California State University, East Bay has responded vigorously to WASC recommendations with a strategic planning process that has strengthened our academic quality, enhanced student success, and examined the campus climate with a clear focus on increased student learning, institutional resources aligned with academic programs, and evidenced-based decision-making.

– President Mohammad H. Qayoumi
Mission

To provide an academically rich, multicultural learning experience that prepares all its students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful lifework, and to be socially responsible contributors to their communities, locally and globally.

Seven Mandates

A tradition of teaching, learning and academic quality

An inclusive campus climate that values students, faculty and staff, and fosters multicultural learning

Strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access

Vibrant university villages

An efficient, well-run university with culture of accountability

A quest for distinction realized

A university of choice through regional stewardship
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California State University, East Bay has responded vigorously to WASC recommendations with a strategic planning process that has strengthened our academic quality, enhanced student success, and examined the campus climate with a clear focus on increased student learning, institutional resources aligned with academic programs, and evidenced-based decision making. - President Mohammad Qayoumi

This report demonstrates that the university has taken major strides to increase its educational effectiveness. Since the Capacity and Preparatory Review Report in 2004, California State University, East Bay (CSUEB) conducted five (5) research studies, the results of which were widely discussed through a series of university dialogues leading to reflections, actions taken, and actions planned for each study. These studies were: Program Review, General Education, Multiculturalism, Student Success, and Campus Climate.

In preparing this report, faculty and staff contributors closely heeded the recommendations of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Commission regarding the clarification of lines of authority, communication, and planning involved in defining CSUEB’s mission and attaining its educational goals. President Mohammad Qayoumi, appointed in July 2006, rapidly implemented changes in fiscal management and enrollment processes and instituted a strategic planning process that enables the university to better anticipate and respond to emerging needs. These significant improvements in institutional capacity are detailed in the concluding chapter.

General Education. Cal State East Bay offers a freshman General Education (GE) program that is academically challenging and effective. All first time freshmen join integrated learning communities, an innovation that has proven to be successful in achieving student learning outcomes and increasing retention. Several studies, (including direct assessment of GE learning outcomes, student perception surveys, and a national Lumina Foundation for Education study) are reported in Chapter 2. These results, among other findings, show that most students achieve high levels of mastery of GE learning outcomes and that the GE program helps freshmen become better communicators, writers and researchers and to become acquainted with the diverse backgrounds and interests of their peers. Despite this success, freshman GE faces a number of sustainability issues.

Multiculturalism. In response to the WASC Commission’s concern, CSUEB is bolstering its commitment to make multiculturalism a key value or cornerstone of the educational experience of CSUEB. In Chapter 3, the report details several surveys, including student learning outcome results, a statistical study, a course content analysis, and a longitudinal study. The results show that students take more multicultural courses than required, they achieve the student learning outcomes for multicultural competence and that many departments have integrated multicultural issues into their mission statement, student learning outcomes, and curriculum. Students also report welcoming and positive contact with those with different backgrounds and are given opportunities to participate in university-wide events that celebrate different cultures. A searchable data base describing courses with multicultural, international, and gender or sexual orientation content is developing and further discussions are planned in the Academic Senate regarding increasing student multicultural competence.

Student Success. Students who attend Cal State East Bay must be given the resources they need to navigate their educational voyage and obtain reliable and timely information regarding their progress toward graduation. Following the WASC review in 2005, an Advising and Retention Research Team (ARRT) launched several studies to determine how advising is distributed at the Hayward and Concord campuses and CSUEB’s effectiveness in retaining and graduating students including students of color. These reports, discussed in Chapter 4, show that students who obtain more intensive and continuous advising achieve greater success in completing a degree than those who do
not use these services. Also, the web is reported as the most popular source for advising information, thus the university is developing a one-click advising website. The evidence reveals the need for general advising services to be more centralized on the Hayward campus which led to the one-stop advising center in the new Administration and Student Services building and the university established a new Student Success Assessment Committee to monitor student success.

**Campus Climate.** In the Capacity and Preparatory Report, CSUEB proposed a campus climate study to determine whether the campus is welcoming and open to students, faculty and staff and is respectful of all segments of the university community. Towards that end, a major campus climate survey questioned all students, faculty and staff regarding their perceptions on issues affecting campus climate. The findings, discussed in Chapter 5, provide insights about the experiences with the academic, career, and diversity climates. The results are presented in the categories of positive experience, mixed experience, and needs attention. Importantly, the survey results, which were presented to and discussed by 12 different groups at both campuses, already served as the basis for improvements and the data tables are posted on a web site to encourage analyses by other interested campus members.

**Conclusion: Capacity for a New Era.** Finally, CSUEB implemented a strategic planning process that strengthens its ability to guide its future growth with confidence and certainty. President Qayoumi established institutional policies and procedures that will result in enrollment growth and financial stability. Chapter 6 describes new lines of communication that have been created to increase faculty, student and staff participation in the budget and other important decisions in which they have a stake. These decisions are guided by seven mandates in the Framework for the Future that define CSUEB’s identity and future initiatives. Consequently, there is notable improvement in campus morale with the initial implementation of these efforts. In many ways CSUEB is a very different place than it was two and a half years ago when the Capacity and Preparatory Review team visited the university (March 2005).
INTRODUCTION

In July 2006, CSUEB welcomed the university’s new president, Mohammad H. Qayoumi. Under his leadership, the university has embraced a shared commitment to the future, collaboration among divisions, and the application of data to decision-making across the university. While this approach brings a new spirit to CSUEB, it also builds on the university’s 50 years of accomplishments and its recent reinforcement of academic quality through Academic Senate committees and the earlier stages of the current WASC review.

With a clear sense of direction, CSUEB is in many ways a very different place than it was two and a half years ago, when the Capacity and Preparatory Review team visited the university (March, 2005). Initiatives identified five years ago are now well established in areas such as planning, implementation and accountability, enrollment management, resource management, campus climate, advising and retention, and student learning assessment. Since March 2003, when CSUEB’s Institutional Proposal was accepted by WASC,1 the University has experienced dramatic changes including a name change, the opening of a new academic building, student housing and university union expansion, as well as a new senior administrative team.

CSUEB continues to pursue its commitments to build educational capacity and effectiveness and now exudes a spirit of renewal and momentum energized by the faculty and its leadership, the staff, and the associated students, and led by the new administration and president. During Fall 2006, the president organized a series of town hall meetings, which generated the Framework for the Future, including the seven mandates to implement the university’s mission, vision and values. In his inaugural address, President Qayoumi proclaimed a new era and a pivotal moment in the university’s history as the campus honors its fiftieth year. According to Qayoumi, CSUEB must sustain and nurture the spirit of a true community, manifest a pioneer spirit, and share responsibility for charting the university’s future.2 CSUEB’s priorities include increasing enrollment, achieving financial stability, increasing the proportion of tenure track faculty, and improving the appearance of the Hayward campus.

OVERVIEW
How is this report organized?

This report demonstrates CSUEB’s commitment to the educational effectiveness goals of academic quality, student success, and campus climate and its progress towards meeting the remaining WASC capacity issues regarding planning, multiculturalism, workload, and the Concord Campus. First, it demonstrates how the Educational Effectiveness Review at CSUEB has moved forward during the WASC Re-accreditation process since the Institutional Proposal (2003). The university undertook five research studies to document CSUEB’s educational effectiveness. Second, this report represents the ways in which the university is addressing the issues remaining from the Capacity and Preparatory Review.3 The capacity section of this report covers plans for achieving the seven mandates in the Framework for the Future, which will drive all future university efforts including resource allocation and accountability. This chapter is the integrative essay and conclusion.

APPROACH TO EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
How did the institution design its review as a rigorous inquiry with searching questions, appropriate methodology, and effective use of evidence?

In what ways will the evidence CSUEB presents demonstrate a Commitment to Educational Effectiveness?

In the course of the Educational Effectiveness Review, CSUEB conducted five research studies characterized by “...sustained, evidence-based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives.”(Standard 4)
1. Academic Program Review,
2. General Education Program,
3. Multicultural Learning Experiences,
4. Advising and Retention of Students, and
5. Campus Climate.
These five studies document CSUEB’s increased ability to “…use the results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection...to establish priorities at different levels of the institution, and to revise institutional purposes, structures, and approaches to teaching, learning, and scholarly work” (Standard 4).

**Approach to Remaining Capacity Issues**
The new executive team assumed responsibility for establishing a sustained leadership system (CfR 1.2), gathering data, and obtaining input from multiple constituencies to establish the seven mandates in the *Framework for the Future*. These mandates are aligned to the academic, student, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs of the university (CFR 4.2), and are being used to generate resources and build organizational structures that can be sustained (Standard Three). Thus, the capacity issues identified by the Commission (planning, multiculturalism, workload, and the Concord Campus) and the findings and recommendations from the Educational Effectiveness studies are incorporated into the University’s new strategic plan and implementation mandates, as illustrated in the figure below.  

---

**Faculty, students and staff have been engaged in every aspect of the Educational Effectiveness process and the results are being incorporated into the daily routines of the university...**

---

**INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

*What was the extent of institutional involvement in the Educational Effectiveness Report? How were faculty included in discussion of the issues addressed and recommendations reached?*

Faculty, students and staff have been engaged in every aspect of the Educational Effectiveness process and the results are being incorporated into the daily routines of the university:

- Four standing committees of the Academic Senate assumed responsibility for 3 of the research studies and reports, which are the basis for the essays on Academic Quality.
  - The Program Review study was conducted by The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR).
  - The General Education study was led by the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC) and the Sub-Committee on General Education.
  - The Cultural Groups and Women Sub-Committee of CIC oversaw the Multiculturalism study.
- Results from the Campus Climate and the Advising and Retention studies were presented and discussed by twenty-four groups on the Hayward and Concord campuses.
Twenty-one Town Hall meetings involving significant university-wide participation contributed to the formation of the seven mandates for the future. This process underscored the university’s commitment to implement the goals of academic quality, student success, and campus climate.

