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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

IA - Description of Institution and Visit

California State University East Bay (CSUEB) is a comprehensive Category II Master’s institution that awards mostly baccalaureate degrees. CSUEB’s main campus is located in the Hayward Hills. CSUEB has another campus Concord, Professional Development and Conference Center in Oakland, and offers degrees at several international locations. CSUEB, under its prior names, have been accredited by WASC since 1961.

California State University East Bay began as Alameda County State College and changed its name to California State College at Hayward three years later. In 1994, as California State University-Hayward, it began a series of MBA programs at international sites, that have continued through several location changes to today. In 2002 a joint Doctoral Program in Urban Educational Leadership was proposed by California State University-Hayward, San Francisco State University, San Jose State University and the University of California, Berkeley; this degree program was approved by the WASC Commission some time later.

In the 2004-05 academic year, the institution changed its name to California State University East Bay to more appropriately reflect the geographical region it serves. Although the name change does not reflect an accreditation issue, it was a contentious issue on the campus and in the city of Hayward that will be discussed in our report.

The current enrollment at California State University East Bay is approximately 9,000 full-time and 4,000 part-time students. Some 49% are minority students (African American, Asian Pacific, Hispanic, or American Indian), 26% white, 16% other, and 8% international. There is a nearly 50/50 split in students under 25 years and those over 25 years of age with the average age of undergraduate students being 28.
The seven-member WASC team visited California State University East Bay from March 16 to 18, 2005 for the purpose of conducting a Capacity and Preparatory Review, which constitutes the second phase of the three-part WASC accreditation review process. Four members of the team were responsible for conducting a review of the East Bay campuses, while three other members were focused on the review of CSUEB’s international locations and the Systems Review Proposal.

California State University East Bay conducted a complete and extensive self-study in preparation for the visit of the team, including the construction of a very informative website. The visit itself was very well organized. The Resource Room was excellent and amazingly complete, and the team was treated royally throughout the visit and at the international sites. Our special thanks are extended to the entire California State University East Bay family--but most especially to the gracious hospitality of President Norma Rees, Carl Bellone and Gale Young, and at the sites to Gregory Christainsen and Gary Wishniewsky who went far beyond the call of duty.

**IB - Quality of Preparatory Report**

The institution chose to follow a slight modification of the WASC standards in its Capacity and Preparatory Review, which followed the organization it had used in its Institutional Proposal. The Capacity and Preparatory Review was conducted thoroughly and completely, including the incorporation of its website. The Report described extensively the planning and consultation efforts undertaken by the University, but did not describe as much progress in implementing the planning process as might have been expected given the report of the previous WASC accreditation review. (It should be noted that while on campus and at the sites, the team
was provided with large amounts of documentation and evidence based on conversations with various groups that to some extent demonstrated the progress we hoped to find.)

IC - Response to Previous Commission Reviews

The previous accreditation team made several comments about the University's praiseworthy planning efforts, but regretted the lack of implementation data. The widespread implementation of planning efforts continues to be a serious concern for the visiting team, and the institution was made aware of its lack of progress in this area. All of the other major recommendations have been satisfactorily addressed and will be described in the context in this Report.
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY UNDER THE STANDARDS

The discussion in this section addresses the capacity of California State University East Bay to achieve educational effectiveness as described in the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. An additional request was made to conduct a Systems Review related to the Transnational Executive MBA (TE MBA), the Moscow MBA, and the Executive MBA programs in Graz (Austria), Hong Kong, and Singapore. The initial response to this request is included in the Appendix.

Standard 1: Focused and compelling vision

In response to Standard 1, the University recently completed a review of its mission, values and vision statements in preparation for its Capacity and Preparatory Review. Using campus-wide discussion and an iterative process, a very diverse Mission Campus Outcome Team (COT) was able to build consensus, among faculty, staff, students, and administrators around the new mission, vision, and values. The team did not find evidence of broad dissemination across the whole campus or that all constituents were united together for their implementation.

The campus has acknowledged multiculturalism as a salient objective in its mission and of the need for multiculturalism needs to be infused across the entire campus, into its curricula, and into its student, faculty, staff and administrative recruitment. The institution's Affirmative Action Liaison Officer is conducting workshops throughout the campus to prepare the faculty and staff to do aggressive multicultural recruitment. Another important step to address this issue is the diversity survey conducted by an Academic Senate Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee. The faculty, through its governance activities, has begun a systemic survey to gather
and regularize the data relative to multiculturalism. The faculty is to be commended for taking this action. The team did not find that these data were incorporated into the University's planning and decision-making processes. For example, the team did not find evidence that administrative actions to develop and monitor policies and to establish appropriate organizational structures for the recruitment and retention of ethnically diverse faculty were as of yet sufficiently implemented to successfully yield the desired results in terms of multicultural recruitment. The institution must review its organizational capacity decisions in light of these and the other elements of the new mission, vision, and values statements as it begins its preparation for its Educational Effectiveness Review.

**Standard 2: Infrastructure for coordinated assessment**

Prior to visiting California State University East Bay, the team member’s were quite skeptical about the infrastructure for coordinated assessment based solely on the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report. However, after meetings with those responsible for General Education, Student Affairs programs, Assessment of Degree Programs, and Institutional Assessment, the team members came away confident that California State University East Bay is well on it way to creating an excellent infrastructure for coordinated assessment.

**General Education**

The institution has been very responsive to the 1995 WASC report that concluded that there was a lack of curricular coherence and no clear purpose for general education. A new program was instituted in fall 1998 that established year-long learning communities for freshmen students. The content of these thematically integrated courses include the natural sciences, humanities, and /or social sciences whose thematic links meet requirements in communications, composition, and information literary courses. Two of the major strengths of the program are the
establishment of learning communities and the integration of learning in courses with remedial work where needed. The success of the program is demonstrated by these facts: students in the learning community program have higher retention rates, perform better on writing skills test, and report significant learning because of diversity among the students. A five-year program review was completed and as a result, mandatory sophomore clusters were eliminated. This gave students more flexibility in their course selection.

Assessment processes in General Education (GE) are informed by institutional mission and priorities, which has led to program changes in freshman and sophomore offerings. The Academic Senate, first in the GE subcommittee and next in the full curriculum committee, reviews and approves courses, which contributes to ownership of GE by the entire university faculty. In addition, as demonstrated in the GE assessment posted on the web, there are various communication vehicles that contribute to a sense of faculty ownership. All of this combines to result in an active and broad-based discussion among faculty on GE, which in turn has led to thinking about assessment and student learning in other areas of the curriculum, particularly the major. As one of the faculty members noted, learning outcomes not only help students know what is expected of them but they inform discussion within faculty committees and departments as well.

