Introduction

In recent times, President Norma Rees has described California State University, Hayward (CSUH) as a place where “good things are happening in bad times.” In this report, you will read about important developments at CSUH: recruiting the largest incoming freshmen class in CSUH’s history to join our university community; the newly-implemented mission for the university; the acceptance by the Academic Senate of the student learning outcomes for our General Education program; a proposal that faculty use *The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* as a guide for their teaching and advising; re-organization of the Office of Institutional Research for better coordination of assessment; ground-breaking for a Business and Technology Center to provide students with a state-of-the-art environment in which to learn and grow; expansion of the University Union; plans for increased student housing; a “Best in the West” designation from the *Princeton Review*, largely based on input from our own students; and our recent initiation of a name change to California State University, East Bay to more accurately represent the regional nature of our multi-campus university (Hayward Hills, Concord Hills, and Oakland Center) and our commitment to serve our local communities.

You will read about challenges facing CSUH. First and foremost, CSUH has experienced another round of serious budget cuts with attendant staff shortages, work overloads, deferred maintenance, concern for the institution’s well-being, and dreams set aside. The consequences of this set of budget cuts is compounded by the fact that we did not fully recover from the cuts in the early nineties. Other challenges include: the slow progress of faculty diversity and the necessary resources to implement change as we work to integrate our new mission and our student learning goals. There is, however, a hope that perhaps, within the next two to three years, the California economy and the allocations to the CSU will improve and that we will be positioned well for a new era based on the plans we are developing now.

Preparatory Review Report and Goals

Our Institutional Proposal was based upon an ambitious comprehensive model. In its acceptance letter, WASC encouraged CSUH “to take every opportunity to narrow its focus. Greater attention and priority should be given not only to the university’s strategic planning initiatives, but most particularly and directly to the development of an overarching institutional emphasis on the improvement of student learning.”

From the inception of the WASC process, President Rees has committed the university to using WASC accreditation to improve the university’s planning process and to re-energize and re-organize planning around educational effectiveness and ongoing dialogue about student learning. As a result, we are leveraging the process to integrate and institutionalize our structures and systems in order to assess our performance, and to use that assessment to improve student learning over time. (WASC Handbook 2001, p. 6). In this review phase, our goal has been to understand our current capacity for educational
effectiveness. Hence our re-examination of the mission, along with student learning outcomes, program review structures, support and resources for student learning, and our on-going policies and procedures, processes, data, and evidence systems.

The university also sees this as an opportunity to coordinate learning assessment efforts, including various requirements for student outcome measures, into an effective, comprehensive university assessment plan focused on meaningful assessment of student learning.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report

Our major purpose and context since the acceptance of our Proposal has remained the same; however, changes in context are noted below along with a preview of the report’s contents. The reflective essays represent significant input from the university, consistent with our commitment from the beginning to engage the community in every step of the process. This report, therefore, should be viewed as an anthology, comprised of chapters and sections contributed by a number of faculty and staff. These pieces reflect their involvement in the WASC process, often through our Campus Outcome Teams (COTs; see below) and their dedication to the goals, view and tone we set for the CSUH–WASC Planning Process. [Organization for Capacity Review] The report also reflects upon Criteria For Review (CFR) particularly important to our new mission as well as our institutional capacity. Data on CFRs, not directly addressed in the chapters, are presented in the Institutional Portfolio as [Appendix III – CFRs].

CSUH has constructed a standing web-site for its WASC accreditation reviews. It includes all the required elements from the Institutional Proposal and for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. In addition, we have special links for assessment, CSUH’s defining characteristics and other selected exhibits. [Institutional Portfolio]

I. Focused and Compelling Vision (Standard One)
   This chapter describes how CSUH created its new mission, vision, and values statements through a consensus-building process, and how CSUH is reflecting on WASC’s “five (5) expectations” for diversity to enrich our multicultural learning experience. The university seeks to infuse the mission, vision, and values statements into every aspect of its educational enterprise. In our discussions, we identify many aspects of diversity that Hayward does well; however, we want to become an exemplar of a multicultural learning environment and we view our accomplishments and our challenges in that light. We are using the mission, vision, and values as the lens through which we view this process.