Membership of the Campus Climate and Advising and Retention committees included representatives from the Academic Senate, faculty from the four colleges and Concord Campus, student affairs staff, and the Associated Students. These committee members wrote the research reports and were involved in writing the campus climate and advising and retention chapters.

The Educational Effectiveness Steering Committee includes the chairs and co-chairs of the other committees, along with key constituents. The Committee members incorporated the findings from the research studies and edited drafts of the Educational Effectiveness Report.

The President and Provost and their cabinets reviewed several drafts of this report.

Academic Senate reading groups offered extensive notes, which were incorporated into the final report.

The preliminary reports were placed on the web for feedback.

A DYNAMIC PROGRESSION FROM PROPOSAL TO EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

How is the Institutional Presentation consistent with and a departure from the model of review accepted by the Proposal Review committee?

The progression from the Institutional Proposal to the Educational Effectiveness Review has enabled CSUEB to be innovative, while remaining consistent with the model of review that was accepted by the WASC Proposal Review Committee.

The process in 2002 that led to the Institutional Proposal involved wide participation and the university’s endorsement of four goals.

Goal 1: A Focused Compelling Vision
Using a consensus-based approach that included input from the entire university community, a new mission, vision and values statement was written and adopted in July 2004. The 2007 Framework for the Future converts these concepts into seven strategic mandates for the university’s strategic plan.

Goal 2: A Welcoming Diverse Learning Community
The Capacity and Preparatory Review addressed campus climate, student services, and co-curricular activities. Throughout the Educational Effectiveness phase, two major research studies and a series of university-wide discussions have focused on advising and retention and campus climate.

Goal 3: Strengthening Academic Quality
The third major goal articulated in CSUEB’s Institutional Proposal involved establishing standards for academic quality. This goal includes defining rigorous expectations for students, offering a curriculum that anticipates and is relevant to the changing social, cultural, and economic needs of the community and society, and understanding what and how students learn, as evidenced by coordinated assessment. Seven aspects of academic quality were appraised during the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase: General Education program; Degree programs; Academic Program review process; The Library and information resources; Instructional technology; The faculty; and connections with the community. For the Educational Effectiveness phase, CSUEB chose three aspects of academic quality for extensive research studies: general education, academic program review, and multicultural learning experience at CSUEB.

Goal 4: Planning and Implementation
In the course of the Institutional Proposal process, the University acknowledged the need to connect resource allocations with clearly defined plans to support student learning. At the onset of the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the Academic Senate created the Committee on Budget Resources and Allocations (COBRA), which was praised by the Visiting Team. Early in the Educational Effectiveness phase the university initiated a planning process that President Qayoumi transformed into the Framework for the Future. This is discussed in more detail in the final chapter on institutional capacity.
In summary, WASC’s *Standard Four: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement* has been the guiding and organizing principle for CSUEB’s approach to the *Educational Effectiveness* review. Further, the other three standards and five research studies are now integrated into the strategic plan, the program review process, and the implementation and accountability policies and practices of the university. Therefore, CSUEB’s approach to the *Educational Effectiveness* review is consistent with the model accepted by the Proposal Review Committee. The following table provides an overview of the review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Evidence &amp; Methodology</th>
<th>WASC Standard and Criteria for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Review</td>
<td>In what ways is the new Program Review Process effective in evaluating academic quality and student learning?</td>
<td>Content Analysis&lt;br&gt;Quality of program reviews from 05-06 compared with those from 06-07.</td>
<td>2.1 Degree program content&lt;br&gt;2.2 Clearly defined degrees&lt;br&gt;2.4 Shared expectations for student learning&lt;br&gt;2.5 Students involved in learning&lt;br&gt;2.6 Graduates achieve expectations&lt;br&gt;2.7 Program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>What is the educational effectiveness of our general education program?</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis&lt;br&gt;Student Perception Data&lt;br&gt;Rubric Scoring of student learning in general education courses.</td>
<td>1.2 Leadership&lt;br&gt;2.2 Clearly defined degrees&lt;br&gt;2.3 Clear expectations for student learning&lt;br&gt;2.4 Shared expectations for student learning&lt;br&gt;2.5 Students involved in learning&lt;br&gt;2.6 Graduates achieve expectations&lt;br&gt;2.7 Program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>What does CSUEB understand “multicultural learning experience” to mean?</td>
<td>Content Analysis&lt;br&gt;Course descriptions and program outcomes&lt;br&gt;Open-ended Survey&lt;br&gt;Rubric Scoring of student learning in multicultural courses.</td>
<td>1.5 Diversity&lt;br&gt;2.4 Shared expectations for student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and Retention</td>
<td>How well do we retain and graduate students by race, gender, transfer, freshman? What is the relationship between advising, retention &amp; graduation?</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis&lt;br&gt;• Analysis – 10 yrs data&lt;br&gt;• 2000 Cohort&lt;br&gt;• Survey questions&lt;br&gt;Situational Mapping&lt;br&gt;• Advising</td>
<td>2.4 Shared expectations for student learning&lt;br&gt;2.12 Advising and information&lt;br&gt;2.13 Appropriate student services&lt;br&gt;2.14 Transfer students served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>What are the factors of Campus Climate?</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis&lt;br&gt;3-perspective survey of faculty staff and students.</td>
<td>2.5 Students involved in learning&lt;br&gt;2.11 Co-curricular programs&lt;br&gt;2.12 Advising and information&lt;br&gt;2.13 Appropriate student services&lt;br&gt;2.14 Transfer students served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Implementation Accountability</td>
<td>What are CSUEB’s priorities?</td>
<td>Situational Analysis&lt;br&gt;Existing data. Content Analysis&lt;br&gt;21 Town Hall meetings.</td>
<td>4.1 Reflection/planning&lt;br&gt;4.2 Alignment of academic and other plans&lt;br&gt;4.3 Planning informed by data and evidence&lt;br&gt;4.4. Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter will demonstrate that CSU EB, through its Revised Five Year Program Review Process (CAPR 9), meets CFR 2.1. Degree Program Content; 2.2. Student Achievement; 2.6. Student Learning Outcomes; 2.7. Program Review. All degree programs are reviewed for their appropriate content and must provide evidence of student achievement of specified competencies in ways that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits.

CFR 2.4. Shared expectations for student learning; 3.4. Faculty development; 4.7. Improvement of teaching and learning. Faculty, through the Academic Senate take responsibility for creating student learning outcomes, establishing, reviewing, and demonstrating the attainment of learning objectives and ongoing inquiry in the process of teaching and learning. The Office of Faculty Development will provide support for preparation of program reviews.

CFR 4.4. Quality assurance process; 4.6. Improvement based on assessment. CAPR 9, with its MOUs and Annual Reports, serves as a deliberate set of quality assurance processes for program evaluation, a clear policy, procedures, and set of practices for gathering and analyzing evidence, and evidence of the commitment of the leadership to make improvements based on the results of the processes.

INTRODUCTION

During the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) conducted a comprehensive analysis of the program review process. The goal was to insure that colleges and departments have sufficient procedures in place to sustain high academic quality and accountability for learning outcomes. In Spring 2006, the Academic Senate approved the modifications to the review process with 2005-2006 CAPR 9, which brought about a more systematic organization of review documents and directly linked student learning outcomes to program activities. The CAPR 9 document clearly specifies the responsibilities that college deans as well as department chairs or program coordinators have for conducting reviews of academic programs.

The previous program review process included a self study, an assessment plan, and an external review. However it was not adequately aligned with tenure track or other resource allocations, did not require direct evidence of student learning, and was not linked to the university strategic plan. Overall the CSU EB’s revised program review process assesses whether academic programs have clearly stated missions and goals that involve measurable and reliable evidence of student learning. This information is expected to inform curricular development, facilitate strategic planning, enable course modifications, advance faculty development, and provide meaningful advising to students.

Six significant changes were added to the program review process.

1. Required student learning results. With the initiation of CAPR 9, programs are now required to report results of student learning on specific educational effectiveness. 10

2. Student Learning Outcomes Rubric. This document, used by the program faculty to self-evaluate, contains 15 questions examining items such as a clear statement of the program’s mission, description of the program’s student learning objectives, the assessment plan, and the student learning results. 11
3. **Coordinated External Review.** While CSUEB always included a report from an external reviewer, the format for the report was not specified. Now the External reviewer must evaluate the program on a 26 point rubric which accompanies a narrative report.

4. **Program Plan for the next 5 years including projected tenure track needs.**

5. **Two new accountability processes.**
   a. **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** This document formally summarizes a meeting between the Provost, Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies, Dean, Program Chair, and CAPR Chair or member, regarding the program achievements; current resources and anticipated future needs, including tenure track positions; and the program’s goals expectations.
   b. **Annual Report.** The Annual Report submitted by each program tracks progress on the goals of the Five Year Review and MOU. This 3-page report, submitted to the respective Dean and the Academic Senate office, serves to:
      1) establish joint responsibility between a program and administrators for maintaining academic quality,
      2) document progress on program goals, and 3) verify resource allocations described in the MOU process.

6. **Recommendations.** CAPR can now make one of four recommendations regarding program continuity: continuation without modification; continue with modification; discontinuance; or the newest category, continuation of the program for a specific amount of time with annual monitoring by CAPR and the Dean to examine issues identified in the program review.

   CAPR reviewed 22 programs in 2005-06 under the old process and 10 programs in 2006-07 under the new procedures to assure that the new process was effective.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. How effectively does the institution review and modify its courses and programs to reflect new knowledge and changes in the needs of society and to ensure that the degrees remain rigorous and aligned with core purposes?

**METHODS**

**Five-Year Program Review**

CAPR employs procedural methods involving deliberation and dialogues. CAPR members jointly discuss and reflect on the program materials submitted and the results of interviews with the department representatives. The 10 programs reviewed under the new CAPR procedures were significantly informed by the use of the Student Learning Outcome rubric, the 26 point rubric included as part of the External reviewer’s reports, and the overall quality of each section of the self-study report.