Assessment of student learning has led to changes in the freshmen learning communities. In the lower division General Education program courses assessment plays a major role in the continuous improvement of individual courses and the program as a whole based on a consistent set of student learning outcomes that are written into syllabi. This has resulted in very good retention rates from the first to the second year.
GE reform and teaching is challenging at best. The success of designing, assessing and changing the freshmen and sophomore learning communities suggests that CSUEB has the potential to define and sustain educational effectiveness. The challenge that the campus faces is to build on the lower division learning goals in creating learning outcomes for upper division courses. These are in the process of being written and will need the support of various faculty committees before they are adopted. Of particular significance, given the mission of the institution and its diverse student body will be infusing diversity learning goals throughout the General Education and majors curricula. Unfortunately, while described as an important learning outcome, the team was unable to discern how extensive multiculturalism is presently embedded throughout upper division courses.

Student Affairs

Led by the Vice President, Division of Student Affairs has engaged in a process that stands out as an exemplar of planning. Central to this planning process has been the development of a culture that has as its motto, Students First. This process includes ongoing assessment by each program in the division. There also is attention to diversity throughout the Division of Student Affairs, particularly in relationship to retention of at-risk students. These values, combined with a culture of assessment have led to numerous innovations. For example, a new data base will allow Student Affairs to track students who use any of their services and then analyze these data to identify patterns of program use that contribute to student success. Another example is the Early Alert System that is tied to BlackBoard and provides students and their advisors with information about academic problems within the first five weeks of the quarter.

There are multiple opportunities, many of which originate in Student Affairs, to get students engaged in the life of the campus. However, because the student body is made up of
mostly commuter students it is very difficult to draw people into these opportunities. As a result many students at CSUEB do not have a sense of belonging to the campus. Retention is seen as a university-wide responsibility. The productive partnership between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs should be nurtured to further enhance student engagement and student success using the model of the learning communities that has been created within General Education. The value of these learning communities is demonstrated by the high retention rate for first-time freshmen, 81.6% in fall 2003.

The Student Affairs leadership and staff all agree that their culture of planning guided them through significant budget cuts. However, cuts of up to 25% percent of the Division of Student Affairs budget have struck at the heart of the unit’s mission. GE advising is a particularly critical function of the University Advisement Center, however, students reported difficulty in getting appointments to see advisors and often there are waits of up to an hour and a half for drop-in advising around noon time when students have a lunch break. Students also reported a perceived acute lack of available services for those who attend evening classes. All of this results in considerable frustration of the part of students and staff, and, more importantly, also results in wrong course choices that hinders students’ progress toward a degree.

One of the most severe problems facing CSUEB is the breakdown of degree audit and financial aid systems, which has resulted in students not receiving transcript reviews or financial aid checks in a timely manner. The visiting team is extremely concerned that some students’ financial aid has been delayed up to a quarter, forcing students to borrow from family and friends or put expenses such as books and supplies on credit cards, thereby incurring very high interest rates. Similarly, transfer transcript reviews are sometimes not completed for a year after enrollment at CSUEB causing considerable confusion related to appropriate course selection. At
worst, this can result in students dropping out or at the very least not graduating in a reasonable amount of time and, therefore, incurring additional expenses. In order to attain educational effectiveness; attention will need to be paid to the impact of support services budget cuts on student success. New ways of delivering services to students need to be explored including the use of technology.

Assessment of Degree Programs

The accomplishments of those responsible for the assessment of degree programs within the individual colleges are quite impressive. The college assessment documents on the California State University East Bay website and those shared with team members in our meeting demonstrate a growing sophistication in assessment including the use of assessment results to guide improvements. There will be considerable evidence of well-established assessment processes at the program level by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review if these activities are sustained. However, the program review process that is the responsibility of the faculty Committee on the Academic Review Process (CAPR) is only now beginning to use the assessment of student learning outcomes as part of their review of program quality and success. It is expected that by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review considerable progress will have been made in this regard and that there will be evidence of the program review process being linked to resource allocation as well.

Institutional Research and Assessment

The most important issue related to the infrastructure for coordinated assessment is that there appears to the team to be a disconnect between the detailed and dynamic assessment and improvement activities that are continuing and expanding at the unit level and the institutional planning and institutional assessment process. Ongoing planning is occurring and educational
effectiveness is being monitored and used as a basis for change at the unit level. Yet, the question remains, how does all of this fit together and become integrated at CSUEB?

The recently created Office of Institutional Research and Assessment that reports to the Associate Vice President, Academic Programs and Graduate Studies has been charged with addressing this concern about the *disconnect*. It will be a major challenge to coordinate and guide implementation of the institutional strategic plan and related resource allocation with strategic indicators of success gathered from academic and other program reviews. The key here will be to insure that the institutional research and assessment process is meaningful, manageable, and sustainable; otherwise it may collapse under its own weight. The success of the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment will be a crucial ingredient of a successful Educational Effectiveness Review. The visiting team recommends that this office be given sufficient resources and authority to insure that success.

**Standard 3: Capacity for sustaining core resources and functions**

Taking its cue from the organization of the California State University East Bay WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, this section focuses first on the issues related to faculty, staff, and students and then on those related to fiscal, physical, and information resources.

**Faculty and Staff**

The new mission statement, while laudatory in its focus on student learning, makes no mention of faculty or staff in its values or vision statement. Given the centrality of faculty and staff to educational effectiveness, the institution may want to address this omission and explicitly acknowledge their central importance.
Due primarily to budget cuts the institution has seen a continued erosion of tenure-track faculty numbers. This had led to the present mix of 64% tenure track and 36% part-time faculty. This reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty has happened as student enrollment has increased. The following are other workload issues:

- how labor intensive the quarter system is;
- the general low level of preparedness of students;
- the pressure to sustain a system of faculty governance with a reduced number of tenure-track faculty;
- the heavy teaching load (one of the highest SFRs in the CSU system); and
- the expectations for campus service, especially among junior faculty, given the reduced number of senior faculty with tenure.

- Sustainability of teaching at the international locations due to current limitations in CSUEB full-time faculty.

In both the institutional self study and in our meetings with faculty and staff, they reaffirmed their commitment to the institution. Faculty members are very concerned about quality teaching and student learning and are sincere in their desire for cross-disciplinary dialogue about them. The proposal for learning communities among the faculty looks to be a productive way to address this desire. While the faculty prides itself in being focused primarily on teaching, there are some who also wish to have time for their scholarly and creative work.

