, a growing popularity among students, and significant changes in leadership as a result of both an administrative reorganization and the arrival of several new senior administrators. Although it has an appropriately organized leadership structure that includes a full-time president and chief financial officer under the governing authority of the CSU Board of Trustees (CFRs 3.8), its size and attendant complexities cause CSULB to be in a position of having outgrown, to some extent, its traditional patterns of communication and decision-making. The self-study identifies organizational effectiveness as a target for special attention and clarification of the process of participation in decision-making as a high priority within the context of a culture that is built upon a high degree of decentralization and shared governance. Enhancement of the

evaluation of performance and the identification and resolution of barriers to communication and to institutional achievement of its strategic goals are explored in the self-study in preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review. (CFR 1.8)

The importance of looking at the effectiveness of communication and decision-making across the campus is substantially magnified in the context of a turbulent economic environment. During the past several years, Long Beach, like the other twenty-two CSU campuses, has ridden a roller coaster of enrollment increase, decline, and containment coupled with budget enhancement, retrenchment, and recurring cut-backs. It now faces one of the most severe financial situations in California history where the 2008-2009 budget was passed less than a month before the March 2009 Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit with a significant cut for the University of California and California State University systems. The 2009-2010 financial picture looks bleak. The review team was sensitive to this situation and sought answers to questions about the possible impact of budget reductions on the plans originally developed by the institution to guide its self-study. In response to its mission statement with its emphasis on quality education, CSULB has developed a Strategic Priorities and Goals process that provides an opportunity for many constituents to be involved in setting priorities and investing in institutional development. Significant reductions have been implemented across the campus while protecting the instructional program and course offerings and the support areas that foster student success. (CFR 3.5) It is important to mention that data from 2007 pointed to an increase in fund-raising. At that time, the year-end total was \$27.3 million; endowments were up by 19 percent with a total of \$36.1 million. In 2007, the campus was planning to launch its first major capital campaign, however, future fund-raising efforts are likely to be affected by the current economic downturn. (CFR 3.7)

Due to reductions in State general fund support, the university is approaching a crossroads where further reductions could significantly affect many of the initiatives across divisions that many faculty and staff have come to expect as baseline services. While CSULB may have to retrench selectively in order to survive other budgetary reductions, the effects will be felt by all members of the community. (CFR 3.5) Already in place to address planning and budgeting, is a group called the Resource Planning Process co-chaired by the Provost and Vice President for Administration. It is a process, rather than a formal committee or structure, but it has worked for over twenty years to ensure appropriate representation of different campus constituencies in the planning and budgeting process. A smaller group, the Campus Goals Group, reviews progress on existing goals and amends priorities, as needed. These informal and formal avenues for campus involvement in strategic decision-making may give CSULB much-needed resilience as it faces an uncertain fiscal environment but it will be important to pay special attention to the challenges of communication and transparency in order to handle the inevitable stress on campus governance.

The first Core Commitment, “Organizing for Effectiveness,” addresses the challenge of adapting (a) internal lines of communication, (b) formal structures of governance, (c) campus-wide working relationships and their alignment with areas critical to student success, and (d) administrative infrastructures to create and support a contemporary environment melding education and research with an investment in the strategic priorities adopted by the CSULB leadership. Core Commitment I. focuses, as well, on the organizational structure of the Academic Senate. This theme, or core commitment, also addresses the shared governance exhibited throughout the university with involvement in many forums by faculty, staff, students, and administrators. (CFR 3.8, 3.11)

Institutional investments, administrative and governance attention, and the locus of decision-making are being rebalanced as a result of a changing environment. Some decisions ranging from

actions regarding window washing to the acquisition of technology, previously made at unit levels, have become more centralized. Other decisions, such as enrollment management, are developed centrally and across divisions and then driven down to unit levels with informational tools to guide resource use in the development of class schedules. Decisions about the appropriate locus of decision-making for different campus functions take place in a highly decentralized and distinctive culture where members of the campus community value personal responsibility and commitment, individual voice, and a culture of shared governance. (CFRs 1.1, 1.6) The team heard throughout their visitation that the campus community acknowledges that many significant portions of students' educational experiences lie beyond the classroom. The campus must decide whether and how to support these experiences as well. Options, like co-curriculum activities, are being discussed and weighed ad hoc in the budget planning groups. Processes, used in these meetings, can provide a means for learning what the impact of different levels of cuts might be, what decisions might have to be made, and what can be done to minimize the impact of those decisions. (CFRs 2.11, 4.6)

The two key questions addressed by the Core Commitment I group were derived from the observations of the previous WASC Visiting Team who expressed admiration for the collaborative culture of CSULB but who also raised concerns about the ability of the highly decentralized culture to identify and effectively address merging needs of a broad campus community exposed to a rapidly changing environment. The questions addressed: 1) making effective decisions at university, division, and unit levels with particular attention to the issues that were active during the 2002 visit, namely, shortcomings in academic technology and the capacity to promote student success in the face of planned enrollment growth, and 2) communicating effectively in a large, complex environment. Both of these challenges require attention to information resources and organizational structures that direct timely and usable information to those who need it in order to support effective planning and decision-making

within a culture of inquiry. To address the redesign of shared governance and the identification and support of institutional priorities, the following changes have been made since the last WASC team visit.

- A new strategic planning and budgeting model has been introduced that has led to the identification of a set of strategic priorities (student success, academic quality, service excellence, campus life, and sustainable environment) that now direct the attention and investments in institution-shaping infrastructure and processes.
- The strategic priorities form the framework for the annual budgeting process, both to identify appropriate investments and to ensure the protection of capacities critical to mission. This process has now been tested in times of increasing budget allocations as well as during recent budgetary reductions.
- The Division of Academic Affairs has been redesigned to sharpen the focus of decision-making and to remove barriers to communication while supplying accurate and timely information to decision-makers at each institutional level. The focus of this restructuring has been to provide support and attention to issues of critical importance to CSULB's future: advising; enrollment planning and student success; program quality; academic technology; and support for faculty and student research, scholarship, and creative activity. Although the self-study report targets these changes and a simplified organizational structure of the Academic Senate, similar restructuring and realignment efforts have occurred in the other divisions, as well, and new patterns of interaction and collaboration are drawing institutional resources together in new ways to support the strategic priorities. A feature of these

joint efforts involving administrators, faculty, staff, and students is the development of a strong sense of shared responsibility for the student experience and student success.