In the Spring Quarter 07, CAPR examined how the new procedures affected the presentation of evidence by programs, and discussed ways to strengthen the Committee’s ability to evaluate the evidence to assess the quality of degree programs.

**Memorandum of Understanding**

Four (4) MOUs were written by the Interim Provost during the 2006/07 academic year. The meetings leading up to these MOUs are supposed to be open and explicit discussions regarding the findings in the program review and the best means of addressing them. The purpose of the MOU is to detail the expectations of a program, the Dean, and the Provost. The four completed MOUs were examined by all parties to confirm that they fairly represented the oral agreements in the meeting.

**Annual Report**

Virtually all programs filed their first annual reports late in Spring Quarter 07 with their respective College Dean and the Academic Senate Office. CAPR reviewed the annual reports noting the level of completion and the general quality of the student learning assessment summary. A more
A detailed review is expected in Fall 07, with the plan to create a spreadsheet to chart program goals stated in Five Year Reviews and to track data from the Annual Reports to note progress.

Additional Evidence of Student Learning Assessment
One Programmatic Improvement. The College Deans wanted to assess the readiness of the academic programs to fulfill the requirements of the new CAPR program review process. As a one-time assessment, each degree program was asked to identify one area that needed programmatic improvement, state how it used evidence of learning outcomes to undertake programmatic change, and identify improvements in educational effectiveness that followed from the change. CAPR members reviewed these submissions for the presence of appropriate information.

Evidence Narrative. College Deans requested that some programs provide narratives of their assessment activities. This was intended to allow faculty to describe in their own words the range and nature of their activities to improve student learning outcomes. CAPR members rated each of these narratives in three areas: adequate description of the process of assessment; quantitative or qualitative data showing results of student learning; and educational effectiveness resulting from programmatic changes.

RESULTS

Five-Year Program Reviews
2005-2006. CAPR met weekly during the 2005-2006 academic year and reviewed reports from 22 programs. Several programs had been granted review delays from the previous years and CAPR made it a goal to review all programs that had been delayed as well as those regularly scheduled for review. These 22 programs did not have the benefit of the CAPR 9 process. No direct evidence for student learning results was required to be furnished in the earlier CAPR review process. Nor were the guidelines for self-study consistent across the programs. The external reviewers’ reports were varied in focus and format, and CAPR did not have clear guidelines or rubrics to inform their own deliberations. Thus CAPR relied on traditional measures of quality such as relatively stable or growing FTE, FTEF, diverse student population, curriculum compared with other similar programs, faculty publications, etc. Each program reviewed received specific comments related to areas needing improvement in the next 5 years.

The following paragraph, taken from the 2005 CAPR Annual Report to the Academic Senate, illustrates CAPR’s concerns and discussions in that year. In particular, this paragraph highlights the shift in thinking to a student-centered learning process guiding assessment.

“Our ability to evaluate the quality of our programs has not always been clear, either for CAPR members or for programs undergoing review…. As we struggled through several reviews this year, we used what we learned in the review process to more clearly detail our procedures. For example, evaluating Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) can be difficult for those outside the field. We implemented and revised the proposed SLO rubric from the previous year’s WASC subcommittee. We asked how well the program could determine and evaluate their expectations for students and how well these expectations align with programmatic and University goals. We also asked how well the program implements new ideas gleaned from the assessment process. We also asked how program currency and effectiveness is maintained; how the evidence is collected and utilized to create improvements in the program; and how outside evidence is available and utilized? There is a range of programs and a range of review procedures that programs undergo, from licensing, accreditation, and credentialing to internal reviews. We need to provide review for the entire spectrum of these programs and our procedures need to reflect the diversity that is present at the University.”

2006-2007. CAPR met biweekly and reviewed 10 programs; 5 had been scheduled in previous years and 5 were current reviews. Each program prepared its review in accordance with the new CAPR 9 requirements. All programs received extensive comments related to areas that needed improvement during the next 5 years. The Academic Senate approved continuance of 5 of the 10 programs; the other 5 will come before the Senate in Fall Quarter 07. Overall the scores on the student learning outcome rubric for the 10 programs reviewed
ranged from a high of 96% to a low of 74%. To highlight CAPR's work, three examples of how it makes recommendations and modifications regarding programs are briefly described below. Two of these programs are thriving and highly successful and show clearly the use and development of student learning outcomes. One program illustrates the seriousness with which CAPR reviews programs and the utility of the new process as it supports program recommendations. Extensive summaries detail how CAPR made its determination on these programs.

Program XYZ was found to be a strong program based on traditional indicators of performance (e.g., relatively stable FTES; FTEF; diverse student population). Its faculty maintained strong scholarly activity despite heavy teaching loads. It had suffered enrollment drops in recent years but had rebounded with robust enrollment growth. The program had begun collecting assessment data and had used the results to make programmatic decisions. Most impressive is the department’s ambitious and detailed plans for revising the curriculum, adding a new degree program, and increasing its enrollment. This program received a score of 96% on the student learning outcomes rubric.

Program ABC was found to be a strong program based on historical and current academic practices. It has an active study program for students, including seminars, workshops, colloquia, research projects, advising, and community activities. The program had developed and implemented assessment of direct and indirect measures of student learning into their regular processes and demonstrated the use of evidence to make programmatic improvements. They documented that they used their previous plan as a guide and made effective changes since the last review. The program FTES are steady and growing gradually. Its faculty is strong but aging and does not benefit from the dynamic contributions that new faculty can bring. This program received a 92% score on the student learning outcomes rubric.

Program LMO, also reviewed under the new standards, struggled to maintain course offerings and majors in the past five years. Analysis of the data by CAPR led to two conclusions. First, several external factors had converged to undermine the recent health of the program and second, the program had made changes that were leading to improvements. The program's score on the student learning outcome rubric was 75.8%. While recognizing the strength and contribution of this program to the university, CAPR acknowledged the current difficulties by requiring that LMO show sufficient change in the next 5 years, such as student learning outcome assessment and increased enrollment or risk being recommended for discontinuance.19

As CAPR reflected on the 32 program reviews over the past two years, they found that the programs fell into three categories: thriving; moderately successful; and those experiencing difficulty.

- Programs that thrive are able to maintain stable enrollments and attract enough majors to sustain a sufficient level and variety of course offerings including GE courses. These programs possess sufficient tenured and part-time faculty to consistently offer courses in the curriculum. They also had stable leadership and they are able to use programmatic assessments to make improvements.
- Moderately successful programs did not consistently maintain stable FTE enrollments. These programs also had insufficient numbers of tenured faculty (and increased reliance on part-time lecturers) to cover the curriculum offerings, especially electives. However, these programs were able to make programmatic changes that enhanced academic quality.
- Programs that experience difficulty in attaining FTES stability were unable to properly gauge student demand, did not offer a curriculum that attracted sufficient students, and did not conduct vigorous assessment or the use of appropriate evidence to inform curricular and programmatic decisions. Low enrollments led to budget cuts, further weakening the capacity to retain or hire faculty.

Annual Reports

Academic year 2006/07 was the inaugural year for the Annual Report process. Most Annual Reports arrived in the Senate office in late spring, giving CAPR just enough time for a general review for completeness and the data for student learning assessment. CAPR found that while the programs completed the reports, the level of detail on student learning assessment was varied both in the number of programs that are collecting evidence and the quality of the evidence being collected. Approximately a third of the program reports demonstrate attempts at assessing student learning outcomes, but do not show clearly measurable student learning objectives that are linked or related to program review.20

Memorandum of Understanding

The four MOUs written in 2006/07 resulted in promising changes. They accurately reflected the oral agreements made in the MOU meetings. The College Deans are now directly engaged in the Five Year Review process. Decisions supporting tenure track allocations are more closely tied to
evidence provided in the Annual Report. More attention has been directed to student learning outcomes and there have been fewer delays in scheduling program reviews.

**Additional Evidence of Student Learning in the Degree Programs**

*One Programmatic Improvement.* CAPR members reviewed the submissions, paying particular attention to the programs’ readiness to meet the new CAPR 9 requirements. Eighteen of 33 graduate programs responded and 38 of 43 undergraduate programs. All but four departments responded for at least one of their degree programs. While all of the program chairs that responded could articulate the steps involved in using direct methods to evaluate student learning beyond the use of grades, not all of the programs were identified as ready for their Program Review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Readiness</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ready</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will be Ready</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet Ready</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t Respond</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence Narratives.** Twenty programs submitted narratives describing the process by which the program assessed learning that did not involve grading and how this evidence influenced programmatic decisions, such as changes in courses or other program activities. It was found that all but one program is engaged in assessment activities involving quantitative or qualitative data. Six programs did not provide sufficient information.

Taken together, the results show that the faculty may know what needs to be done to design and implement the assessment and evaluation of student learning outcomes but will need support in order to fully integrate and coordinate evidence and use it to inform programmatic decisions.

**REFLECTION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS**

**Limitations**

The large number of program reviews conducted at CSUEB (32 reviews in 2 years) presented many challenges, but CAPR members believe that the challenges were worth the effort, because timely and systematic information is indispensable to a university that seeks stronger academic programs that are focused on student learning. Perhaps the most pressing challenge has been to insure that programs with weak self-studies or who failed to submit assessment data commence new student learning outcome assessments as soon as possible and that they receive the necessary institutional support to do so. It may be the case that some programs are conducting adequate assessments and using the evidence for curricular improvements but need help articulating the process to others. New mechanisms of academic program accountability introduced through a strengthened strategic planning function have generated a greater sense of urgency and cooperation among all academic programs to fulfill their primary mission.

**University Dialogues**

The CAPR committee of the Academic Senate was the locus of weekly (05/06) and bi-weekly (06/07) dialogues. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate as well as the full Senate extensively discussed and voted on each completed Program Review and CAPR’s evaluation of the programs. The process actively involved the Deans, Program chairs and the Provost.

**Reflections**

- The evidence reported in this chapter suggest that the academic and support programs involved in assessment are using this information to guide programmatic modifications. It is clear that some programs have forged strong linkages between assessment and effective program modification.