Staff members are committed to providing quality support and improving their service. The Student Services division provides a model of strategic planning and collaboration for the benefit of students. The innovative collaboration between the Library and Instructional Technology also provides a model for meeting student needs despite reduced budgets and staff.
Since faculty members and staff are critical to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness in the institution, it is essential that the institution demonstrate how it sustains the quality of life and professional development of faculty and staff within a challenging budget climate. This can best be done by the Provost in conjunction with the Academic Senate addressing workload issues related to the:

- quarter system;
- need for sufficient time for faculty to meet expectations for scholarly activity including research and professional development;
- scope of the curriculum and its impact on workload;
- demands of a myriad of faculty governance committees; and
- culture of small classes.
- engagement of a greater number of faculty in the international business programs

All of these issues need to be held up against a commitment to student learning and to a sustainable faculty and staff. It is suggested that the institution examine some promising institutional practices that tie student learning to the use of technology that have been tried and tested in a variety of institutions such as those involved with the Pew Student Learning Project.

CSUEB’s new mission statement emphasizes a multicultural learning environment that is consistent with its diverse community of students, faculty and staff. Comparative institutional data clearly indicate that it is this diversity that places CSUEB apart from other CSU campuses. The team found however that diversity among faculty is not consistent with the diversity of CSUEB’s student population. Further the team felt that the formal policies and organizational capacity focusing on the recruitment and retention of an ethnically diverse faculty were not sufficiently implemented.
The visiting team recommends that the University further develop and more widely advertise its support of untenured faculty in their progress toward tenure and throughout each stage of their career in relation to the complex and multiple tasks of teaching, research and professional development, and service.

Part of the sustainability of the faculty will depend on their ability to help faculty, particularly junior faculty, become established scholars and active in their professions. A common concern was the uncertainty surrounding retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. With the help of the faculty development center junior faculty can be given appropriate guidance and support so that they are successful. In addition, there seems to be a capacity issue relative to the use of indirect costs funds and whether they are supporting the research agenda of the faculty.

The fiscal crisis in the California State University system has impacted many colleges in the state and CSUEB is among them. On a positive note, this year the President has made available 30 faculty positions to be filled, consistent with the institution's newly-established mission statement.

**Student Voice**

What seems to be missing in all of this is the voice of the student body at CSUEB, the third “human resource” along with faculty and staff. Participants in the Student Open Forum cited many different concerns about the lack of student input in important decisions. For example, except for the student association president and students who also are members of the staff, there did not seem to be awareness that the accreditation review was occurring or an understanding of what it meant to the University. In addition, there did not seem to the team to be wide-spread student involvement in campus decisions at the Hayward and other sites.
A major concern of students was the lack of information and dialog about the University name change. This has caused considerable consternation among the students to the extent that two resolutions were passed by the Associated Student organization: Resolution against the proposed name change from CSU Hayward to CSU East Bay and Resolution of no confidence in CSU East Bay President Norma Rees. The team did not find evidence of general unrest on the campus or at the sites, but neither did they find evidence of how these student concerns are being addressed. Today’s students are tomorrow’s alumni, future donors, and community support.

Like the faculty and staff, the CSUEB students are sincerely dedicated to the University. But because of the way they have been treated they report that they do not have a sense of belonging to it. It is unclear how Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, the Student Affairs division, and the University Advancement Office will collaborate to develop and implement activities to give current students a voice in campus affairs, and also insure the development of a supportive alumni constituency.

Together the faculty, staff, and students constitute the human resource “capacity” of the University that will allow it to survive and to thrive in the future. California State University East Bay would strengthen its community by assessing the extent to which all members of the University feel respected, nurtured and included in the decision making process. If needed improvements are found, they should be implemented in order to form the foundation for educational effectiveness.

Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources

The following discussion covers current budget capacity including budgeting and planning issues, fund raising through sponsored research and institutional development, and physical facilities, and information resources.
Budget capacity

The fiscal crisis in the California State University system has impacted many colleges in the state including CSUEB. Given current expenditure and revenue trends, CSUEB will not be able to provide sufficient financial resources to achieve its mission on a sustainable basis. Financial reports show growing expenditures per FTE while state general funds essentially have remained flat at best. In addition, declining net operating assets indicate decreasing operating balances available to address contingencies. At the time of the visit CSUEB did not demonstrate a clear link between budgeting and planning, nor did written policies exist to show capacity and sustainability. The institution said, once again, that these elements were not totally within its control. This is not a satisfactory answer and is an issue of concern for the visiting team.

CSUEB departments have undertaken innovative measures to adjust to past budget cuts. However, even if the Governor’s budget for the CSU system is adopted by the legislature, it will not fully relieve CSUEB’s fiscal problems given past cost increases and enrollment growth. Data presented by the CSU trustees to the Governor in defense of the 2005/06 general fund budget indicate that the total of general funds and fees per FTES at the general fund level requested by the CSU trustees will still be less than that of 2001/02.

In order to preserve CSUEB’s academic programs, the budgets for support programs including library services, information technology services, facilities maintenance and the Division of student Affairs have been disproportionately cut on a repeated basis. For example, a series of budget cuts have reduced campus housekeeping staff by thirteen FTE or approximately one third of the authorized staff complement. These programs have adjusted their operations to maintain critical services within reduced budgets by reengineering work processes and by rearranging work schedules, at times requiring severe personal sacrifices on the part of staff. The
shifting of all housecleaning work to a “graveyard” shift and thereby essentially isolating an already decimated housecleaning staff from the rest of the campus community is an example.

Even with these actions, important services to students have been reduced. Library operating hours were cut back and difficulties are being encountered in providing degree audits, academic advising and financial aid processing. More importantly, morale among these employees and affected students are showing signs of deterioration. Continued budget cuts in these support services will cause long term damage to CSUEB’s capacity to support its educational mission.

Clearly the institution must act now to assure sustainable budget capacity. Assurances are needed that funds will be directed to support the mission and vision of CSUEB. In addition, to address the low morale of both faculty and staff mentioned in the preparatory review report and brought to the attention of the team, the planning and budget process should be transparent. While there is some evidence that this is being done now, more work is needed.

The California State University East Bay faculty has begun an exploration of the University’s budget with the desire to make recommendations to the administration concerning budget allocation. The Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA) is part of the institution’s faculty governance structure. The team found that the work of COBRA is facilitating long term budget stability. It has educated faculty on the budget process and has also developed ways to involve faculty in vetting the budget. The team was especially impressed with the commitment of its members to the institution. They have invested two years of their time to understand the complexities of the process and each member has a four-year committee appointment.
Equally important is the Committee on Reporting, Utilization and Monitoring of Budget Systems (CRUMBS). This faculty/staff committee examines better ways to make the University budget and its allocations and expenditures more understandable to the University community. Faculty and staff members of CRUMBS are working cooperatively to produce meaningful budget status reports that are easily understood by faculty as well as administrators. Clearly COBRA and CRUMBS are moving the institution in the correct direction. CSUEB is commended for bringing both providers of financial information and stakeholders in the budget process together to help them better understand and monitor budget implementation. Another faculty governance committee, CAPR (the Committee on the Academic Review Process) should be part of an integrated budgeting and planning process. However, there was evidence based on conversations in several of our meetings that CAPR doesn't talk to all support units when conducting its reviews and, therefore, these units are unaware of the potential impact on their services.