The recent reorganization of the Division of Academic Affairs to address clarity of reporting lines, attention to newly defined institutional priorities, and the realignment of the committee structure of the Academic Senate with institutional goals has resulted in a clarification of the consultative process and the pathways by which members of the campus community can participate in defining institutional priorities and goals and in devising solutions to campus problems. (CFR 1.3) Shared governance is valued at CSULB and is carried out through multiple committee structures with participation from many units and individuals across campus. The WASC team heard appreciation for shared governance but also listened to numerous concerns that established processes for communication across the campus might be less open for some members of the community. While openness is valued, there appear to be “silent voices” who do not feel confident that they will be heard. It is important in maintaining CSULB’s culture of shared governance and open communication to examine this issue and to explore avenues through which individuals who feel disenfranchised can participate freely. (CFRs 1.4)

In preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER), the next phase of the WASC process, the Core Commitment I Team adopted two questions that it plans to use as a starting point for demonstrating how the efforts to enhance institutional decision-making processes and communication will better equip CSULB to “meet the challenges facing higher education.” The self-study report claims that, in fact, the work completed since the last team visit has resulted in: 1) clearer lines of authority that direct some specific functions, 2) a reflection of a campus commitment to shared governance and collaborative responsibilities, and 3) an institution which is better equipped to face the future while preserving its participatory culture. These conclusions

are based on the result of opinion surveys prepared by the Organizing for Effectiveness Committee and distributed to key campus constituents to assess the perceived impact of the reorganization of the Division of Academic Affairs on the effectiveness of decision-making and the effectiveness of communication, especially with regard to the management of enrollment growth and technology. While interesting, such studies must be supplemented during the development of documentation for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER), especially, to provide evidence that has a more direct bearing on the extent to which the institution meets relevant Criteria for Review in WASC Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. While the development of strategic priorities offers a framework within which to build new institutional measures, evaluations of effectiveness will need to be apparent at the time of the EER. The Division of Administration and Finance makes extensive use of institutional scorecards to measure progress on institutional goals but data collection and use of findings are inconsistent across organizational structures. In order for the institution and for the team to interpret data, it will be essential to establish baselines and targets. Program and course indicators are under development but program assessment is somewhat uneven. (CFR 1.2)

The researchable questions developed for this thematic area are broad and in need of sharper focus. In addition, the conclusions reached during the first self-study should be revisited since the questions of importance have changed since the initial study was conducted and a cadre of new administrators is now in place. The campus now must test the effectiveness of the new organization as a vehicle for identifying priorities and essential functions, in a time of constrained resources, with the dynamics of new leadership. In addition, more substantive tests of effectiveness are needed in addition to opinion surveys and assertions about timely exchanges of information and expedited program approvals. What information was collected? Who evaluated the evidence?

Against what baselines and targets was evidence evaluated? What was the framework for evaluating evidence? How did the results of these studies lead to further enhancements of the timeliness of decision-making and the effectiveness of communication? What does CSULB mean by the term “communication”? What metrics will the institution use to continue to monitor the impacts of its efforts to clarify and streamline the channels for identifying and working on issues of importance to the campus? In the context of tightening resources, how will the campus use assessment results, program reviews, and other performance data to prioritize among competing needs and programs? According to Robert C. Dickeson in his book, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, “Most institutions can no longer afford to be what they’ve become.” (CFRs 4.6, 2.11) The commendable and very sincere commitment to “protect the student’s educational experience,” mentioned frequently during the visit, is too broad to provide guidance for the decision that must be made in response to changing financial conditions. It begs the question of which parts of the educational experience, for which students, in what programs, are most critical to achieving the mission of the university. (CFRs 4.6, 2.11)

An example of a possible impact is on library and technology services. Although funding for the library has remained somewhat stable over the years, there is concern by some campus personnel that there should be a more visible commitment by the campus to provide funding for library holdings. A similar concern was expressed in regard to technology needs. The CPR report noted that a Technology Plan was needed to improve campus-wide communication, the information used in advising students, and student access to course content, alignments, evaluations, and other class-related functions. In early 2008, a University Information Technology Strategic Plan was approved that details objectives and guiding principles for moving forward with a technology agenda that is in conformity with the university’s mission and priorities. It outlines a broad framework that has led to plans for an Information Technology Governance Council that will be broadly represented, advisory to the vice presidents, and will seek to identify and prioritize issues.

Through this document, it is envisioned that better coordination of effort and more efficient and effective utilization of resources will provide support for information technology initiatives to better serve students. (CFRs 3.6, 3.7) It would be helpful to document the impact of the coordination envisioned in the Technology Plan as a component of the studies conducted for the EER.

As the CPR team studied evidence provided in the self-study report and in related documents, the question arose regarding whether the campus community might be confusing a “culture of data gathering” with the often-heard WASC concept of a “culture of evidence.” What does a “culture of evidence” really mean at CSULB? While gathering data often is seen as the first step in a reflective process, it is more productive to begin a process of inquiry by first deciding what questions are most critical to examine. The ultimate goal is to use evidence to pursue focused and targeted and measurable goals. It is the review team’s hope that the identification and study of researchable questions that will be undertaken as the campus community prepares for the Educational Effectiveness Review will be the vehicle through which CSULB sets up a true culture of inquiry, not simply a culture of data collection, that supports focused action on issues of critical importance to its mission. It appears from the team’s admittedly limited exposure to the campus that the use of evidence is unevenly distributed across the campus. This is not surprising since CSULB has only introduced a stronger emphasis on data-driven decision-making in the past couple of years. A more consistent pattern of inquiry and disciplined and consistent use of evidence could provide a basis for shared governance and shared responsibility for accomplishing the strategic priorities of the university. While the over-arching areas of inquiry posed for investigation in Core Commitment I: 1) effective decision-making and, 2) effective communication, are relevant, it will be important to investigate them deeply enough to show how the many facets of organizational change described in the Capacity and Preparatory Review self-study relate to WASC Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

(CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, and 2.7) and to Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.6 and 4.7)

B. Core Commitment II. Staffing for Effectiveness

Although the area of Human Resources was not identified in the last WASC accreditation recommendations, in its preparation of its Institutional Proposal, CSULB recognized the important relationship of faculty and staff on the quality of academic programs and services and set out to examine staffing policies and procedures along with the environment in which personnel carry out their work. Diversity, a core purpose of the institution's mission and values, was part of the inquiry. (CFR 1.5) It became clear to the reviewers that CSULB has a strong commitment to serving students and has demonstrated its willingness to be proactive in its approach. The campus administered several surveys, conducted interviews, engaged faculty and staff in focus groups, and reviewed various reports to assess campus structures, policies, processes, and issues in relation to WASC standards, as well as employee satisfaction on a number of measures. Studies, noted in the CPR report, were conducted by Core Commitment II members "to determine how best to attract and retain excellent personnel and how best to maintain a comfortable and supportive work environment."