- CAPR members emphasized the interdependent and interactive nature of the new CAPR program review process. The success of the new process depends on the commitment and follow-through of all involved. The Program Chairs and directors must make the program review, and MOU, a high priority. College Deans must become more involved in the program review process. They must insure that every program in their college collects student learning outcome evidence and uses it to improve program quality. Further, the program faculty must be held accountable for submitting the annual reports and using them as the basis for requests for resources and tenure track allocations. The Provost and Deans should follow-up with all MOUs in a timely manner.

There is evidence that progress has been made on a number of CAPR 9 processes.

1. College deans have a greater involvement in the Five Year Review process in 2006/07 than they did previously. They attended the Five Year Review meetings and MOU meetings, and through the Associate Deans, monitor submission of Five Year Reviews and Annual Reports.
2. Academic programs have demonstrated increased attention to the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, and are now expected to clearly articulate and assess them.

3. Attention has been directed by CAPR to college deans and the Provost regarding the need to consider CAPR 9 and the submission of an Annual Report as pre-condition for requesting a tenure track allocation for 2007/08.

4. Programs have completed Annual Reports, indicating they are responding to the CAPR review process.

5. Of the programs scheduled for review in 2006/07, only one requested a delay, which is in stark contrast to previous years when a number of programs requested delays without substantive reasons.

6. The format for CAPR 9, while longer and more systematic than previous review reports, provides one opportunity for CAPR to effectively study a program and the issues facing it in the future. As a result, CAPR made more detailed recommendations than in years past, and correlated those recommendations to the evidence supplied by the program and made them available on the institutional website. 25

**Actions Planned**

1. The MOU meetings scheduled for programs in 2006/07 are scheduled for Fall Quarter 07.

2. MOU meetings will occur within two months (not counting the summer break) of Academic Senate acceptance of each CAPR report.

3. The Office of Faculty Development will offer an increased number of special workshops to assist faculty to plan and implement program assessments.

4. A special meeting for new members of CAPR will be held to familiarize them with the CAPR 9 policy and practices.

5. All materials and documents for a Program Review will be placed on the web with exemplars.

6. The CAPR chair will continue to meet with the College Councils.

**The evidence reported in this chapter suggest that the academic and support programs involved in assessment are using this information to guide programmatic modifications. It is clear that some programs have forged strong linkages between assessment and effective program modification.**

**Actions**

**Actions Taken**

1. CAPR Chair met with college councils to describe the program review process.

2. Early in Fall Quarter 07, the former Chair of CAPR is scheduled to conduct workshops for program chairs and coordinators to assist them in preparing for the Five Year Review.
CHAPTER 2

ACADEMIC QUALITY ~ GENERAL EDUCATION

This chapter describes the actions that CSUEB has undertaken to fulfill the following Criteria for Review.

**CFR 1.2. Educational Objectives.**
Its General Education (GE) student learning outcomes are clearly recognized as the institution’s educational objectives.

**CFR 2.2. Student Achievement.**
The GE program is an integral part of the curriculum, including the upper division level, and its student learning outcomes have been approved by the Senate and are published in the university catalogue.

**CFR 2.4. Shared Expectations.**
The faculty, through its Academic Senate, and the assessment of student learning of GE outcomes, take collective responsibility for establishing and reviewing the levels of academic achievement.

**CFR 2.6. Achievement of Expectations.**
Direct evidence from student work demonstrates that students achieve at or above the expected levels for GE competencies.

**CFR 2.7. Program Review, 4.4 Quality Assurance Process & 4.7 Improvement of Teaching and Learning.**
Faculty conduct periodic inquiries about the GE program through two separate reviews by the Academic Senate which include the analysis of assessment results and the inquiry into the teaching and learning of GE outcomes. 26

INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes CSUEB’s efforts to develop and assess a general education program that is academically challenging and educationally effective. CSUEB has an innovative GE program required for all first time freshmen involving integrated knowledge content clusters and collaborative learning that has proven to be effective in enhancing student learning and increasing retention. Participating faculty have continually adapted the program to meet the needs of freshman and the goals to become effective communicators, writers and researchers and better acquainted with the diverse backgrounds and interests of their fellow students.

Cal State East Bay started more than a decade of reform in General Education since the fall of 1995. The Academic Senate approved a new design for lower division GE courses and a revision of upper division GE requirements in spring 1996. In 1998 the first cohort of freshmen entered under the new general education program. In the first five years, the program’s main characteristics included freshman and sophomore learning communities, thematically linked sets of courses (clusters) that included almost all lower-division general education requirements, and a new upper-division capstone course. These learning communities enrolled student cohorts of 90 in a year-long program of study. Cluster students take three thematically linked courses, one per quarter, for the entire year. Also student learning outcomes were adopted for the first time in 1998 for the general education program, accompanied by a planned schedule assessment for student learning.

In 2002-2003, the GE program underwent its first review involving multiple sources of data. 27 The results from this review brought additional changes. The most important change was the elimination of the sophomore clusters in favor of greater curricular choice for students. The capstone GE course was eliminated and replaced with an upper-division science requirement. The university was encouraged to revive its commitment to the freshman learning communities and the approval of cluster courses. Structures for general education were placed under the Academic Senate and its committees, rather than in the Colleges. And finally, a commitment was made to develop student learning outcomes in all areas, basic
skills and disciplines in order to guide teaching and allow assessment of student learning. This expression of support was encouraging, as it acknowledges that taking an integrated and collaborative approach to student learning enhances student academic performance. [2002-03 GE 5-Year Review]

By Winter 05, the Academic Senate had approved student learning outcomes in both lower and upper division science, humanities, and social science courses. To date, the Academic Senate has approved student learning outcomes in four of the five basic skill requirements: Writing; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Information Literacy and Oral Communication. Student learning outcomes have been approved by the required faculty committees and await approval of the Academic Senate.

CSUEB undertook this study of General Education with the aim of identifying and correcting weaknesses and to strengthen the program as a whole. Several research questions were identified that are described next.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What do students learn in the General Education Program?
2. What is the best method(s) for assessing student learning in General Education courses?
3. How does the institution insure that freshmen develop the core learning abilities and competencies called for by the General Education Program? These include a strong sense of community, skills in understanding and working with the wide diversity of students, and a high retention rate.
4. How do students understand and describe their experiences in the freshman learning communities?

METHODS

1. Rubric Scoring of Student Learning Outcomes in GE Courses
   With the endorsement from the GE Subcommittee, the Provost, and Deans, and in cooperation with the Center for Faculty Development, CSUEB formed the GE Faculty Learning Community (GE~FLC). This group spent the year studying how to assess learning in general education programs and developed a pilot program to evaluate assessment strategy. The members of the GE~FLC selected one Senate approved general education learning outcome for each of the required areas. Rubrics were chosen as the methodology for this research study. This research study provided the first direct measure of student learning in the broad areas of knowledge required of all CSU students. [2005-06 GE ~FLC Final Report]

2. The Analytic Essay Portion of Writing Skills Test
   When native freshmen took the Writing Skills Test (WST) as juniors, it was possible to measure how well native CSUEB freshmen did on the WST compared to transfer students. Data comparing the pass rates for the past 6 years on the WST for native freshmen and transfer students is compiled and reported annually by the Testing Office.

3. Information Literacy
   Instruction in information literacy became a GE requirement with the new GE program. Library 1012, Information Literacy, is linked to all freshman learning communities. At the beginning of this Library course, students are given a pre-test, designed by CSUEB librarians, to measure their information competencies. The test is given at the end of the course and the percentage improvement in correct answers is one measure of student learning.

4. Surveys
   a. The Entering Student Survey is given in the first week of classes to gather information on student expectations for college.
   b. College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) is given at the end of the first year to measure student reports of their first year experiences.

5. The Lumina Foundation Longitudinal Study
   Cal State East Bay is one of 25 campuses participating in a study funded by the Lumina Foundation for Education. Researchers Vincent Tinto and Cathy Engstrom from The Higher Education Program at Syracuse University are carrying out this national longitudinal study. CSUEB is also one of only five universities selected to be case study campuses, tracking a group of 50 freshmen.

RESULTS

Rubric Scoring of Student Learning Outcomes in GE Courses
Fifty-six (56) faculty evaluated 2,155 student artifacts (essays, tests, and oral presentations). The faculty volunteered to use the rubrics as a pilot study in the Winter and Spring Quarters of 2006 and to provide feedback regarding the effectiveness and ease of using the rubric. The data from the faculty evaluations indicate that generally 75% to 80% of the students have satisfactorily achieved the student learning outcome measured for lower division science, social science, humanities, and cultural groups and women courses. Nevertheless, the faculty view is that the university must do everything it can to insure that the 20% to 25%
of the students who now fail to reach an acceptable level of performance succeed in doing so in the future.

The discipline area that had the highest mastery of the student-learning outcome -90%- was for cultural groups and women33. [See Chapter 3, Multiculturalism] The GE~FLC received feedback from most of the participating faculty. Comments were solicited on the following three questions: 1) in what ways was this rubric useful and relevant for assessing the GE outcome(s); 2) what changes could be made to improve the usefulness and relevance of the rubric; and 3) other comments. Responses fell into six categories and the numbers can be found in the full report. The faculty feedback describes overall positive responses to the use of the rubrics. Almost all faculty who participated in the pilot study reported that the rubrics were easy to use and provided important information about student learning. Only 3 of 56 faculty did not find the rubrics useful and offered suggestions for simplification. Many faculty said that the rubrics enabled them for the first time to focus on general education outcomes. The faculty also reported that the feedback they received from using the rubrics would immediately affect the way in which they taught their course(s), improve their course planning, and increase student learning.

Almost all faculty who participated in the pilot study reported that the rubrics were easy to use and that the feedback they received from using the rubrics would immediately affect the way in which they taught their course(s), improve their course planning, and increase student learning.

CSUEB freshmen report on the College Student Experience Questionnaire that they get frequent opportunities to practice the steps of good writing—drafting, editing, revising, and peer editing, before completing their final papers. They also report that they do more writing for their classes than is the case for students in national comparison groups.