Finally, through COBRA and CRUMBS, the faculty has “stepped up to the plate” to assure CSUEB has a sustainable budget through appropriate processes. The task is not complete unless appropriate administrative policies, practices and structures are put in place. The team found that program planning and assessment information need to be more formally incorporated in the budget preparation and budget monitoring processes in order to better link planning with budgeting. It suggests that COBRA and CRUMBS address this issue, perhaps in conjunction with CAPR.

It is important to note that currently the Concord campus’ budget is part of the Hayward Hills campus budget. As such, Concord controls no faculty and depends upon its interactions with the academic colleges to obtain faculty for its courses. Although all faculty hired in the last
10 years or so have the expectation of teaching at Concord stated in their appointment letters, the distance between the Hayward Hills and Concord campuses makes this difficult to realize.

The Governor has recommended increases to the CSU budget for FY 06 and this may result in some relief. CSUEB wants very much for the State to uphold the Compact that the Governor made with CSU. Although significant gains will not be made during the first year, the institution expects to hold its own. In future years, CSUEB expects to have its allocation grow under the Compact.

**Fund raising**

CSUEB’s funding from contracts and grants increased from $11.5 million in FY 2002 to $20.2 million in FY 2003. Noteworthy grants include $2.8 million for the GEAR-UP program and $1 million for the after hours library program. The team meeting with faculty, administrators and representatives of community agencies indicates strong potential for additional funding in areas such as small business development, graduate social work, the sciences, and life long learning. The team believes significant opportunities for additional extramural funding exist which can help to mitigate some of the institution’s budget shortfalls.

The campus is engaged in several long-term research and community relations activities that bring both financial and personal rewards to the participants. The College of Education and Allied Studies’ recent community activities include Project SOAR (Successful Options for Academic Readiness), and the GEAR-UP program funded by the US Department of Education that provides support services to Oakland students and their families to assist students upon entering college. The East-Bay Biotechnology Educational Partnership program, funded by Genentech, is to introduce high school students to biotechnology techniques and experiences
through the use of kits provided by the funder. Genentech also supports Research Day at CSUEB.

Many curricular activities and degree programs are tied to the community at CSUEB and many, many community relations programs are ongoing. The community activities in which CSUEB participates are a clear strength of the institution and should be considered in its preparation for its Educational Effectiveness Review. Yet CSUEB acknowledges that it doesn't have a systemic way to connect all of these activities and events or to even publicize them. Also, there is presently no vehicle to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration. The campus needs to find a way to organize, coordinate, manage, and disseminate information about all of the opportunities that exist, often in overlapping areas.

Research awards have been received by all four of the campuses' colleges with the College of Science leading the way in 2003-2004. The College of Science and its faculty have received a RISE (Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement) and a SCORE (Support for Continuous Research Excellence) grant from NIH and several individual research grants to principal investigators on the faculty.

In light of the University's success in attracting grants, the institution needs to examine its incentive system for this activity. The team found some confusion concerning the distribution of overhead funds and the responsibility for negotiating overhead rates. CSUEB needs to assure that policies, practices, and structures internal to the campus, relating to contracts and grants administration, are formalized and widely communicated to faculty and staff.

The institution is commended for revitalizing its community relations and fundraising programs. The professionalism exhibited by the University Advancement Office during the team's review of fund raising activities is noteworthy, especially its thoughtful and timely
approach to creating a culture of philanthropy. Program success and potential growth are evident in the $10.5 million raised for the new business and technology building and the current rate of growth in gifts and pledges. As of the end of February, gift and pledges have exceeded the total of gift and pledges for FY 2004.

What seems to be missing is a concern for “community relations” among the student body at CSUEB. Participants in the Student Open Forum cited many different concerns about the lack of a student “voice” in important decisions. As noted above, faculty and staff, students constitute the human resource “capacity” of the University that will allow it to survive and to thrive in the future.

*Physical facilities*

The Hayward campus has excess physical capacity. The campus was built to support 17,000 students, while current enrollment is approximately 14,000 students. However, most of the buildings are at least thirty years old. Deferred maintenance is estimated at $31 million. (A number the East Bay's physical plant personnel believe is underestimated by 30%.)

Housekeeping activities and personnel on the Hayward Hills campus have also been strained by the budget reductions. The team did not find a plan to remedy this problem and is concerned that as buildings age further and the cost of repairs and maintenance increases, the deferred maintenance problem will only worsen.

CSUEB recognizes California’s serious energy problems and has undertaken proactive steps including the regular monitoring of electricity brownouts by the electricity provider; installing the state’s second largest solar voltaic array and exploring campus co-generation options. The team commends CSUEB staff for these efforts.
CSUEB also has considerable open land available, at both the Hayward Hills and Concord campuses. This situation presents unique opportunities to the campus in these times of fiscal austerity. Most particularly the Concord campus in Contra Costa County has several excellent buildings that are available during the daytime hours for community and other activities. The team believes that the Concord campus represents a valuable, but underutilized asset for CSUEB. It provides CSUEB with the ability to address the growing population base in CSUEB’s service area. The team’s visit found faculty and staff assigned to the Concord campus to be dedicated to the institution as well as the community they serve. The physical facilities are attractive and well planned with ample land (380 acres) available to serve a larger student population.

The team is most concerned that the physical development of CSUEB is guided by the master plan prepared for the original campus, albeit modified from time to time when individual buildings were constructed. Over the last thirty years, there have been changes in demographics; campus mission; state funding priorities; faculty and student housing needs; and utility economics. CSUEB continues to work under its original Campus Master Plan, in part because the campus was built out for 17,000 students and has never achieved this number. No Master Plan exists for the Concord campus, although one currently is being completed. We understand that CSUEB plans to develop a new Master Plan within approximately two years. It is suggested that first, the Master Plan be created in parallel with and integrated into the campus strategic planning, budgeting, assessment and resource allocation process and, second, that both be substantially completed in time for consideration as part of the Educational Effectiveness Review.
**Information resources**

Instructional Technology and the Library represent but two of East Bay's learning resources that have, through Strategic Planning efforts, been able to accomplish a great deal in spite of the University's budget cuts. After a technology fee failed to be implemented both units are doing less than they did previously, but report that they are accomplishing their objectives to the same depth of service and concern for their users. These two units are also collaborating to enhance their services in cost-effective ways.