At the time of the CPR visit, the team learned that in fall 2008, CSULB had 898 tenure/tenure-track (T/TT) faculty and 1,465 full-time or part-time lecturers. This compares to 883 T/TT faculty and 1,294 full-time or part-time lecturers in Fall 2005. While the number of T/TT faculty over this period peaked at 916 in Fall 2007, the numbers of lecturers steadily increased. The ratio of T/TT faculty to lecturers was a concern raised in the 2002 team report and seems to have continued to decline as the university's enrollment has increased and as more lecturers have been hired at a greater rate than T/TT faculty to accommodate the growth. While this trend is not unique to CSULB, some consideration should be given to the impact of the changing composition

of the faculty upon student learning and assessment of learning. Further, some attention to how the increasing numbers of lecturers are introduced to the culture of the university will be important to ensure consistency in the learning experiences of the students and their success and progress to graduation. The campus appears to have sufficient qualified personnel for operations and academics with staff and administrators comprised of 1,474 individuals in Fall 2008 compared to 1,451 in Fall 2007. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)

The diversity of the student population is not reflected proportionately in campus personnel, particularly, in the faculty or the administration. Key administrators, during the visit, acknowledged their responsibility to increase diversity. At this time, there is no clear evidence that the campus has formal policies or procedures focusing on the recruitment and retention of ethnically diverse faculty. There is a lack of established goals, identified strategies, or an action plan to address issues of diversity. A systematic, deliberate, and coordinated approach relative to diversity is needed. Another finding, reported by the “Staffing for Effectiveness” team, was salary disparity based on gender in both faculty and staff categories. More attention and evidence is required to address questions regarding diversity and equity. A Diversity Plan reflecting expectations outlined in the WASC 2001 Handbook of Accreditation, “Illustrative Questions on Diversity for CPR and EER Reviews” was not found by the reviewers. (CFR 1.5)

The 2007 Lecturer Survey and the 2007 Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey were the major measurements used to examine the work environment. For the most part, faculty reported that they enjoy working in a highly diverse institution in a desirable location where academic freedom is valued. Heavy teaching loads and cost-of-living are major concerns especially among untenured tenure-track faculty. The CSU policy calls for a typical workload of 15 hours (12 for teaching, 3 for related activities); consequently, this finding is not uncommon to other institutions in the system, especially when research and scholarship are

requirements for retention and promotion. In recognition of the need for a reduced teaching load, new faculty are given assigned time (equivalent to one class) in each semester over a three-year period and an array of professional development programs and services are made available to faculty.

As one faculty member noted, “It is sometimes a shock when, in the fourth year, this modest time subsidy disappears.” The campus recognizes that additional initiatives will have to be explored to address issues of workload and morale and that data regarding the experience of tenured faculty must be gathered. In reference to faculty workload, although assessment is an important requirement in the teaching and learning process, participation in assessment does not appear to be acknowledged in the Retention Tenure Promotion (RTP) process or in lecturer hires. Positive steps have been taken to address faculty concerns but the campus’ ability to continue to attract, keep, and support faculty requires on-going attention and assessment. (CFR 3.1) The current economic downturn is a concern that came up in various meetings during the CPR visit.

Lecturers participating in CPR visit discussions expressed concerns about job security; the ability to conduct faculty searches was another voiced concern. Key administrators stated at various times throughout the visitation that, in spite of budgetary constraints and potential cuts, every effort would be made to prevent funding reductions to instruction. (CFR 3.3, 3.4) Academic planning needs to consider emerging programs like those in advanced study. The new Doctorate of Education (Ed.D.) represents a growing emphasis on research, scholarship, and creative activities. The issue of supporting faculty and student scholarship was identified by administration as a target of investment and opportunity.

Staff findings regarding satisfaction with the work environment and reported in the self-study report echoed those of faculty for whom data were available and described. The 2007 Employee Satisfaction Survey reported that 87 percent of staff would recommend CSULB as a good place to work. Cost-of-living was of lesser concern among staff but some dissatisfaction was expressed

regarding advancement opportunities. The Office of Human Resources provides training and professional development to help staff improve their skills, but no information was found regarding the extent to which employees are encouraged to pursue additional degrees or skills leading to advancement. (CFR 3.4)

In preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER), the Core Commitment II research questions can lead to a campus engaged in a culture of assessment with clear, identifiable, and measurable outcomes related to campus diversity issues. The development of a comprehensive action plan with elements aligned to expected outcomes should focus not only on ethnic and racial diversity of personnel but on larger questions regarding how the campus serves the needs of a diverse student population. At this point, evidence to support “Staffing for Effectiveness” is in an emerging stage with a need to move from preliminary data-collection through a complete cycle that begins with refining questions and ends with using findings to make improvements.

(CFR 1.5)

C. Core Commitment III. Assessing Student Success

CSULB defines its core academic purpose as “graduating students with highly-valued degrees.” For this WASC review, the institution chose to study its broad vision for student success by focusing on: 1) student learning outcome assessment, and 2) student success, as shown in retention, progress toward degree, and graduation. These are addressed in turn.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. The institution’s expectation for learning and student attainment, though not yet clearly articulated as student learning outcomes for the university or for all degree programs, is beginning to be developed and shared among all members of the campus community and the external stakeholders. Beyond improved graduation rates, however, evidence was not available to support the institution’s ability to demonstrate that its graduates consistently achieve its desired levels of attainment, or that these expectations are embedded in the criteria or standards faculty use to evaluate student work. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6)

CPR Report Appendix 7, “The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators” contains a statement that CSULB has formal learning outcomes at the institutional level and that these are specified in the University Catalog and in mission and vision statements. While it is expected that learning outcomes are to be explicitly stated in measurable terms, these outcomes remain largely implicit and general. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4) Efforts to incorporate assessment of student learning into the program review process are beginning to take shape. (CFR 2.7) Many areas of the institution – faculty, students, administrators, and staff – exhibit a growing awareness of the nature and purpose of student outcomes. Assessment processes are improving, although there is still heavy reliance on indirect measures such as surveys, questionnaires, and focus groups. Such approaches can provide useful information, but they must be accompanied by direct evidence of student performance of the outcome. Asking students about their level of knowledge or their perceptions of growth can be a good preparatory step, but it is not as strong a source of learning evidence as direct samples of student performance, such as responses to specific exam questions, signature assignments, or portfolios of student work. (CFR 4.6) Additionally, much discussion regarding program review highlighted the importance of input from external constituencies, but little specific evidence of this input was presented to the WASC team. A notable exception is the Employer Survey used in the College of Engineering, which yields information from employers regarding specific skills and attributes of the graduates. (CFR 2.7, 4.6)

For the past three years, each degree granting unit has been required to submit an annual report that addresses six facets of the complete learning outcome assessment cycle: 1) Learning Outcomes, 2) Curriculum Map, 3) Measures, 4) Process, 5) Findings, and 6) Use of Findings. A rubric defining these facets is used in evaluating the reports and providing feedback to their authors. Inspection of these reports shows that the frequency of reporting has increased markedly, and that student learning outcomes have been established for many programs and units.