   As part of this attention on diversity and since the acceptance of our Institutional Proposal, President Norma Rees created a new full-time position of Director of Equal Opportunity within Human Resources as an outgrowth of the position of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Equal Opportunity. This Director handles issues related to discrimination and harassment for faculty, staff, and students, and
affirmative action for all employees, including recruitment for staff (responsibility for faculty recruitment lies with the deans and the provost).

II. **Infrastructure for Coordinated Assessment** (Standard Two)
This chapter discusses our progress towards reforming student assessment requirements and highlights our success with the General Education program. It also examines the progress we have begun to make in areas such as Degree Programs, Academic Review, and support for student learning, with a focus on student advising.

Subsequent to the acceptance of our *Institutional Proposal*, the president and the provost created the infrastructure for student learning assessment across the university by moving the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis from the administrative to the academic side of the university, merging it with the Office of Assessment and Testing to create a new *Office of Institutional Research and Assessment* (IRA) under the direction of a newly-hired Assistant Vice President. The office has begun to work with the Office of Faculty Development and the Colleges in the continuing development of effective assessment of student learning, all under the organizational leadership of the Office of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies.

III. **Capacity for Sustaining Core Resources and Functions** (Standard Three)
This chapter details how the university is leveraging its resources for student learning. The faculty section uses the *Seven Principles* to frame discussion of the composition of faculty; hiring, promotion, tenure, and retention; and support for faculty development. The remaining sections include a staff section focused on the challenges of sustaining a viable staff complement, and learning infrastructure sections that address library, instructional technology, and fiscal and physical plant issues.

Throughout this chapter, there is an emphasis on California’s budget crisis, which has worsened since the submission of our *Institutional Proposal*. The crisis has resulted in a continuing decrease in state support, creating challenging times for the university. The 2004/05 allocation for CSUH is approximately 8% below the 2003/04 budget, marking the third straight year of reduced appropriations and resulting in a decrease of over 28% since 2001/02. CSUH laid off thirteen (13) staff members to meet budget reductions, eliminated temporary positions, and re-assigned some staff. Although no tenure track faculty were laid off, the number of lecturers was decreased, resulting in reduced class offerings. As a result of these multi-year challenges, some faculty, students, and staff have expressed a tension between the unique educational opportunity offered at CSUH and the fragility of the infrastructure to sustain it. The higher education compact between California’s universities and the governor if successful, will restore some critical funding over a multi-year period.

Even under trying circumstances, new growth and opportunities are happening. On September 30, 2004, groundbreaking for the *Wayne and Gladys Valley Business and Technology Center* marked the successful completion of CSUH’s first capital campaign involving over $10M in private support. This building (the first new classroom building since 1971) will be a university center for technology-enhanced teaching, learning, and
research in several academic disciplines. Also in September 2004, expansion began on
the University Union to enhance student life, funded by student fees. CSUH is also in the
planning stages to increase housing, first for students, followed by building faculty/staff
housing on the Hayward and Contra Costa campuses.

IV. Forward Planning for Educational Effectiveness (Standard Four)
This chapter presents a brief history of the last twelve years of institutional planning,
highlighting the university’s commitment to move from goal and objective setting to the
implementation of strategies that are aligned with resources and the assessment of results.
Areas of success show our capability to achieve this end and to explain how we intend to
apply these strategies to academic planning. Further more, this chapter is how we are
identifying and addressing our data needs, based on data gathered up to and through

V. Conclusion
The conclusion summarizes the strengths and limitations in our capacity for educational
effectiveness and presents the institution’s plan to address our assessment priorities and
outcomes in the next phase of the CSUH~WASC process.