Leadership and staff for both the library and instructional technology offices are to be commended for their creative approaches to providing services to students. Noteworthy are the learning commons and the BlackBoard course management system. Both innovations are widely used by CSUEB students, except at the international sites. Also, through active participation in electronic consortiums, the library was able to mitigate reductions in hard copy collections.

Yet these trends cannot continue forever and the institution should address these issues during its educational effectiveness preparation. For example, both groups mentioned that CAPR reviews do not always include them and they are then “surprised” when service demands change. The team cautions that budget cuts cannot continue much longer in these programs. Staffing shortages have already resulted in serious reductions in library hours and technical staff support for online instruction is not sufficient.

**Standard 4: Forward planning for educational effectiveness**

Every person that the team met is dedicated to this institution, whether or not they agree with all of its decisions. This is a very positive position from which to begin an Educational Effectiveness Review.
Changes in the organization of the Institutional Research and Assessment offices and their move to Academic Affairs should contribute to tying CSUEB's resources and capacity to educational effectiveness. However, there are large barriers to overcome.

A matrix of Educational Effectiveness Outcomes was shared with the team. The outcomes include many of the ongoing activities cited in this report such as 5-year program reviews and the assessment of the lower division General Education courses. Others represent new initiatives such as a comprehensive campus climate study and quantitative and qualitative research on faculty members' experiences with the Promotion, Tenure, and Retention (PTR) process. However, the most important outcome in relation to Standard 4 is the development of a University-wide planning infrastructure that is aligned with resources. The same need was noted in the last accreditation review in 1995 and is significantly overdue. To quote the last review,

The bottom line is clear: after seven years of significant investment, the University lacks both a coherent process for setting future priorities and a comprehensive framework in terms of which to assess and improve its effectiveness. We are pleased with the amount of activity that has been generated in recent years to correct this problem. No amount of recent effort can substitute for clear and compelling results.

We recommend that the institution get on with it!

The provision of evidence of the impact of such an alignment of university-wide planning and resource allocation is an area of significant concern for the visiting team.
SECTION III – MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings and recommendations in this section are not meant to replace the detailed ones found in the various sections of this report. The following findings and recommendations are those shared with the President and the campus community during the exit interview held on Friday March 18, 2005. They are offered in the spirit of collegiality that characterized our visit. These recommendations and comments are intended to guide the preparation of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Standard 1-Defining Institutional Purposes and Enduring Educational Objectives.

California State University East Bay has developed, through campus wide discussions and iterations a rich mix of mission, values, and vision statements. It is now important that the institution utilize and employ these statements as it makes its planning decisions and implements these activities in its preparation for its educational effectiveness review.

The campus has also recognized multiculturalism as a salient objective in its mission, values and vision statements. This needs to be infused across the campus and into its curricula and student, faculty, staff and administrative recruitment.

The faculty is not as diverse as it could be, given the diversity evident in the student body. The faculty has begun a systemic survey to gather and regularize the data pertinent to this issue. The team believes these data should be incorporated into the University's planning and decision-making processes.

Standard 2-Achieving Educational Objectives through Core Functions

A strength of California State University East Bay is that it takes assessment very seriously and has recognized the benefits from it, as seen in some department's assessment-based curricular changes.
General Education has been responsive to the suggestions in the previous accreditation visit and has focused itself on learning and the Freshman Year Experience.

Another strength of CSUEB is the commitment of its faculty to teaching, community and institutional service and scholarly pursuits. In particular their engagement in Academic Senate committees shows their involvement in faculty governance.

California State University East Bay's Concord campus is truly a gem that needs attention and a bit of polish. The team believes many opportunities to ease the institution's budget crises exist there.

Another challenge as the institution moves to measure its educational effectiveness is that its student learning goals need to be incorporated into upper division general education courses as the campus extends the Freshman Year Experience.

The Division of Student Affairs is a cohesive unit with good leadership that has engaged in strategic planning and may become a model for the campus as it moves to implement and sustain itself in the presence of recent budget cuts. Yet these budget reductions have resulted in a severe reduction in the staff's ability to provide timely and accurate advising among other difficulties.

Finally, the team must ask how can an institution consider itself student-centered when reports received by the team say that the students feel as though they do not have a voice? The students at CSUEB impressed the team as sincere and dedicated and we believe the institution should examine this issue thoroughly in its Educational Effectiveness Review.

**Standard 3-Capacity for Sustaining Core Resources and Functions**

A marvelous occurrence at California State University East Bay is the desire of its faculty to examine and understand the budgeting process. The team finds COBRA and
CRUMBS to be exciting ventures with excellent opportunities for the campus as it begins an educational effectiveness review. The work of these committees provides a sound foundation for developing institutional policies and practices.

Instructional Technology and the Library are but two cogent representatives of what CSUEB has been able to accomplish despite severe budget cuts. They are doing less than they did previously but with the same depth and concern for their users. They are also collaborating to increase services. Yet these trends cannot continue ad infinitum and the institution will have to address these trends during its educational effectiveness preparation. For example, the academic review process committee doesn't always consult with these entities despite their widespread use on campus.

California State University East Bay's tenured and tenure-track faculty present a series of issues. This group has decreased in size, while enrollment has increased, creating workload and faculty governance issues. Both of these activities are time intensive. The faculty's small size has also impacted its scholarly productivity—although they continue to propose and receive research and community activities grants. And so, sustaining the tenured and tenure-track faculty becomes an important capacity issue influencing educational effectiveness. And, many comparable conclusions could be drawn about the staff. All are stretched to the limit, yet the ones that the team met remain amazingly supportive of the institution. Their loyalty cannot be expected to continue without some relief. As the student enrollment continues to increase and faculty and staff numbers decrease, the situation may present serious institutional capacity and sustainability issues as CSUEB begins measuring its educational effectiveness. The team sees the institution's commitment to hire 30 faculty members this year as a positive sign.

California State University East Bay's international programs have appropriate processes and procedures on the Hayward Hills campus. Yet, the sustainability of this structure based
solely on overload teaching may be an issue. The team recommends the institution examine this issue to possibly add flexibility to the in-load/overload concern.

The team also perceived some confusion as to the expectations for faculty retention, tenure and promotion. Faculty need to know at the departmental level what is expected of them. It is possible that clearer statements of these expectations are needed. Also, support for tenure-track faculty professional development should be explored and implemented with appropriate funding.

**Standard 4-Forward Planning for Educational Effectiveness**

The institution is to be congratulated on beginning to develop a true sense of philanthropy at CSUEB. Very competent leadership is in place and the institution’s initial successes are compelling.

CSUEB also needs to examine its incentives for *grant-getting*. A great deal of control is dedicated to the deans as the team understands it and there is some confusion institutionally in terms of indirect cost distribution, etc.