Most departments submit the annual assessment reports required under the new program assessment and review guidelines, but there do not appear to be negative consequences for those that do not participate. Moreover, little if any, data are gathered on the institution's graduate programs, above that required by specialty accreditation for those programs. Beyond that, there is much variability in the implementation of the full outcome assessment process, related in part to participation in specialty accreditation by external national or state agencies. (CFR 2.7)

The new program review process, which will repeat on a seven year cycle, is intended to include a meaningful connection between assessment and resource allocation. Program review now encompasses the annual assessment reports, involves a self-study and external visitors (in departments with graduate programs at least one of the visitors will be from a doctorate granting department), and culminates in a formal review by the Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC). Recommendations coming from the review serve as the basis for a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that ties outcome assessment and program review more directly into institutional strategic planning and resource allocation. The faculty and staff the team talked with regard this system as a substantial improvement over the previous one but its long term effectiveness remains to be seen. It constitutes a major means through which CSULB strives to satisfy Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.4) As CSULB gains more experience with this new program review process, it will be important to show how the annual assessment reports, which reference MOUs only for programs that have undergone formal review since the new guidelines were put into place, have a clear bearing on resource allocation. (CFR 2.7) As CSULB works to build capacity for assessing student learning, the expectation is that it will be able to offer evidence of the use of assessment data in making curricular or institutional decisions. The affiliation of the Office of Institutional Research with Academic Affairs serves as a valuable mechanism in the development of decision support tools for academic planning and course scheduling.

Assessment in General Education has again come to the fore at CSULB in the past few years. Most notable is the design and implementation of a new framework and assessment procedures, enabled by suspension for two years of approving new general education courses and recertifying existing courses by the General Education Governance Council. The new framework embraces the Essential Learning Outcomes from the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU)'s Liberal Education for America's Promise (LEAP) Program. It incorporates a curriculum map of all 676 general education certified courses, requires participation of faculty in a learning community focused on one of the outcomes as a condition for re-certification of the course and features assessment conducted by specialist teams. Here again, the long term effectiveness of this model remains to be seen, but the faculty and also students with whom members spoke viewed the new general education policies with interest, even enthusiasm. Imposing the moratorium on reviewing GE classes, in order to allow the Council time to rethink how the institution would approach the assessment of learning in General Education, is an example of making a conscious decision to rethink an important dimension of the curriculum rather than to continue to increase responsibilities and workload. It is, in the experience of the visitation team, unusual and exemplary to decide to stop doing something in order to create capacity to introduce something new. (CFRs 2.7, 2.8)

At this point, the extent to which all faculty are involved in establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating expectations for student learning varies among colleges and departments. As in the case of other uses of data, this unevenness is not surprising, given how recently this model was introduced. It is unclear, also, how extensively distance education faculty are involved in the determination and assessment of student learning. No assessment results were available for distance education, although an assessment plan was found for the off-campus M.S. Criminal Justice Program in Whittier, where tenured and part-time faculty participate in assessment

processes. The faculty role in using assessment results is unclear across the institution. The extent to which all faculty are involved in establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating expectations for student learning varies among colleges and departments. It seems that many departments delegate this task to an assessment coordinator or committee, and the degree of involvement of the department faculty may vary widely. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6) Some concern was also expressed about the lack of time to do this work, given heavy faculty workloads as well as the limitations of the current infrastructure available to support this work. Many units may lack sufficient access to assessment experts. The team will look for evidence of attention to these issues at the time of the EER visit.

An important issue under “Assessing Student Success” regarding program review relates to Core Commitment II’s focus on “Staffing for Effectiveness.” This issue is the perception that university and system initiatives add to workload. The CPR Report notes that some degree programs choose to treat their options as though they were separate degree programs, doing full self-studies for each. For example, the three degree programs in the College of Education submitted a total of nine self-studies, greatly increasing the workload of the PARC and that of the faculty themselves. It is important to note that this additional workload was not the result of a university initiative; it was related to external accrediting requirements. The prudent decision of the General Education Governance Council to impose a two-year moratorium on reviewing GE classes in order to plan an assessment process appears to have considered workload issues, among other factors.

Co-curricular units are also being required to identify appropriate student learning outcomes for their programs, but there has not been an intentional effort to connect these outcomes with those in the academic areas (institutional, GE, or major programs). It is clear that there are many opportunities for collaboration around achieving specific academic outcomes (e.g.,

communication, teamwork, civic engagement, goal-setting), both inside and beyond the classroom. Co-curricular and curricular outcomes could be addressed collectively, as a part of developing or reaffirming broader institutional outcomes framed as the skills and knowledge that CSULB intends all its graduates to acquire as a result of the entirety of their experience at the university. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.11)

Student Success: Retention, Progress Toward Degree, and Graduation. CSULB has sought to become increasingly student-centered over the past decade. This has resulted in alterations to many programs and practices, including orientation, advising, a freshman seminar, enrollment management, and class scheduling culminating in the elimination of many degree progress bottlenecks. Pursuant to these and other changes, the six year graduation rate for the 2002 cohort is 54 percent, a rate more than double that of a decade ago. On the whole, this constitutes a significant accomplishment in fostering student success. Student advisement has become a strong focus across the institution and faculty, staff, and students expressed a strong commitment to working together in new ways to improve advisement. This attention has taken several forms. The Advising Center was moved from the margin of the campus to the center where student traffic is most intense. As a consequence, usage grew rapidly. The student leaders described a plan to install a number of Life Guard Stations around campus to provide access to advisement and to provide essential information about registration and the effective use of the Degree Progress Report (DPR) and the Pathways to Graduation planning tools.