Assessment of Student Writing ~ Writing Skills Test

The cluster students taking the WST in the fall of 2000, the first quarter in which a measurable number of the 1998 freshman class took the WST, passed at an 85% rate! The average pass rate on the WST has hovered around 65% for all first time test takers. This was the first time in many years that a group of CSUEB students out-performed all other test-takers at a significant level. This first fall group of test-takers was comprised of those students who required little or no remedial work. Nonetheless, at the end of summer 2001, when most of the 1998 class had taken the test, the pass rate remained significantly higher than the other first-time test takers at 72% pass rate. The data for the 1999 to 2002 classes is similar. The Testing Office reports that the pass rate for students from the clusters, until last year, was higher than those CSUEB students not in the clusters or those who transferred into CSUEB [06-07 GE CAPR Report] and was responsible for turning around the decline in CSUEB student pass rates on the WST.

However, in the last year (2005) for the first time since Fall 2000, CSUEB freshmen did not out-perform their transfer colleagues on the WST. These new data are unexpected and require investigation into the possible causes for the change. The Writings Skills Subcommittee discussed this finding in February 2007 and suggested possible reasons: 1) class sizes for remedial English courses increased from 12 to 19; 2) faculty members no longer stay with the same cohort of students; 3) collaboration between composition and discipline teachers has been difficult to sustain, due to issues in scheduling and planning; and 4) the percentage of ESL students may have increased.

Nevertheless, there is ample evidence that students benefit from the writing experience they received as freshmen.
CSUEB freshmen report on the College Student Experience Questionnaire that they get frequent opportunities to practice the steps of good writing—drafting, editing, revising, and peer editing, before completing their final papers. They also report that they do more writing for their classes than is the case for students in national comparison groups.

**Assessment of Student Learning in Information Literacy**

Students taking Information Literacy classes are given a pre-test, designed by the CSUEB librarians, to measure their information literacy competencies. They are also tested at the end of the course to determine the level of improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamentals of Information Literacy</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>% Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table indicates, there has been measurable improvement each year since 1998. Entering freshmen's pre-test scores on information literacy skills also show improvement. This may stem from the fact that CSUEB librarians are actively involved helping high school librarians and teachers develop instructional strategies to assist students become competent in locating, evaluating, and using information.34

**Student Experience and Program Goals**

Cal State East Bay’s freshman learning communities intend to foster a strong sense of community, develop skills in understanding and working with a wide diversity of fellow students, and retain freshmen at high rates. The results from the Entering Student Survey, the CSEQ, the Lumina Longitudinal study, and the institutional data on retention demonstrate that the freshman cluster program builds community, fosters diversity, and improves retention.

**Building Community.** Data collected over the last eight years demonstrates that CSUEB freshmen closely relate to faculty and the campus through the work they do in the cluster courses, particularly the writing and General Studies courses. General Studies courses are required of all freshmen in the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters. The data from the General Studies courses also document the strength of student connections to their faculty—a critical component in retaining students and improving learning. Self-reported data suggest that CSUEB students experience a close relationship with faculty that exceeds the national average. For example, students reported in the CSEQ that they socialized with faculty outside of class, discussed projects with faculty outside of class, and worked with a faculty member on research at a level of contact that exceeded the national average. [06-07 GE CAPR Report]

CSUEB data consistently show that the freshman component of the General Education program successfully supports and sustains students’ connections to the faculty. The Lumina Longitudinal Study, described before, interviewed 50 students over a three-year period who began as freshmen at CSUEB. An excerpt from the report describes the tangible benefits students receive from feeling connected to the campus community:

The composition and General Studies faculty were particularly important in supporting the students’ sense of belonging to the university and their increasing confidence. Students emphasized that having the same instructor throughout their developmental composition classes and their General Studies courses was a powerful positive influence. The English and/or General Studies faculty often played critical support roles in promoting students’ success by acting as liaison between the student and other cluster faculty and between students and the university’s support services and bureaucracy.35

**Diversity.** CSUEB is committed to creating a “multicultural learning experience” and cultivating multicultural competence in its students. General Education is central to achieving that mission. CSUEB students report far more personal acquaintances and interactions with students who differ racially and ethnically than their national cohorts. CSUEB students report possessing more knowledge about diversity according to ten nationally ranked indicators (average of 87% compared to 49% nationally on the CSEQ). And CSUEB students are far more active in making connections with those who differ from them than their national cohort. 36

**Retention.** Students are more likely to continue their education at CSUEB if they get support to improve academic performance and develop the attitudes and competencies for life-long learning. CSUEB’s ability to retain students from the first to second year has grown steadily since a low in 1998 of 73.5% to 80.3% in 2005, currently among the top 35% in the CSU. Data also suggest, although this requires
further investigation, that freshman cohorts of 2001 and 2002 show sharp increases in third and fourth year retention. The Lumina funded study reports that while many of the students interviewed in their first quarter (Fall 2003) said they planned to transfer, only two expressed that intention in their second year, and those were students who were planning to pursue majors not offered at CSUEB.

REFLECTION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

University Dialogues
The results of the studies reported above were submitted for review, as part of its 5-year program review to the Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR), whose full evaluation will be forthcoming in Fall, 2007. The GE-FLC and the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC) and its subcommittee on General Education also discussed these results during 05/06 and 06/07. The reflections that follow represent a synthesis of these discussions.

Rubrics
- Rubrics in a simplified form tailored to a particular GE area can be used for campus-wide GE assessment, especially if a system of rotation is developed that cycles through all outcomes, e.g. one learning outcome from each area, each quarter would be assessed.
- Rubrics need not be the only method of assessment, especially for faculty who are not comfortable with them. Faculty who teach in GE should be given flexibility in the selection of assessment methods.
- Faculty need more support to achieve the student learning outcomes typical for the university as a whole and there needs to be greater awareness and more effective communication of the GE student learning outcomes among the faculty.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on GE learning outcomes as an explicit part of the GE course approval process.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes
- The general student population is also succeeding in their general education courses. More than 75% of outcome in science, humanities, social science, or the contributions of cultural groups and women, regardless of whether the courses were a component of learning communities or stand alone classes.
- Despite these gains, a decrease in writing success has been documented in the last two years. No single cause is apparent, as students’ preparation in composition at matriculation has improved.

Information Literacy
- The Library’s resources to provide information literacy course sections for all entering freshmen are stretched extremely thin. Given increasing first year enrollments and limited budgets, resources must be fully and efficiently utilized to provide first year students with high quality learning experiences within the cluster program.
- Overall, CSUEB’s freshman learning communities are effective in helping students learn new skills and acquire broad knowledge. A significant majority of students complete required courses in communication, composition, critical thinking, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning in their first year at CSUEB.

Sustainability Issues
- During the last review of the General Education program in 02/03, the Academic Senate endorsed the strong recommendation of the Committee on Instruction and Curriculum that the university place more emphasis on planned integration of the courses in freshman learning communities and support and reward faculty for teaching in the freshmen clusters. Accordingly, the Provost has reestablished the stipend supported summer workshops for faculty who teach in the clusters in Summer 2007.
- There were also changes at the departmental level that adversely affected the program. When a new chair took over hiring of developmental composition instructors, discontinuity ensued. The students lost their strong connection to their composition teacher and the additional instruction that continuity provided. Consequently, composition faculty were disconnected from others in the cluster and did not have time or knowledge to select texts to fit specific learning community themes.
- The recently completed external review of the General Education and Freshman Year Programs conducted by San Jose State University Professor Emily Wughalter recommended that CSUEB consider giving General Education and the Freshman Year Program higher priority in the university. Support for faculty teaching in the freshman program should be provided. General Education advising activities and centers on campus should be thoroughly audited. And strategies should be devised to assist sophomore students with their transition from the freshman program and to support sophomore transfer students.
**ACTIONS**

*Actions Taken*
- Summer workshops for faculty teaching in the freshmen cluster program have been re-established for summer 2007.
- A Five Year Program Review for CAPR was submitted Spring 2007.
- The Curriculum and Instruction Committee is reviewing the feasibility of library staff providing information literacy courses to each cluster in Academic Year 07/08.

*Actions Planned*
- The recommendations of the external review and the GE Program Review will be discussed by CAPR in the fall of 2007 as part of the GE Five Year Program Review. The CAPR review of the GE Program will include recommendations that will be submitted to the Senate for acceptance and then reviewed by the administration for inclusion in an MOU, as provided for in the CAPR Five Year Review process.
- Voluntary sophomore clusters are planned for the 08/09 academic year.
This chapter describes the actions undertaken by CSUEB to fulfill the following Criteria for Review.

**CFR 1.2. Institutional Objectives. 1.5. Response To Diversity; 2.2. Student Achievement.**
The 10 GE outcomes pertaining to multicultural learning and competence are the institution's educational objectives.

**CFR 2.6. Achieve Expectations.**
Direct and indirect evidence shows that students achieve a multicultural competence outcome at or above the level of expectation.

**CFR 2.4. Shared Expectations for Student Learning.**
The faculty through the Academic Senate take collective responsibility for establishing and reviewing student attainment of multicultural outcomes.

**CFR 4.3 Planning Informed By Data.**
The strategic plan for the university now includes “inclusive campus climate that values student, faculty and staff, and fosters multicultural learning and competence” as one of its seven mandates.

**INTRODUCTION**

On a majority minority campus, it is not enough to assume that because we are in each other’s presence that we will learn about and from one another, including how to effectively work together. The WASC Commission letter challenged CSUEB to take responsibility for what it meant by “multicultural learning experience” and “multicultural competence” in its mission and values statement. (June 30, 2005, pp. 5-6) At that time, the new university mission and values statement was less than a year old. Since then, the faculty have engaged in research and dialogues about what multiculturalism means at CSUEB.

CSUEB has principally defined the scope of multiculturalism in terms of people and course offerings. More recently the term encompasses its student learning outcomes and campus climate. While both the campus climate and the diversity of the faculty are inextricably linked to academic quality, this chapter focuses on the curriculum and student learning. Historically, CSUEB’s “multicultural” course offerings use five basic descriptors.