Summary of University Engagement for the Institutional Proposal and the Capacity
and Preparatory Review

WASC accreditation at CSUH has become a process of extensive, university-wide
community engagement. In preparation for our original proposal, the university
organized itself into thirty-seven (37) University Communities of Practice (UCOPs). Four
hundred and fifty (450) participants contributed to the twelve (12) outcomes that became
the focus of the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase. [University Engagement –
Institutional Proposal] The proposal and its methodology are evidence of the university-
wide goal to use the WASC accreditation process to increase our ability to create and
sustain a welcoming, diverse learning community where the academic standards are
rigorous; expectations for students are high; the curriculum is relevant to the changing
social, cultural, and economic needs of the community and society; infrastructure and
resource allocations are congruent and aligned with students’ learning needs; and there is
a continuing dialogue about the quality of the environment for learning among the
university community (faculty, students, and staff).

We have continued with full university engagement during the Capacity and Preparatory
Review phase. Twelve Campus Outcome Teams (COTs) were organized and
membership reflects a combination of volunteer faculty and administrative
recommendations; and, to the degree possible, the university’s diversity. The COTs
used the indicators presented in the Institutional Proposal to guide their study. In
accordance with the WASC Proposal Review Committee’s recommendation, the COTs
narrowed their focus and concentrated on specific initiatives to emphasize improvement
of student learning. Most of the COTs made significant progress toward their outcomes
in spite of the short time-frame (twelve months). See the chart on completed stages of
development for each COT [Progress on Outcomes].
Each COT developed a set of findings and recommendations in four (4) progress reports that formed the core of the reflective essays, and the foundation for the Educational Effectiveness phase. [COT Report Summaries]

Ongoing university-wide dialogue took place within each COT through regular meetings, and was encouraged through quarterly meetings with the president, provost, vice presidents, deans, the Academic Senate and all university communiqués. Evidence of these university-wide discussions and meetings are available on the institutional portfolio. [University Engagement – Capacity Review]. It is important to note that university-wide engagement has been sustained throughout the process, including review of the various drafts of this report.4

Appendix
This will document the institution’s response to the Commission’s previous concerns and Substantive Change Proposals.


2 Volunteers were solicited through an email invitation to all faculty and staff. Recommendations came from the president, vice presidents, deans, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Membership in the COTs included around 70 faculty, 35 staff and administrators, and 2 students. Many attempts to secure student representation yielded only 2. The four Colleges were represented as follows: 23 (Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences), 16 (Business and Economics), 15 (Education and Allied Studies), and 12 (Science). Diversity was represented as follows: 45 females, 60 males; European Americans (59); African Americans (20); Asian Americans (10); Latinos (8); Asian Indians (5) Membership on all COTs remained fairly steady.

3 While there are 21 months between the WASC acceptance of the proposal (March 21, 2003) and the submission of this Preparatory Report (Dec., 2004), CSUH could only engage in focused work for twelve months. To have a full array of faculty representation, meetings were suspended in summer terms when faculty are primarily unavailable.

4 The university encouraged on-going dialogue with: bi-monthly WPC meetings and regular COT meetings; three (3) All-COT meetings (May, 2003, May 2004, November 2004); four (4) Cross-COT meetings on the themes of Diversity and PT&R; six (6) editions of The Outcome summarizing progress made by the COTS distributed to all faculty and staff and published in the university student newspaper; regular Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and WPC Chair meetings with the president and provost; quarterly ALO and WPC Chair meetings with the president’s staff, the provost, the deans, and the Academic Senate’s Executive Committee to discuss oral and written reports including: summaries of COTs’ progress reports; four (4) COT progress reports, posted and summarized for all the COT members to review; COT and university-wide review and feedback on the institutional portfolio and drafts of this report; and email and targeted listening sessions with the staff, the president’s council, the provost, the deans, the Executive Committee of the Senate, and the full Academic Senate for review of this report.