CSULB has launched over forty new or revamped student success efforts, spawned in part by analysis of data about student success. Notwithstanding the gain in the graduation rate, gender and ethnicity achievement gaps have been identified and are being addressed. Considerable efforts are in place to maximize student success and data are being gathered on student characteristics, needs, experiences, and satisfaction, however, the team questioned whether these

activities are part of a cohesive Diversity Plan that directs attention to the retention and graduation of different members of the student population. CFR 1.5) For example, the Beach Learning Community (BLC) is designed to serve 150 students who enter with needs for remediation in both mathematics and English. BLC student retention was 12 percent higher than the retention rate for BLC baseline students. More generally, the Graduation Greenlight and Low-Completion-Rate Course projects have shown measured impacts on student success. These and many other projects, such as Student Orientation, Advisement, and Registration (SOAR), Degree Progress Report (DPR), Graduation Checkup, and Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) are contributing evidence of campus commitment to learning and improvement, especially with respect to CFRs 4.4, 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7. As noted, many innovative and meaningful programs have been developed and implemented to support students in their educational experience but, unfortunately, the future of student services and instruction are both subject to financial impacts, and thus, students are worried. The visiting team heard from student representatives concerns regarding the availability of courses, possible delays in graduation, and the ability to pay higher fees and other costs. CSULB's concerns regarding fiscal impacts on students appear to mirror those of students, as shown through the institution's current budget planning process and strategic priorities, however, plans to protect the student experience need to be examined and evaluated from a broad perspective of curricular and co-curricular impacts in order to set priorities. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, 3.5)

In the case of the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), it was noted in Appendix III.6 of the CPR Report that, "While substantial resources and effort have been directed toward passing the Writing Proficiency Examination (WPE) this focus on the test has diverted attention from the larger, more fundamental goal of improving student writing." This is also a larger question with respect to clarifying the relationships among assessment, instruction, curriculum, and student learning. As found in other core commitment research questions, more specificity is

needed in asking questions. With regard to student learning, the use of data collection, analysis, and application of findings are important to assess the impact of these many initiatives and to prioritize among them.

Here, too, baselines, targets and timelines need to be established, and progress then measured against those goals. (CFRs 2.5, 2.6)

SECTION III.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The WASC CPR Team identified ten major findings, or commendations, and five recommendations based on extensive review of institutional information. In general, California State University, Long Beach is a large, decentralized university with a sense of collegiality, enthusiasm, and pride in its setting, its programs, and its service to students. Beach Pride, a campus slogan, expresses more than its coastal location. The reviewers were impressed by the energy and commitment expressed by different constituents across the campus and felt confident that the institution will retain, through shared governance, its prime focus on students as it evolves into a model of a 21st century university.

COMMENDATIONS:

- Student Advisement has become a strong focus across the institution and faculty, staff, and students expressed a strong commitment to working together in new ways to improve advisement and student success.
- General Education assessment processes were redesigned and existing practices were put on hold until this important piece of the curriculum was adequately examined and then implemented.

- Strong Partnerships have been institutional priorities for many years and current examples attest to an urban university that is responsive to the region it serves.
- Planning and Budgeting are guided by a long-term view articulated in a series of strategic priorities and multi-year goals.
- Strong Commitment to Shared Governance includes a strong spirit of collegiality and an openness of communication across the campus community in a culture of engagement.
- Physical Setting alone does not make a campus but the beauty of the CSULB environment and the use of space serve to foster a student-friendly and sustainable environment conducive to learning.
- Centrality of the Student Experience as demonstrated by the highly-visible term, “Graduation Begins Today,” captures in symbolic form the true intensity of the campus focus on student success.
- Staff Members are represented where important discussions take place and where important recommendations are addressed.
- Alignment of Institutional Research with Academic Affairs results in strong support of functions tied to academic planning and course scheduling.
- Expanded Advanced Study is occurring with the introduction of an independent Ed.D. in Educational Leadership which provides opportunities to expand research, scholarship, and creative activities through additional grant funding.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Diversity issues require more attention. A robust plan of action for promoting diversity at CSULB is greatly needed. The student body is diverse but more attention could be given to the retention and graduation of different members of the student population. Diversity of the faculty, staff, and administration does not reflect the student population and a plan is needed to enhance it.
(CFR 1.5)
- Student Learning and Attainment is not clearly articulated as student learning outcomes for all graduating students or for some degree programs. Progress is uneven, with some units more advanced than others in the development and use of student learning assessment. There is an over-reliance on survey instruments to assess learning. Notable exceptions include assessment work done in the College of Education and in the re-design of General Education.
(CFR 2.3, 2.4)
- Open Communication is valued at CSULB but a number of voices are silent. This was a concern expressed frequently during the review. Many people are involved in the reorganized governance structures and in related committees but there appear to be community members who do not feel fully enfranchised. Outreach efforts to increase open communication further need to be explored in relation to possible causes. (CFRs 1.4)
- Budget Reduction Concerns of Students. Student leaders expressed concerns about the impact of budget reductions on the availability of courses, progress toward degrees, and the cost of attendance. These concerns were also

expressed throughout the campus community, however, plans to protect the student experience -a high priority for CSULB- need to be examined from a broad perspective that includes attention to student support programs, effective advisement, assistance in financial planning, and other related student needs. (CFRs 2.10, 2.13, 3.1, 3.2, 3.5)

- Culture of Evidence has different meanings and is often confused with a “culture of data gathering.” The way to achieve a culture of evidence is to put data in context (e.g., through establishment of baselines and targets) and use data to support the identification and study of research questions, ultimately using evidence to demonstrate educational effectiveness and student attainment of learning outcomes at the desired level of performance. It is the reviewers’ hope that the identification and study of researchable questions through the Core Commitment programs that will be undertaken for the Educational Effectiveness Review will become the vehicle through which CSULB sets up a true culture of inquiry. A more consistent pattern of inquiry and disciplined and consistent use of evidence could provide a basis for shared governance and shared responsibility for accomplishing the strategic priorities of the university. As the campus prepares for its next report, the WASC rubric, called “Educational Effectiveness Framework: Capacity and Effectiveness as They Relate to Student and Institutional Learning” can provide useful guidance. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.6, 4.7)

SECTION IV. PREPARATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

Core Commitments I, II, and III, which frame the self-study or CPR Report submitted in WASC in 2008, contain important questions in the areas of Organizational Effectiveness, Staffing for Effectiveness, and Assessing for Student Success. While the questions are relevant, they are quite broad and need specificity to result in evidence that can be used for making decisions in the areas addressed through inquiry. The core commitment research teams need to continue developing the questions, gathering the information that will answer those questions, determining the meaning of that information, and disseminating it to appropriate stakeholders. The EER visiting team will need to see evidence of effectiveness and accomplishments in each of the core commitment areas at the time of the next visit. They will need to find clear, identifiable, measurable outcomes. Also, the reviewers will expect to see data-gathering efforts that move beyond a reliance on surveys and questionnaires to collection and analysis of direct evidence – across the campus units and programs. Within the self-study prepared for the CPR review, the intent to provide evidence for the EER was clearly stated. The CPR team did see preliminary data-gathering and some initial findings but the level of reflection and inquiry must be expanded between the CPR and EER visits to provide visible and tangible evidence, outcomes, and results pertaining to levels of effectiveness described in CSULB’s Capacity and Preparatory Review report, or self-study.