- Multicultural U.S.: Race, equity, ethnicity and/or a culture attributed to the U.S.;
- International: Global, world, or any country outside the U.S.;
- Culture: Analysis of “culture” or “cultural worldviews” without mention of a culture;
- Gender: Female, male transgender;
- Sexual Orientation: Gay, lesbian, bisexual, heterosexual, questioning.

The results from a 2005 faculty survey on issues of diversity confirm that the vast majority of respondents (97%) strongly agreed that the three most important components of a definition for diversity are race, ethnicity, and gender. However, respondents also believed that “diversity” includes disability status, age, sexual orientation and religious affiliation.

Ten General Education outcomes address multicultural competence and constitute CSUEB’s “institutional objectives” for multiculturalism. Upon completion of all general education requirements, students are expected to possess an awareness of issues of cultural, racial, ethnic, and gender diversity. The University requires all students to take a 4-unit course in “Cultural Groups and Women’s Contributions to the U.S.” Students must demonstrate four outcomes that involve the knowledge and the ability to critically analyze U.S. multicultural and/or women's issues, including discrimination and oppression. Five of the required GE outcomes in the Humanities and Social Sciences call for students to understand the interaction among cultural contexts, cultural endeavors, and diversity of human societies. It is common knowledge in the University that many other courses deal with multicultural issues, in a variety of ways. Several research questions were posed to identify in what areas multicultural issues are being taught and their educational effectiveness.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What do the catalogue descriptions of the courses and programs say about what multicultural learning experiences mean to CSUEB?
2. How do the students experience multicultural learning on campus?
3. What are students actually learning about multicultural issues?
4. How do multicultural activities contribute to the multicultural learning experiences in the academic programs and in the co-curricular services and organizations?

METHODS

1. Surveys:
   a. The campus climate survey,
   b. The College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ),
   c. Department Chairs Survey.
2. Assessment of student learning in the courses that meet the cultural groups and women requirement,
3. Content analysis of all course descriptions, program mission statements, and their student learning outcomes, as presented in the current catalogue,
4. Statistical analysis of the courses with multicultural content taken by all students who entered the university in Fall 2000.

RESULTS

Campus Climate Survey

The results from the Campus Climate Survey show the students strongly agree or agree that:
• CSUEB is preparing me to live and work in a diverse society (82.5%)
• My major department emphasizes the importance of diversity in its field (77.6%)

In terms of sensitivity for diversity, students strongly agreed or agreed that
• Faculty and staff are supportive of diversity and minority needs (90%)
• I would recommend to a racial or ethnic peer to attend CSUEB (83.3%)
• I do not feel awkward when I am the only person of my race or ethnicity (82.9%)
College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)

Freshmen and sophomore students are asked on the CSEQ about their awareness of issues related to human differences and similarities, their experiences of others who differ from themselves, and their awareness of social, educational and political issues related to the diversity of humans. Students’ reports of their frequency of contact with students who are different from themselves in the freshman and sophomore clusters consistently rank, on-average, 87% on ten nationally ranked indicators compared with the national norm of 49%. Clearly, CSUEB students are far more active in making connections with those who differ from them than their national cohort.

The 2005 Lumina Foundation Study by Tinto and Engstrom (involving case studies of 50 CSUEB freshmen) underlined the importance of freshmen learning communities in helping students become comfortable working with and making friends with those who are different. It is unclear whether such outcomes are the “natural” result of the diverse student population or if students are taught skills and encouraged to interact with those who are different. Tinto and Engstrom report:

Learning about and from diversity: Many students told us they were learning a great deal about diversity in their learning community classes, particularly in General Studies and composition. They reported that they were increasingly comfortable getting to know peers who were different from them and that they were learning from the diverse perspectives and backgrounds their classmates shared. They felt that learning about and from diversity was both encouraged and validated in their classes.

Student Learning in Courses Meeting Cultural Groups &Women’s GE Requirement

The GE Faculty Learning Community in Academic Year 2005-06 designed procedures for assessing one student learning outcome for the Cultural Groups and Women’s GE Requirement. The rubric, designed to be applicable to the variety of disciplines and theoretical paradigms that are used to teach the courses that meet this requirement, is presented along with the findings on the following page.

This first direct measure of student learning indicates clearly that a significant majority of students taking courses that emphasize the contributions of women and minority groups to U.S. history and culture achieve the learning described by the indicators of the learning outcome. While CSUEB continues the work of educating students to be multiculturally competent citizens, the data indicate that many students have been assisted in developing the competencies necessary to achieve this goal.

Although “social responsibility” is not yet an institutional objective or formally part of our definition for multicultural experience, it is integral to the mission, vision, and values. The GE~FLC proposed an outcome and piloted a rubric for assessing social responsibility in service learning courses. The results from the initial pilot found that 80% of the students were exemplary or proficient in both their knowledge and actions regarding an appreciation of and caring for the environment. And 50-68% of students demonstrated competence regarding their knowledge of citizenship responsibilities and social justice issues. While these results are just a sample, the rubric has potential for helping the faculty understand what is meant in the mission statement as “socially responsible contributors.”

Content Analysis of All Courses, Degree Program Outcomes, Mission Statements

CSUEB takes pride in its exemplary programs that emphasize multicultural learning and competence. For example social justice is central to the mission and outcomes for the College of Education and Allied Studies. The accredited Masters in Social Work was recently lauded as the only MSW program in the US to make multicultural competence and expertise required of all graduates. Additionally, Ethnic Studies (which has a new option in Sexuality), Women Studies, Modern Languages, and International Studies, serve as the academic wellspring for multicultural expertise in the University.
In order to locate “multiculturalism” in the other academic programs, the content of all CSUEB catalogue course descriptions, program and department mission/description statements, and program outcomes was analyzed. Using the basic categories for Multicultural Learning that included Multicultural U.S., International, Culture, Gender and Sexual Orientation, undergraduate programs were found to promise substantially more multicultural content in all areas (Program Descriptions 100%; Program Outcomes 60%; Course Descriptions 28%) than the graduate curriculum (Program Descriptions 48%; Outcomes 32%, Course Descriptions 3.0%). However, there were twice as many courses with International content compared to Multicultural U.S. courses (e.g. 15% to 8%). There are also significantly fewer courses (4.3%) addressing Gender and Sexual Orientation combined than either Multicultural U.S. or International. The trend is similar in General Education courses, as shown in the results.
The departments of English, History, Modern Language, Women Studies, and Ethnic Studies, housed in the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences, offer 62% of all undergraduate courses coded as International, Multicultural U.S. and Gender or Sexual Orientations. Undoubtedly, many more courses cover multicultural issues while not explicitly stating this in their course description.

Statistical Analysis of 2000 Cohort
An examination of courses completed by all students who entered CSUEB in 2000, known as the Cohort Studies, show that almost all students took one or more courses with the designated content (Multicultural U.S., International, Culture, Gender and/or Sexual Orientation even if the student did not graduate. On the average students took more courses coded as International (2.75) than those coded as Multicultural U.S. (2.0), Gender/GLBT (1.25) and Culture (1.0). While not statistically significant, African-American students took fewer Gender/GLBT courses than White or Asian students. (1.0 vs 1.4). The data show that students took more multicultural courses than required, which is a positive sign. African-American and White students took about the same number of courses, while Asian and Latino students took slightly more. Taking additional multicultural courses did not impact graduation rates.

Survey of Department Chairs on Multicultural Learning Experience
A survey was sent to all 28 department chairs, asking them to list the student learning outcomes in their courses that dealt with multicultural issues. They were also asked to indicate how the department promotes a multicultural learning experience and their plans for increasing multicultural learning experiences in the future.

Twenty-two of the 28 departments responded with just over half listing course-based student learning outcomes that address multicultural issues. However, all of the responding departments did provide extensive explanations that illustrate the many ways that multicultural learning experiences are cultivated, e.g. poetry slams, films, guest speakers, choice of plays, diverse team projects, community involvement, clinical placements, and course readings. Moreover, 19 departments described future plans for incorporating more multicultural experiences into their offerings. Overall, the results highlight the many areas in which multicultural experiences are supporting curriculum yet are not revealed in the formal catalogue course descriptions.

Multicultural Learning Experience thru Co-Curriculum Programs and Services
The Division of Student Affairs’ mission is to provide student learning opportunities that enhance overall academic, professional, and personal development and that recognize the need for equity and justice for all students. The staff of Student Affairs views multicultural learning as inextricably bound to diversity and inclusive of race, ethnicity, culture, language, gender, age, sexual orientation, abilities, and learning styles. Multicultural events co-coordinated by Student Affairs include numerous diversity related co-curricular events during the academic year, as well as collaborations with community based organizations in support of such major activities as the African American and Latino Summits, Super Sunday outreach to African American churches, and the Puente Conference.

The Division of Student Affairs is comprised of a diverse and highly skilled professional staff with special skills and expertise that particularly meet the diverse needs of our students. The Division of Student Affairs offers a wide range of support services that are being utilized by increasing numbers of students. For example, in Fall Quarter 2006, Student Affairs reported a significant increase in the number of first-time freshmen using the Student Center for Academic Achievement services, an increase from 220 or 14% in 2002 to 905 or 57% in 2006.

REFLECTIONS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS
Limitations
The major limitation is the content analysis of course descriptions published in the catalogue. While it provided us with useful information, it doesn’t adequately capture the rich pedagogical methods used in the classroom, including required readings, assignments, and activities.

University Dialogues
The results for the studies cited above were reviewed and discussed by members of various faculty committees (Committee on Instruction and Curriculum, CE Sub-Committee, Cultural Groups and Women Sub-Committee, Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee and the Diversity Council for an Inclusive CSUEB) along with senior staff. Summarized below are faculty views about what “multicultural learning experience and competence” should mean to CSUEB.

Discussion of Results
- CSUEB is offering multicultural learning experiences throughout its academic and co-curricular programs, while also drawing from the intellectual expertise found in the degree programs that specialize in multicultural issues. Multicultural learning has been institutionalized through
the adoption of student learning outcomes in GE.