Also, there appears to the team to be a disconnection between the detailed and dynamic assessment and improvement activities that are continuing and expanding at the unit level and the institutional hierarchy. Planning is occurring and educational effectiveness is being monitored and used as a basis for change at the unit level. However, the question remains how does all of this fit together and become integrated at CSUEB?

Finally, EVERYONE that the team has met at CSUEB is dedicated to this institution—which is something that the team believes you all should take great pride in! Now, however, is the time to implement your planning objectives. And, as the previous accreditation review said—BE ABOUT IT!
SECTION IV – PREPARATIONS FOR THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT AND REVIEW

The institution is poised to implement the design for their forthcoming EE Review as evidenced by their six priorities as outlined on pages 34-35 in their December 15, 2004 report. As mentioned in previous sections of this report, the team observed that significant effort has been expended to plan for the strengthening of institutional capacity in key areas including assessment of student learning, student support services, diversity, resource sustainability, and budgeting. The formation of their office for Institutional Research and Assessment and its major role in coordinating the EE Review is promising.

However, the team wishes to emphasize that formal policies and procedures which institutionalize practice in functions important to educational effectiveness are not yet established. Of particular note is the need for policies and procedures that assure educational assessment results regularly inform decision making in institutional planning and budgeting. The team suggests that CSUEB address this matter in its educational effectiveness report.

In addition, since the team was concerned about the lack of concrete evidence of examples that verified the impact of the implementation of the planning and other processes, we especially encourage the use of concrete examples of evidence that they have achieved the six priorities for their educational effectiveness. In other words, evidence of achievement rather than intentions is particularly important.

Establishing, implementing, and monitoring appropriate administrative structures and lines of authority and responsibility will be particularly important for diversifying the faculty and establishing a climate where a diverse faculty can succeed in their multiple responsibilities of
teaching, research and service. Finally since their six priorities are very extensive, they should be encouraged to prioritize among and within them.

The report on the Systems Review Proposal addresses those matters specific to Educational Effectiveness for the off-campus, international programs.
APPENDIX
Systems Review Proposal

Organization and Strategy

The Systems Review Proposal received special attention as an integral part of the Capacity and Preparedness Review. The Transnational Executive MBA (TEMBA), the Moscow MBA, and the Executive MBA programs in Graz (Austria), Hong Kong, and Singapore have become a distinctive part of CSU East Bay’s institutional identity since 1993. In line with Standard 1, the international programs in the College of Business and Economics (CBE) exemplify the alignment of the academic programs with the new mission of a California State University in a global context. The continuation of these programs is presumed to be central to the future direction of the University.

In addition to the four international programs that are operating currently, programs in Vienna and Beijing were terminated; and a second Beijing MBA program and a Moscow BS program were approved by WASC’s Substantive Change Committee, but not implemented. The reasons for not implementing the programs were consistent with CFR 1.8 and found to be prudent in the face of rapidly changing market conditions.

To be responsive to foreign governments and independent organizations with which the University negotiates MOU’s for local administrative and academic support, shorter turn-around times would be a considerable benefit. The three to six months required for the preparation of lengthy proposals and review by the Substantive Change Committee of WASC has created frustration among collaborators abroad.

The Systems Review Proposal was accompanied by two supplemental binders with program brochures and extensive appendices. Among the most useful data are exit surveys in
capstone courses in Moscow, Hong Kong and Singapore during 2001-2002 and 2002-2003. An excellent supplemental report on student exit surveys for MBA cohorts 9-13 in the Moscow program was mailed to the team just days before the visit. Copies of student assignments and capstone experience projects were provided and examined at the Singapore site.

Nan Maxwell, Director of the Human Investment Research and Education Center (HIRE) in the College of Business and Economics, is to be commended for creating high quality evidence on student satisfaction and faculty performance. The HIRE Center has provided excellent summaries of student opinion surveys, both domestically and from international sites, and the Center has conducted one faculty survey. Dr. Maxwell’s reports have provided a balanced view of strengths and weaknesses, including areas of significant student dissatisfaction, which aided the visiting team in gathering additional evidence in meetings with students in Singapore and Moscow. Evidence was gathered in Moscow that action was taken by the Rector of IBE to discontinue Russian faculty who were found to be inadequate by the students in their course evaluations. The international programs show satisfactory effort at this stage to address many although not all elements described in CFR 2.7 and Standard 4. One alumni survey was conducted in Moscow, and international alumni addresses are being gathered in all programs so that alumni surveys can be introduced in 2008, and repeated every five years, after the Graz program, which was begun in June 2004, has completed four cycles. A recent survey presented to the team in Moscow by the Institute of Business and Economics demonstrated very favorable indicators of educational effectiveness: significantly enhanced salary upon graduation, job advancement, and high student satisfaction.

This report is based on the findings of the team of three who spent a day and a half on the home campus and four days each by two of the three at the Singapore and Moscow sites. The
report provides a summary based on review of documents, interviews with faculty, students, alumni and partners (i.e., Hart Institute), and examination of facilities at the three sites.

**Major Findings and Recommendations**

The interim dean and international program directors in the College of Business and Economics are to be commended for their global vision, entrepreneurial spirit, and administrative prowess with the TEMBA program and the off-campus MBA and EMBA programs. These programs have created value for the University at multiple levels, including enhanced international reputation, opportunities for faculty development, and instructional enrichment. The Moscow MBA has been ranked No. 1 among 15 MBA programs in Russia by *Kariera* magazine five consecutive times, and the No. 1 rating by RosBusinessConsulting was published by *Izvestia* daily newspaper in 2005. The President and the Interim Provost deserve high commendation for their strong support of the superb administrative team that is working so well together, signaling alignment of University leadership with these off-campus and innovative programs.

We found that while there are concerns about sustaining resources under Standard 3, the faculty report that benefits exceed costs. Among the benefits are opportunities to enhance salaries, to develop new courses, to do consulting, to do research on international business practices, and to provide domestic Transnational EMBA (TEMBA) students with a rich variety of international business experiences.

Costs to the faculty include time away from campus, erosion of time for student advisement on the home campus, diminution of time for committee service, travel time and jet-lag, and increased workload during a time of diminished full-time faculty resources at CSU-EB. Comments to members of the team by faculty indicated that another subtle cost is the status
differential and diminished sense of faculty ownership created between those who are invited by the program directors to teach abroad, and those who do not get invited, reportedly because of weaker teaching records or lack of region-specific expertise. A final consideration is the increased risk to personal safety since 9/11.