For the EER visit, the institution will need to respond to the suggestions and recommendations made by the CPR review team. Particular attention is to be given to the areas regarding: 1) Diversity, 2) Student Learning and Assessment, 3) Open Communication, 4) Budget Reduction Concerns of Students, and 5) Culture of Evidence. These are identified as Recommendations in the “Report of the WASC Visiting Team Capacity and Preparatory Review.”

The CPR team found numerous commendable activities and considerable pride and enthusiasm when it visited the campus. It is the expectation of the team that the values that CSULB holds and exemplifies in so many ways will be maintained during difficult times and that the EER team will see what the CPR team saw – a vibrant campus with student success continuing to be its highest priority.

APPENDICES

Ed . D. in Educational Leadership Program Review: Report – APPENDIX A.

CSU Long Beach Ed. D. Educational Leadership Program
Reviewed During CPR Visit – March 4-6, 2009
Reviewers: Judith Ramaley and Irma Guzman Wagner

Program Overview:

The CSULB Ed. D. Program in Educational Leadership is one of the first independent doctoral programs developed and implemented in response to a Chancellor's Office initiative to move from joint program models. The first cohort of 27 students was admitted in 2007 and is now at the dissertation stage. Twenty-six students were admitted in 2008 and 30 entered in 2009. Students are enrolled in one of two specializations: K-12 or Community College/Higher Education. A total of 60 units are required regardless of the specialization. These units are distributed as follows: Core Courses: 35 units, Research Courses – 13 units, and 12 units of Specialization Courses. Classes are taught on Saturdays and during the summer.

Program requirements include: letters of recommendation and GRE test results and other indicators of academic and professional capability and promise. Students come primarily from the areas surrounding CSU Long Beach, are employed in neighboring school districts, community colleges, CSULB, and private institutions, and are working professionals.

Funding and Support:

The primary source of funding for instruction is from student fees (comparable to University of California fees.) Each student pays an approximate total of \$18,000 distributed across equal semester and summer payments. Support of the program from the Chancellor's Office is found in online library services and assistance provided by the CSU doctoral program team. A commitment for four faculty positions was made by the campus to initiate the Ed.D. Program. More positions have been filled since its inception. CSU Long Beach is one of six campuses involved in a Carnegie-based analysis of initial independent doctoral programs.

Lessons being learned from the Ed .D. Program

The faculty who participate in doctoral study also work with Masters students. Together the two levels of advanced study are contributing to a strong research culture within the College of Education. Participation in the doctoral program is open to any faculty members who present appropriate credentials. The cohort students are grouped into interest areas, each mentored by a faculty member. These interest areas are beginning to develop as research themes within the Department. Masters students are also being drawn to these areas. As a result of the open opportunity to participate and the growing integration with Masters level work, the doctoral program is not being seen as an elite or separate experience within the department but rather an opportunity that any interested and qualified member of the department may enjoy.

The program design requires a tight schedule for completion. The first student cohort is entering its dissertation year now. The students are area practitioners who will select

topics that arise from their professional experience and the methodology will be primarily action research. The lessons from the first cohort are being studied and will be incorporated into the way that the department approaches each subsequent cohort.

It appears that the emergence of a stronger doctoral presence at CSULB will place pressure on the research infrastructure. The Provost's Office is actively investing in research and graduate study and is planning to strengthen the support structure for external grant seeking. According to Associate Vice Provost Till, the campus has invested \$1.2M a year in addition to a \$210,000 allotment from the Chancellor's Office to support research. There are now two separate categories of support: (1) summer research stipends for students and their faculty mentors; (2) internal awards for faculty who are doing preliminary research that could lead to external funding, summer research stipends, and assigned time to complete manuscripts for publication or to complete a research project.

Two student comments, shared with the WASC team, indicated satisfaction with the rigor of the program. One of the responses requested attention to scheduling and length of courses to avoid conflict with others, and to ensure that the content and related expectations reasonably matched the time allocation for a course. It was also pointed out that an expectation to hear more than one point of view was not met in a program that should focus on current issues that could be discussed from different perspectives. It should be pointed out that the tone of the comments was extremely respectful and professional and written in a manner designed to provide assistance.

As the Ed.D. Program implements its Assessment System, program improvements will certainly occur based on data analysis. Hopefully, the students' comments mentioned here, though not a representative sample, will be taken into consideration along with other comments received through direct measures of a wider respondent group. The assessment plan reviewed during the visit is under development and provides an avenue for ongoing program review.

Assessment:

Recommendations on the 2008 Annual Report on Assessment addressed the need to continue the implementation of its assessment plan and to report the results in the June 2009 annual assessment report. This finding was based on the fact that the Ed.D in Educational Leadership is new and, as such, did not provide an assessment report in June 2008. The new dean indicated, in the telephone interview, that plans are being developed in response to the requests from Academic Affairs relative to Program Review and Assessment.

Information obtained through: Website, Program Assessment & Review (file in Team Room), Phone Conversation with Dean Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Meeting with Associate Vice Provost James Till, Meeting with Chair Jennifer Coots, Department of Advanced Studies, Education and Counseling and Student Comments

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

APPENDIX B

[Summary form for distance education evaluators. A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report. Evidence based on the information collected may be integrated into the body of the team report as appropriate.]

1. INSTITUTION

California State University, Long Beach

2. TEAM MEMBER(S)/REVIEWER(S):

Milton Hakel, Jená Burges

3. DATES THAT DISTANCE EDUCATION MATERIALS WERE VIEWED:

March 1, 2009- March 5, 2009

VIEWED IN CONJUNCTION WITH (check all that apply):

CPR

4. CONTEXT (for example, number of programs offered via distance education, degree levels offered via distance education, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition; average class size)

The online platform for CSU-LB is currently BlackBoard (called BeachBoard here), but the institution will be migrating to an open-source alternative, Angel, over the next few months. Elluminate Live!, a web-based resource for synchronous voice and video interaction, is also available.