- Students receive significant exposure to multicultural issues in their freshman clusters and the required course in “Cultural Groups and Women.” Most students took more than one multicultural course with the designated content.
- Students’ experience with diversity at CSUEB is overwhelmingly positive compared to the national norm, and they believe that CSUEB prepares them to live and work in a diverse society.
- A rubric designed to measure student learning in courses meeting the cultural groups and women GE requirement was confirmed as a relevant and reliable way to assess multicultural learning. The pilot study showed a significant majority of students (85%-90%) achieve learning outcomes at the “accomplished” or “developing” levels.
- Multicultural, international, gender or sexual orientation issues are represented in 100% of the undergraduate Program/Mission descriptions, 60% of program learning outcomes, and 28% of the course descriptions. Currently five programs offer 62% of these courses.
- CSUEB appears to prefer taking an international approach to multiculturalism rather than focusing on the U.S. and offers fewer courses in gender and sexual orientation.
- The breadth of multicultural learning experiences in the disciplines extends well beyond the course descriptions to include special events, assignments, and activities.
- The Student Affairs staff reflects diverse cultures and they possess multicultural expertise to address the individual needs of students with diverse backgrounds and orientations.
- Multiculturalism is featured prominently in CSUEB’s mission statement and values. CSUEB provides academically challenging learning experiences and a supportive climate that enable its students to graduate with competence and self-confidence.
- The foregoing studies provide a broad picture of the sources and depth of student knowledge of multicultural issues. However, there remains inconsistency and variation in how multiculturalism is conveyed as a topic of discussion among students and different campus constituencies, which suggests a need to establish more uniform and integrated approaches.
- Faculty need to be engaged in a continuing dialogue regarding the best ways to encompass all the dimensions of multiculturalism in the curriculum.
- CSUEB embraces several dimensions of the core meaning of multicultural learning and competence that include:
  - **Valuing Diverse Cultures, People, and Ideas.** The university’s mission, visions and values statement identifies multiculturalism in all of its forms as a positive, desirable strength. It supports the expression of diverse views so that people with different backgrounds can understand each other’s unique perspective and reasoning processes. This is expected to cultivate an openness to and respectfulness of ideas of people with different individual, social and cultural orientations.
  - **Social Responsibility.** Multiculturalism on this campus involves being aware of one’s impact on others and being willing to volunteer one’s services to the community e.g. through service learning projects.
  - **Social Justice.** Valuing and appreciating diversity and multiculturalism also includes that students learn from the history of social activism as well as become familiar with theoretical frameworks for constructively dealing with injustice, oppression, and intolerance. Accordingly, students should possess the courage and ability to respond to and correct injustice, and the ability to defend themselves against ascriptions to their identity that they do not accept.
  - **Inclusiveness.** CSUEB educates a huge percentage of previously underserved students, students of color, first generation, nontraditional students (not just in terms of age), and students with disabilities. These are students who have been deprived of educational opportunities in the past, but are ready to seize them now.

**ACTIONS**

**Actions Taken**
- CSUEB is developing a website called “Common Ground” that highlights multicultural activities and issues and features a searchable database of courses with multicultural, international, gender, or sexual orientation content. In addition, the database can produce a list of courses satisfying specific GE requirements, including Cultural Groups and Women requirements. This plan also includes adding faculty, staff, and student profiles, identifying available campus resources that support multiculturalism, as well as featuring campus activities and multicultural events.

**Actions Planned**
- There will be continued discussion in Academic Senate committees about ways to better integrate and coordinate efforts to increase multicultural competencies and assess the results.
- Faculty Development workshops will focus on ways that multicultural learning experiences can be better integrated into the curriculum.
CHAPTER 4
STUDENT SUCCESS ~ ADVISING AND RETENTION

This chapter demonstrates that CSUEB meets:


By first analyzing the evidence on advising, retention and graduation and then establishing a Student Success Assessment Committee and one-Stop Shop as well as other improvements, CSUEB is ensuring that it will increase retention and graduation rates and meet students’ academic, professional, and personal goals.

INTRODUCTION

The Advising and Retention Research Team (ARRT), formed in Fall 2005, was comprised of faculty and staff from all four Colleges at the Hayward Campus, a representative from the Concord Campus, staff from Students Affairs, and a student. Based on discussions, recommendations, and conclusions reached during the Capacity and Preparatory Review, ARRT focused on five research questions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the relationship between advising, retention, and graduation?
2. How effective is the current infrastructure for advising by faculty and staff?
3. Is advising meeting the needs and expectations of CSUEB’s ethnically, racially, and culturally diverse student body?
4. Who is most likely to be retained and graduate and why?
5. What institutional structures are needed for the planning and assessment of advising, and for the successful retention and graduation of students?

The Advising and Retention Research Team’s working definition of an advisor is as follows: a trained faculty or staff member who assists students with registration, selecting classes, and reaching their educational goals.

METHODS

Advising Analysis

In Winter Quarter 2006, a Campus Climate Survey was conducted that included all students, faculty and staff from CSUEB who were asked about their level of awareness about where academic major and General Education (GE) advising takes place on campus. The responses from 1479 undergraduate students and 101 full-time faculty were analyzed. In addition, self-reported data was collected regarding the types of advising that are offered on campus enabling the development of a matrix of advising locations and types of services.

Early Alert Analysis

In addition, the Early Alert component to the advising and retention system was analyzed in Spring Quarter 2006. Early Alert is an advising system run jointly by Student Affairs and Academic Affairs that enables faculty to send electronic mid-term progress reports to inform students about their progress in class.

Retention and Graduation Analyses

Institutional Research Data. Retention of first-time freshmen and transfer students was determined by the analysis of 1997-2005 student cohort data available from Institutional Research and Assessment. For these retention and graduation analyses, the students were placed into four categories based on ethnicity (African American, Hispanic, White, or Asian) and were further divided based on gender.

EOP and EXCEL Programs. Data from two special high-intensity advising programs at CSUEB were analyzed. The EXCEL program offers eligible students (low-income, first generation or disabled), in-depth, long-term academic support throughout their education that includes advising, counseling, tutoring, and scholarships. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) serves first-generation, low-income students. Students in the EXCEL program in the years 1998-2002 were matched to a CSUEB control population.
graduation rates were compared between EXCEL and control groups. Regularly-admitted (EOP) students from the 1997 and 1998 cohorts were compared to all regularly-admitted CSUEB students for average persistence.56

**Cohort Study.** Students who began at CSUEB in the Fall Quarter of 2000 were analyzed as a cohort to determine the individual background data that correlated with or determined graduation rates. Individual background data that were analyzed included ethnicity, gender, high school GPA, educational levels of mother and father, level of unmet financial need, numbers of majors declared at CSUEB, and years of persistence.

**Student Learning Assessment in Student Affairs Units**

During the Fall Quarter 2006, the Division of Student Affairs developed and implemented a framework for the identification of student learning objectives. Units began by identifying 1) three student learning outcomes specific to their unit; 2) activities and services that support the achievement of these outcomes; and 3) tools to assess the effectiveness of unit activities and services in achieving the learning outcomes. Three units are included in this assessment.

**RESULTS**

**Advising**

Based on the Campus Climate Survey results fifteen separate locations on campus were identified as providing student advising. [Advising Fig. 1] At least 12 different types of advising were provided that included academic information, financial aid, and health and psychological assistance. The average time spent with students at these locations ranged from 15 minutes (reported by a number of locations) to 90 minutes reported by EXCEL.

The focus here is on the advising that students receive about their academic major and about general education.57 Over 95% of students reported using the catalogue, handouts, or the web for advising about their major, while over 80% reported using their department or program including the Student Information Lobby for academic advising. Over 55% of students reported using the University Advisement Center, over 50% the General Education Office, and nearly 30% the EOP or EXCEL offices for advice about their major. [Advising Fig. 2]

Over 40% of full-time faculty reported referring students to their department or program for advising about the academic major, while nearly 30% reported referring students to the catalogue, handouts, or the web. Less than 10% of faculty referred students to any of the following locations for advice about their academic major: EOP/EXCEL offices, General Education Office, University Advisement Center, or Student Information Lobby. [Advising Fig. 3]

Undergraduate students reported seeking advice about General Education from numerous locations on campus, but the most frequent source of information was the catalogue, handouts, and web. Over 85% of students reported using these as a source of general education advice one or more times per year. In addition, nearly 70% of students reported receiving general education advice from the Student Information Lobby, as well as 45-55% reporting that they received advice from their department or program, the General Education Office, and the University Advisement Center. Less than 30% of students reported receiving general education advice from the EOP or EXCEL office one or more times per year. [Advising Fig. 4]

Faculty responses about where they refer students for general education advising varied greatly and showed little apparent trend. Between 15 and 25% of faculty reported referring students to each of the following sites: department or program office, General Education Office, University Advisement Center, or the catalogue, handouts, and the web. Between 10 and 15% of faculty reported sending students to the EOP or EXCEL office or the Student Information lobby. [Advising Fig. 5]

**Advising at the Concord Campus**

Due to the low number of Concord student respondents to the Campus Climate Survey, the effectiveness of advising at Concord could not be disaggregated for analytical purposes. However, observation and anecdotal evidence demonstrates that the advising infrastructure at the Concord Campus differs from the Hayward campus, and has its own advantages and disadvantages. One of the advantages at Concord is that because of its small size, the “One-Stop Shop” model is already largely in place. Students get basic questions answered by the staff at the Information Counter in the Lobby of the Academic Services (AS) area. If they require more in-depth academic advising, students may make an appointment with an academic advisor, and these advisors are also located in the AS building.58

A disadvantage of the Concord structure is the lack of adequate advising for majors. On the Hayward campus, the academic units conduct advising for majors. However, advising for majors is limited, primarily because many Concord sections are staffed with lecturers. The staff academic advisors at Concord do perform advising for majors, but still need to improve their proficiency in advising for all majors offered at Concord.59
Early Alert
Because the Early Alert study was completed for only a single quarter, the data were too limited to conduct a thorough assessment of the effectiveness of this program. Nevertheless, entering freshmen who received an Early Alert showed positive outcomes. They increased course completion rates, improved individual course grades, and showed greater persistence rates to the next quarter than freshmen who did not receive an alert. The same results were not found for upperclassmen. These students who received Early Alerts did not show as high a course completion rate or similar persistence rates as those who did not receive Early Alerts.60

A two-year assessment of faculty utilization of Early Alert by term was completed at the end of Spring Quarter 2007. While utilization (in terms of number of faculty and number of classes involved) significantly increased from Fall 2005 to Fall 2006, this utilization subsequently decreased in Winter and Spring 2007. The peak usage coincided with a high level of publicity for the program, through the use of cross-divisional presentations, email reminders to faculty, and ongoing training on the use of the system provided by the Office of Faculty Development. As these efforts waned, so did utilization of the Early Alert system. Clearly, Early Alert can be an effective mechanism for providing students with timely information and must be institutionalized.