International program directors are sensitive to the market demands in their respective countries and they are to be commended for assuring relevance and adaptation of the curriculum to the expectations and needs of each region. While it was necessary for the program directors to operate as independent authorities during program implementation, we did not find evidence of the participating faculty being given an opportunity to develop ownership of the global educational effectiveness outcomes as expected by CFR 2.4. Two of the faculty teaching at Singapore during the site visit were adjuncts, one was based in Thailand for many years and currently works with the Asian market, and the other is a full-time faculty member at another CSU campus. The Program Director in Singapore had not taught on the home campus in the past year. In Russia, a current faculty member also was from another Bay Area university and teaching on an adjunct basis. She had, however, taught in the Moscow program before. The other instructor was a faculty member of a Russian institution and a graduate of the CSU-EB Moscow MBA. The overall effect the team observed is that the potential benefits of enrichment of campus intellectual life and the domestic program primarily affects participants in the TEMBA program, but not the domestic MBA program. One member of the team observed an extensive cross-cultural negotiation exercise between the TEMBA students and a cohort of Singapore students. This was an excellent example of the cross-fertilization among programs. Students from both groups learned about the each other and differing negotiation styles from this exercise. The team also noted that TEMBA students who brought family members with them to
the site had less engagement in networking and social activities with students and alumni from the Singapore cohort, detracting from some of the benefits of a brief immersion experience like this.

As a faculty, the participating faculty need to develop ownership of each program by working as a group to reflect on the evaluation of each of the 3-5 core student learning outcomes for the degree, to reach consensus on assessment protocols, and to continually monitor the flow and sequence of the whole curriculum. The visiting team expects that evidence of progress in building faculty dialogue about educational effectiveness in each of the international programs will be available for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

The visiting team commends the faculty’s efforts at videotaping presentations by students that will be graded by one or more rubrics as part of the capstone course grade. Based on the writing assessments conducted by the CSUEB faculty, the written English language fluency of Singapore students may be comparable to that of CSUEB home campus students. But in general, they are not, in the judgment of the site evaluators, comparable to the writing skills and fluency of graduate students at their institutions, where there is a greater proportion of native English speakers in classes. We encourage an effort to find a means to disseminate this information to other faculty to assist them in refining the educational experience. The visiting team identified one possible way to involve home campus faculty in the international programs is to have a second reader on the culminating experience projects, which could utilize a home-based faculty member in this role. This would give a greater sense of ownership to the CSU-EB faculty and opportunity for them to contribute to global assessment of students. The visiting team hopes to find evidence that the dissemination of information has happened between domestic and international programs when they return for the Educational Effectiveness Review.
The visiting team commends Dr. Gary Wishniewsky, Director of the Office of International Programs, for consolidating administrative support for all four programs in a highly effective manner, including articulating international program processes with home campus processes in the Admissions and Registrar’s offices. Administrative responsibility has been placed in the hands of an able Director of International Programs, who also oversees the Moscow MBA Program. The recent appointment of the Director of Special Programs in the Division of Continuing and International Education was intended to assure that performance by international administrative partners continues to meet CSU-EB’s legal, academic and financial standards.

The faculty and the international program directors have clear policies and guidelines regarding performance expectations while teaching abroad, except for orientation to and demonstration of competency in accessing information resources available through the main library and regional libraries at the off-campus sites. Librarians from the home campus also participated in the site visits to evaluate library resources at the Singapore and Moscow sites. Students expressed dissatisfaction with access to Asian business resources through the main library and the team found such data to be difficult to find and/or limited through the CSU-EB library. The librarian visited Jurong Regional Library, Singapore Central Library, and Singapore School of Business Library and reported that all public libraries in Singapore are under the jurisdiction of the National Library Board and its Central Library, which conveniently, is scheduled to open across the street from the Hartford Institute where classes are held. The librarian reported these libraries to have a good collection of books in all aspects of business, with local and regional business information as well as new items from the US. They are staffed by professional librarians who are available to provide reference assistance. But access to the electronic databases at the National University Singapore Libraries (Central and Business) is not
available, although access may be possible on a student-by-student basis through a (paid) membership in the National University of Singapore Society, which is being explored. Even a corporate membership for the Hartford Institute (annual fee of $750+ a year) does not allow access to electronic databases so the librarian indicated she will “work more closely with our faculty to offer library services at this end after examining class syllabi and encourage students to make use of National Library Board Central Library services.”

We commend the University for sending librarians to the sites to evaluate access and adequacy of print and digital resources appropriate to needs of each site. The University provided good faith indicators that library and information support capacity, including a 24/7 online chat reference service is available at the remote sites (which was tested and found to be responsive in Moscow). Library holdings were meager at the Moscow site, with the library serving primarily as a service to check out textbooks, some of which were up to 10 years old. None of the approximately 40 students in the Foundation year that we interviewed had been able to access the CSU-EB library at all. It was later reported to the team that this is due to electronic database licensure restrictions because they are not considered CSU-EB students until they matriculate into the second year. Overall, there are positive indicators of adequate student support services that appropriately address CFR 2.13, however the team recommends access to the CSU-EB library be provided to first-year students to maximize the joint program’s capacity to support these students.

The team initially was concerned about a third-party partner to manage recruitment and logistics in Singapore, including classroom and instructional support, but found the Hartford Institute and its staff to be professional and competent. The company itself is well-funded (reportedly 350 million Singapore dollars), publicly traded (promoting financial transparency),
and possessing a wide recruiting network throughout Asia. The physical facilities were designed
to support state-of-the-art instructional activities with adequate student support services. We
found processes and procedures in place comparable to the home-campus, with a delivery
modality and schedule that meets the needs of working students. Students expressed satisfaction
with the schedule, support services, physical facility, price, place, and product overall. A unique
strength of the Hartford Institute is that it also brokers other business degrees through British and
Australian universities, both cohort-based and online, so unsuitable students (due to admissions
qualities or preferences for another type of degree or delivery modality) can be directed to other
programs. This enhances academic integrity, retention of students, and tempers the inherent
conflict of interest that exists with a broker such as the Hartford Institute. Noteworthy of
commendation is the method by which the Hartford Institute digitally scans and emails
admissions documents for preliminary evaluation by CSU-EB, and the screening they perform to
match students with the best MBA program, thereby enhancing a suitable fit with CSU-EB. We
found that students in the program evaluated other options, and data and interviews substantiated
high retention and satisfaction by students with the program. These are indicators of the good
work being done by the Hartford Institute in this regard.