The MS in Engineering Management is the only fully online program available through the University College and Extension Services; it is a joint program with Dominguez Hills and is currently being phased out.

Certificate programs are more numerous, including a popular Global Logistics Specialist Certificate, offered on both a classroom-based and online basis with an equal number of students in each version (each cohort is now 38 students). Faculty and industry experts teach in the program.

About 194 online courses were offered in 2007-2008 through both OCES and state support, accounting for a total student enrollment of 3383 (752 FTES). Faculty comprising a head count of 124 include permanent CSU-LB faculty, temporary faculty, and industry experts.

5. DESCRIPTION OF DISTANCE EDUCATION INTERACTIONS (what was viewed, description of formats, other details to help describe nature and context of the review):

Online courses in Emergency Management, Public Policy Administration, and Professional Studies were viewed. Posted on the CSU-LB's "BeachBoard" version of BlackBoard, they follow a common format and layout; additionally, a rich set of resources and online tutorials is available. All materials are accessible, complying with the CSU Accessible Technology Initiative.

6. OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED OR PERSONS INTERVIEWED CONCERNING DISTANCE EDUCATION (prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit):
During the visit: the Dean and Associate Dean of University College and Extension Services were interviewed, and the Provost and Vice Provost were consulted. The UCES Online Learning Faculty Standards were reviewed, as was the CSU-LB Syllabus Policy specifying the additional requirements for online courses. The site of an Elluminate course was also visited.

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.
<i>Quality of the Learning Infrastructure.</i> Is the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)	Yes, the BeachBoard Learning Management System is well-engineered to facilitate interaction. Instructors and students also interact frequently via e-mail. The planned move to Angel requires follow-up.	X
<i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the institution's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other student services appropriate to the modalities of delivery? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)	Very few programs are wholly online; in the event of a need identified by an online-only student, the Program manager (UCES) works with the relevant department coordinator to address the issue on an individual basis. As programs are added, having policies and procedures in place will become increasingly necessary.	X
<i>Connection of Faculty to the Institution.</i> In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 3.1, 3.2)	Academic departments have responsibility for engaging distance learning faculty in assessment of student learning. UCES Online Learning Faculty Standards are provided to faculty teaching online courses, and the policy requires faculty to engage in training with a designated instructional designer. In addition, the Office of Academic Technology offers workshops as well as eLearning Consultant. The planned move to Angel may require additional support.	X

<p><i>Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to distance learning activities.</i> In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to distance learning activities? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</p>	<p>UCES personnel are serving on a Core Commitment Research team as one way of building connections between distance education and the CPR/EER</p>	<p>X</p>
<p><i>Context of distance learning to the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>Global engagement is cited as an institutional priority facilitated by online learning. There is currently no university-level planning with respect to distance education; program development is more reactive. In many cases, UCES gets word about program demand and brings it to the attention of an academic department.</p>	<p>X</p>
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness for distance learners? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning in distance learning courses and programs? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>CSU-LB has begun explicitly to incorporate distance education courses into program review and program assessment. In addition, the syllabi reviewed included statements of expected student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>X</p>

Additional Findings, Observations or Comments. Please provide any other information that you believe it is pertinent to note. Also, if any of the boxes above are checked, elaborate here. Finally, please include any recommendations you might have for subsequent team members/reviewers concerning distance education courses and programs.

The expense of developing online instruction results in migration of online programs to self-support, which costs more for students. Thus the increased geographic access provided by online learning opportunities can be offset by an increase in financial barriers, but, given the financial realities in the state, there does not appear to be much choice.

Collaborative planning is now underway to develop an online Engineering Management graduate program on the Executive MBA model.

OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

APPENDIX C.

[Summary form for off-campus site reviewers. A completed copy of this form for each off-campus site visited should be appended to the team report. Evidence based on the information collected may be integrated into the body of the team report as appropriate.]

1. INSTITUTION:

California State University, Long Beach
Department of Criminal Justice
M.S. in Criminal Justice

2. SITE LOCATION (include physical address):

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD) STAR Academy
11515 S. Colima Road, #M-106
Whittier, CA 90604

3. TEAM MEMBER(S)/REVIEWER(S):

Irma Guzman Wagner

4. CONTEXT (for example, number of programs offered at site, degree levels offered at site, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition)

The site where the M.S. in Criminal Justice is taught is a former high school purchased by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department to provide training at different career points. The M.S. in Criminal Justice is the only CSULB program being taught at this facility.

Twenty-nine (29) cohort students are enrolled in Cohort IV B.

The Department of Criminal Justice offers its Master of Science in Criminal Justice Program in Whittier in partnership with the University College and Extension Services. The program is identical to the on-campus CRJU master's degree programs, except for the class site which was selected because of its location near the border of Orange and Los Angeles Counties. The off-campus site is offered through a cohort model of students who continue to follow the same schedule of 12 classes over an 18-19 month period. Classes are taught on Saturdays in accelerated six-week sessions. The class visited was the fourth cohort to be enrolled in the program. All classes are taught in a face-to-face mode with an instructor present; this is not an online program, except that students have access to Beachboard if they wish to use it.

The class in session on the day of the visit was PPA 500, Foundations of Public Policy and taught by Dr. Paul Walters, Chief, Santa Ana Police Department

The August 30, 2008 to April 10, 2010 Cohort IV B consists of twelve classes to be taught by five tenure-track faculty and seven instructors. A department requirement is that all faculty and instructors hold a doctorate degree. This was confirmed through the

schedule, a course syllabus, and by the department chair. The sudden death of Dr. Bruce Berg in February 2009 has necessitated the hiring of an instructor to teach his class. The instructors hold respected positions in police departments, U.S. or District Attorney's Offices and a number hold juris doctorates.

5. DATE VISITED and LENGTH OF VISIT:

March 7, 2009 – 11:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.

6. VISITED IN CONJUNCTION WITH (check all that apply):

- CPR
- EER
- Special Visit
- Substantive Change review
- Other (please explain)

7. DESCRIPTION OF ON SITE INTERACTIONS (with whom did reviewers speak, in what contexts?)

- 1) Lunch meeting at restaurant near the site: Attending;
Dept. of Criminal Justice, Department Chair, Dr. Henry Fradella
College of Health and Human Services Associate Dean, Dr. Susan
Stanley
Instructor, Dr. Paul Walters
Faculty member, Professor Paul Wang
Faculty member and CRJU Off-campus Program Coordinator, Dr. Sam
Torres
UCES Program Manager, Matt Reimers
- 2) Site and Facilities Tour – Student Coordinator Jennifer Webb
- 3) Class Visitation and Interview with Students – 29 present (College
representatives were invited to attend as observers and to answer
questions at the end of the session. Time: 40 minutes
- 4) Conversations enroute to site with Dr. Fradella, Dr. Stanley, and
Mr. Reimers; on the way to the airport: Drs. Fradella and
Stanley

8. OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED (prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit):

Websites: <http://www.csulb.edu/colleges/chhs/departments/criminal-justice/degrees/maturs/index.htm>
[http://www.csulb.edu/Off campus masters/Off Campus Accelerated Masters Program.htm](http://www.csulb.edu/Off%20campus%20masters/Off%20Campus%20Accelerated%20Masters%20Program.htm)

Copies of:

Information Flyer
 CSULB – Dept. of Criminal Justice Curriculum Map for M.S. in Criminal Justice:
 for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs
 Dept. of Criminal Justice Rubric for the Assessment of Theses and Empirical
 Directed Research Papers
 Information for WASC Site Visitors – prepared by Associate Dean
 Master of Science in Criminal Justice – Information (3 page handout)
 Master of Science in Criminal Justice – Program Orientation flyer (1 page)
 Listing of Information Meetings, 2009
 Cohort IVB Schedule and Instructor Assignments – Class in Session at time of
 on-site visit: PPA 500: Foundations of Public Policy and Administration
 Course Syllabus for: CRJU 631, Legal Issues in Criminal Justice (Accelerated
 Study)

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)</p>	<p>Yes, the facility, as a former high school has adequate classrooms. The campus is well kept and spacious. Two are used by the department and both are large and appropriate for instruction. The seats are tiered with a very large space at the front for small group instruction. Technology services are available, as requested, for each class. These are handled through the Student Coordinator.</p>	
	<p>On-campus and off-campus advisement of CRJU graduate students is identical. The Graduate Advisor meets with all students in person at the Whittier site at the start of each cohort and mid-year. In addition, students receive one-on-one advising by appointment, by telephone, and via email.</p> <p>Students attested to sufficient advisement and also noted that library facilities are not a problem since all books can be obtained through online services or at neighboring CSU campuses. Also, computing services are not problematic since all students have their own computers and access to related technology.</p>	

<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)</p>	<p>Specific questions were asked regarding services and answers were positive.</p>	
<p><i>Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)</p>	<p>The site is quite large so actual visibility of CSULB is limited to the space and time when students are taking classes, however, all of the faculty who teach in the program are Department faculty; others are chosen by the Department to teach because of their high qualifications. The program is not a new one and there are many connections with the LA Sheriff's Department that operates the Academy in Whittier. The program director, Dr. Sam Torres, is a tenured Professor in the Department who previously worked directly with various justice agencies in the surrounding area. His connections between the university and the community were noted by Chief Walters.</p> <p>In terms of the connection to the on-campus site, the curriculum is the same for on-and-off campus students. All courses are part of the Department's. Assessment Planning. Admission requirements are the same.</p>	
	<p>The Department involves multiple constituencies in decisions affecting Criminal Justice programs, specifically, in the most recent revisions of the courses and the development of assessment plans.</p> <p>Because the M.S. program (on and off campus) is designed for professionals, visiting instructors with considerable expertise serve as conduits between the application of theory and practice. Conversations occur between and among tenure-track faculty and visiting lecturers.</p>	

<p><i>Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to off-campus activities.</i> In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to activities at this site? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</p>		
<p><i>Context of this site in the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>The same mission and vision drive the off-campus program since it is identical to that offered on-campus. It is operationalized through teaching that meets the same standards in terms of hiring and evaluation.</p> <p>Another example is that the cohort model used in Whittier will be adopted at the Long Beach campus because students praise the benefits provided through its student support and networking systems.</p>	
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>According to the Dept. Chair, all courses in Criminal Justice were revised in the last two years – all are new and all are part of a Curriculum Map. An assessment system is in place, although still new, to collect data to use in program modification, as needed.</p> <p>The Dept. will assess the on and off campus M.S. programs and use T-tests to determine difference in student learning. These data, according to the Chair will be available for the EER reviewers.</p> <p>Both on and off campus students take the same Comprehensive Examinations if they choose that option in place of a traditional thesis. The M.S. requirements are similar.</p>	

Additional Findings, Observations or Comments. Please provide any other information that you believe it is pertinent to note. Also, if any of the boxes above are checked, elaborate here. Finally, please include any recommendations you might have for subsequent team members/reviewers concerning this site.

QUESTIONS ASKED: See Suggested Lines of Inquiry Above.
Also, Questions related to the three CPR Core Commitments

And questions, if not covered above:

- Quality of facilities: Do the classrooms and other facilities foster learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)
- Interactions between students and faculty: Are interactions in and outside the classroom encouraged? (CFR 2.5)
- Faculty: Who is teaching in the program/ Are the faculty connected to the main campus? Do they have the same support and development opportunities as faculty on the main campus? (CFRs 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)
- Student support services: Are student needs identified and responded to: (CFRs 2.11, 2.13, 3.6)
- Library Support: Are resources sufficient and is information literacy and library usage an integral part of the curriculum? (CFRs 2.2, 3.6)
- Assessment of Educational Effectiveness: Are learning outcomes identified and results analyzed? Is regular assessment of the program conducted? How do the results compare with those of programs offered on the main campus? (CFR 4.6)

In summary, I was quite impressed with all aspects of the program. The campus representatives with whom I met were knowledgeable about the program structure, courses, services, and the like. They were enthusiastic and supportive of the program and its students. In meeting with the class, I asked a number of questions related to the opportunity to take classes away from the main campus; I sought answers to learn the positive aspects, as well as those in need of attention. Overwhelmingly, the students responded affirmatively and gave examples of why the program in Whittier is serving their needs. They view themselves as CSU Long Beach students and as one said, "We don't need to go to the campus because we have what we need right here." Student professional backgrounds range from working in Immigration Offices to providing legal assistance in social service agencies – the array of experience is vast. Keeping in mind that this review was part of the Capacity and Preparatory Review process, similar questions regarding CSULB's Core Commitments were posed.

Like other academic programs at CSULB faculty recruitment and hiring are dependent on available university resources. A department's ability to maintain an adequate ratio between tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty is one that is a concern for Criminal Justice, especially since two of its tenure faculty have passed away in the last two months. The Department Chair expressed a commitment to the program and hopes that the positions can be filled in order to maintain a reasonable ratio.

It was a pleasure to visit the M.S. in Criminal Justice program in Whittier.