The Institute of Business and Economics (IBE) is located on the campus of the National
Academy of Economics in Moscow. It is adequately staffed, including doctorally-prepared
faculty and a distinguished and respected founding Rector. The Institute provides the
Foundation (first) year in a traditional two-year MBA format, and those students who
successfully pass the GMAT, TOEFL, writing skills assessment, and meet the 2.5 GPA
requirement of the on-campus program are matriculated into the second year. The second year is
delivered on-campus in Moscow, face-to-face, as two or three-week intensive classes. Most
students reported using computers at home or work, although computers are available in the library. The team found limited use of BlackBoard in courses taught in Moscow. Midway through the Foundation year, only one class used it and only a few of the 40 students had accessed it. Students expressed a strong interest in having more timely course content placed on IBE's web site, and wider use of Blackboard by the faculty would help meet this need. Upon completion of the program of study, students receive an MBA from CSU-EB and a diploma from the Institute.

Student satisfaction in Russia includes learning time-management skills, polishing English-language skills, international recognition and transportability of the American MBA degree, networking with peers, and enhanced opportunities for international employment. Students described Russian professors as stronger on theoretical knowledge (e.g., mathematical modeling), and American professors as having valuable professional experience. Student complaints centered around the need for timely communication about class schedules (at least a month in advance); insufficient feedback and poor communication about grading standards by Professors Evstigneev, Doynikov, Handruev, and Balashak; a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the GMAT preparation class; and the intensity of the program because almost all students work full time. Constructive suggestions included staggering exams to provide at least one day between them for better preparation, the desire for company visits, internships, and career placement services. Despite CSUEB's efforts in this area, there is still a desire on the part of Moscow students for greater interaction with business students on the Hayward campus, either virtually or through exchange programs.

The team highly commends the Rector, Dr. Edward Goizman, and his staff for their academic values, administrative oversight, spirit of friendship, and effective collaboration that
was very evident to the visitors and has resulted in 700 MBA graduates since 1993. The team recommends that the issue of succession in the administrative and academic leadership at IBE needs to be discussed, because it is an important capacity issue to assure continued success into the future. The team is unclear what role the IBE Board of Trustees has in the appointment of a rector when the need might arise. The team met with a group of very able alumni who are deeply committed to the program and who might be able to serve on a search committee or the Board of Trustees in the future.

The team found some concerns in relation to Standard 3 for CSU-EB faculty. Given the intensity of teaching three classes for each of three quarters, and adding international teaching as overload during the interstices of the year, the visiting team observed indicators on the home campus and at both sites that CBE faculty resources are strained. A few members of the faculty clearly thrive on the stimulation that international teaching and consulting provides. More than 50% of the CBE faculty has taught in the international programs, but estimates vary on the number of untapped additional faculty who might be willing and qualified to teach abroad. No evidence was available on the number of experienced faculty who might be willing to continue teaching abroad or the frequency with which they might return. Consequently, the visiting team was unable to obtain clear evidence about how many international programs that the College of Business and Economics might be able to sustain. The interim dean expressed a firm opinion that the current number of four programs may be about all that the present faculty could sustain. If the Systems Review is approved, CSU-EB must address in each expedited proposal how faculty resources will be allocated so they maintain quality of both the home and off-campus programs.
A survey of faculty who have done international teaching on overload would help the international program directors and the dean to understand more accurately the number of experienced faculty who are willing to continue teaching abroad, how often, and for which programs. A survey also could bring more precision about the number of faculty who would appreciate an opportunity to teach in one or more of the international programs, if their teaching records demonstrate their qualification to participate. Furthermore, it did not appear that faculty who provide coverage for those who do travel are recognized or rewarded for their contributions to the success of the off-campus programs and continuity of on-campus programs. This is an unacknowledged strain on faculty resources.

The College of Business and Economics is to be commended for the number of full-time and experienced professors who are participating in the international programs as expected by Standard 3 and CFR 3.1 in particular. At the Singapore site, we found faculty with appropriate qualifications and standard course content, adapted to the Asian market. In Moscow we also found faculty with appropriate qualifications and sensitivity to the Russian context, but over-reliance on adjunct faculty. There appears to be some risk, however, of faculty burnout after a period of years of overload work, and there is a need to assure that the absence of faculty does not undermine the quality of education for students on the home campus. In order to assure sustainability, the College may need to add full-time faculty on the home campus, because adjunct faculty typically tend not to enrich the curriculum, advise students, participate in committee work, or contribute to the intellectual life of the university as effectively as do full-time faculty. The team cautions the College against the extensive use of retired and adjunct faculty in either the domestic or international programs, and we endorse the AACSB standard
that at least 75% of the courses taught (including special sessions) should be the responsibility of full-time faculty.

The visiting team recognizes the need to be competitive in the international market, the constraints imposed on faculty workload by the collective bargaining agreement, and the CSU system’s policies on financial requirements of state-supported versus self-supported programs. To ensure sustainability and academic integrity, however, the visiting team recommends that consideration be given to developing an option for qualified CBE faculty to teach in the international programs as part of their normal teaching load, rather than as overload. A couple examples of on-load teaching overseas were provided to the visiting team, and the faculty members appreciated those opportunities. An exploratory survey of faculty could clarify the extent of interest in taking advantage of the on-load option. For example, if faculty could teach in two international sites for 4-6 weeks during a 10-week quarter, then they would benefit from capturing 4-5 weeks for research into international institutions. A small research stipend and time for scholarship might be more attractive than overload pay to a portion of the faculty.

Information given the team indicates that currently the Singapore program is at about break-even, and does not generate sufficient income to the University to provide for stipends.

The selection of faculty for overseas teaching has raised concerns among some of the faculty who have not been chosen to participate. The visiting team commends the international program directors for establishing an application process to identify the faculty who wish to participate. This open approach will encourage better communication and, perhaps, could expand the pool of interested faculty. It also may be useful in the future as a faculty development opportunity. Interested faculty members, whose teaching on the home campus falls below the performance threshold for international teaching, could be given the incentive of
teaching overseas after their student ratings have improved and they have learned, for example, to use Blackboard on the home campus.

As international programs increasingly become institutionalized and a part of University culture, the visiting team recommends that the University think more comprehensively about regularizing the processes for faculty recruitment, appointment, development and promotion. As faculty teaching abroad becomes part of the regular life of the University, those members of the faculty who remain at home should receive more formal recognition, appreciation, and possibly service credit for the unpaid overload in extra teaching and advisement that they have been providing as a courtesy to their colleagues who are teaching overseas. Without the good will and service of the faculty at home, teaching abroad would not be feasible for their colleagues.

The team found sufficient evidence that the institution has appropriately addressed Standards 1, 2 and 4 with respect to the Systems Review for off-campus programs. The team found some reason for concern under Standard 3 as identified in this report. The team is satisfied that institutional purposes have been defined and educational objectives and processes in relation to the off-campus systems capacity are adequate to assure self-monitoring. The team commends the steps taken to create an organizational culture committed to learning and improvement under Standard 2 and 4. The indicators are positive that this good work will continue and, indeed, it needs to in order to satisfy the Educational Effectiveness Review later on.