Retention
Using data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at CSUEB, the AART determined the average percent of first-year freshmen that continued through the second year broken down by student ethnicity and gender. Over 85% of Asian students were retained the second year, while around 80% of White male and female students and Hispanic female students were retained. The retention rates of male Hispanic students (approx. 75%) and of African-American students (approx. 70%) were lower. [Advising Fig. 6] Retention rates of male students tended to be lower than females.

Similarly, the average percent of transfer students who were retained to year two was calculated. At or over 80% of Asian, White and Hispanic transfer students were retained to year two, while between 70 and 80% of African American students were retained. [Advising Fig. 7] Male students were retained at lower rates than female students.

Graduation
Using data from the office of Institutional Research and Assessment, the average percent of first-year freshmen who graduated by the end of the sixth year, categorized by student ethnicity and gender, was determined. On average, approximately 50% of Asian and female White students and slightly less than 45% of female Hispanic students graduated during that time. Approximately 30% of female and 20% of male African American students graduated. Overall, 5-10% fewer male students graduated compared to their female ethnic counterparts. [Advising Fig. 8]

The average percent of transfer students graduating by the end of the fifth year was determined. More than 70% of Asian, female White and female Hispanic students graduated at the end of the fifth year, while fewer than 70% of male White and fewer than 60% of male Hispanic students graduated at the end of the fifth year. Fewer than 60% of female and 50% of male African American students graduated by the end of the fifth year, a much lower graduation rate than students of other ethnic groups. [Advising Fig. 9]

Retention and Graduation Of EOP and EXCEL Students
The 1998-2002 cohorts of EXCEL students were retained (approx. 90%) and graduated (approx. 46%) at higher rates than a matched CSUEB control population (retention rate of approx. 78% and graduation rate of approx. 31%). [Advising Fig. 10] Likewise, regularly admitted students in the EOP program showed higher persistence and graduation rates than all CSUEB students. [Advising Fig. 11]

Fall 2000 Cohort Analysis
Both first-time freshmen and transfer students who entered CSUEB in the fall of 2000 were tracked and their background data analyzed in relation to graduation and retention rates. Within this six year period, there were statistically significant differences in graduation rates based on ethnicity: Asian

High school GPA was a significant predictor of graduation. Students with the highest high school GPA graduated at a higher rate than students with lower high school GPAs, regardless of student ethnicity, gender, or other characteristics.
students graduated at the highest rates (average = 70.8%), followed by White students (66.9%), Hispanic students (65.7%), and African American students (57.9%). Students who reported their ethnicity as “Other” graduated at higher rates than African American students (61.6%).

High school GPA was a significant predictor of graduation. Students with the highest high school GPA graduated at a higher rate than students with lower high school GPAs, regardless of student ethnicity, gender, or other characteristics. Financial need also affected graduation rates; students who were academically dismissed received more years of financial aid than students who graduated. Students who graduated tended to be more varied in academic majors than students who left the university without graduating. Finally, although a smaller proportion of first-time freshmen (55.1%) graduated than either lower-division transfer students (55.7%) or upper-division transfer students (75.9%), all of these graduation rates are above the system-wide CSU average of 42%.

**Student Health Services (SHS)**

A SHS learning outcome is that students will understand how to avoid unhealthy behavior with adverse academic consequences. To encourage healthy behaviors, the Health Promotions Department of Student Health Services now utilizes peer educators in workshops and makes presentations to model positive behavior. In addition, four other interventions have been implemented to improve services and increase student learning. [SHS Survey Comp 06 to 07]

---

**Student Affairs Assessment**

Student Affairs units are at different stages in the assessment process. Nine of the thirteen Student Affairs units have identified student learning outcomes and three units have collected assessment data. Of these units, one has completed the assessment cycle and implemented strategies and interventions that address areas of needed improvement.

**The University Advising Center** developed and administered a survey to assess whether students have gained increased understanding of general education and graduation requirements as a result of meeting with a UAC advisor. The Center is now in the process of tabulating responses and analyzing survey results, which will be completed by Fall Quarter 2007. [WASC-UAC Survey 2007]

**Counseling and Psychological Services**' learning objectives address four key areas: healthy behavior, academic success, retention, and persistence. In the analysis of interventions, survey results revealed that 96% of student clients who responded to the survey felt participating in counseling may allow them to be a better student. In response to these results, counselors now ask their students about the progress they are making in school and assess psychological barriers that may be hindering academic progress. [CaPS survey]

---

**Reflection and Discussion of Results**

**Limitations**

The purpose of the advising studies reported in this chapter is to establish a base line regarding the sources and utilization of advising on campus and how advising affects educational outcomes involving retention and graduation. This provides useful information regarding overall trends categorized by race, gender, ethnicity and other background data. But more data needs to be collected that will better enable CSUEB to target specific outcomes. [CaPS survey]

**Universities Dialogues**

The team organized a series of 12 campus presentations in Winter 2007, based on analyses described below, to initiate a campus dialogue. Both the analyses and the resulting dialogues have been used in development of this report. Considerable feedback was received from faculty, staff, students and administrators regarding the analysis of advising, retention, and graduation data and recommendations presented here.

**Web Based Advising.** There was a nearly universal recommendation for improved electronic (web-based) advising resources. The web information system is currently undergoing change in response to this request. Degree roadmaps have been improved but still need to be aligned with clearly posted annual schedules of classes. PeopleSoft student advising modules are being implemented in Summer 2007, but faculty and advisors need additional training.

**Assess Best Practices.** Second, faculty from many academic departments recommended that advising and retention rates of students by major, department, and college be assessed to determine best practices. Once advising and mentoring practices are identified that are successful in
enhancing student retention and graduation, the university can move toward improvement of student success through implementation of these practices.

Assess Leavers. Third, faculty urged that the reasons why students leave or transfer from CSUeb must be identified, thus enabling the university to implement programs to increase retention. There was widespread support of the development of an exit survey that would include effective ways to contact students after their departure.

Face-to-Face. Finally, faculty and students felt strongly that there is no substitute for face-to-face contact with a committed, informed advisor and/or mentor. With enhanced tools and training, both faculty and staff can become better advisors and mentors.

**ACTIONS**

**Actions Taken**

**Student Success Assessment Committee**

CSUeb has developed and begun to implement a plan to make the assessment of student success a permanent part of university programs. In accordance with our plan [Advising Fig. 12], a Student Success Assessment Committee has been formed with membership from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, the Concord Campus, and Planning and Enrollment Management. The committee is charged with the analysis of benchmarks of student success, such as graduation and retention rates and time to degree, and will integrate these indicators with data from units that provide advising (e.g., University Advisement Center, EOP, EXCEL, academic departments, Concord campus). In addition, this committee will oversee the enhanced usage, implementation, and analysis of the Early Alert program. Based on their analyses, the committee will develop goals and recommendations for improvement of student success that will lead to both short term and longer-term implementation and action plans. Under the leadership of the Student Success Assessment Committee, CSUeb is engaging in self-examination, reflection, and improvement to enhance student success.

**One-Stop Shop for Advising**

Cal State East Bay is constructing a new Administration and Student Services building to replace the current Warren Hall, most of which will be demolished due to earthquake safety concerns. Based on the findings of the AART study, the original plans of the replacement building were changed in order to have a one-stop shop for all non-major advising on the first floor in a prominent place. This will be first time all non-major advising at CSUeb will be available in one location.

**Actions Planned**

**One Click Stop for Advising**

Because students and faculty rely so heavily on web-based advising information and tools, it is essential that web-based information be accessible, accurate, and easily navigated. Furthermore, with faculty uncertainty about where to send students for advising about topics outside of their academic major, and the anticipated arrival soon of a new web-based advising module, faculty will need improved training and information about advising.

Cal State East Bay is currently in the midst of a transition in which, by the end of July 2007, a new PeopleSoft CMS system will replace our current system. This new system will make much more information available in a timely way for advising. However, faculty will need training to competently utilize these new systems. The Academic Senate leadership has therefore requested that Information Technology Services staff work closely with them in organizing training sessions to ease the transition.

**High-Intensity Advising**

Although CSUeb overall retention and graduation rates tend to be higher than the statewide CSU averages, significant room for improvement exists. In particular, African American students are retained and graduate at lower rates than students of other ethnic groups. Furthermore, male students of all ethnic groups are retained and graduate at lower rates than females; this difference is particularly pronounced for Hispanic students. However, students in high-intensity advising programs such as EXCEL and EOP have higher retention and graduation rates than other students. Therefore, actions will be taken to insure that eligible African American and male Hispanic students obtain access to high intensity advising services. Finally, research on the causes and remedies for the retention and graduation gaps that have been identified here must be continued.

**Enhanced Utilization and Analysis of Early Alert**

The Early Alert program shows promise in increasing the value and timeliness of advising information. The newly formed Student Success Assessment Committee will direct efforts to enhance informational and outreach activities and conduct a new assessment of the Early Alert program. Once the number of faculty participating and students receiving Early Alerts is increased, the usefulness and impact of the program can be meaningfully assessed.

**Student Learning Assessment in Student Affairs**

The assessment of advising effectiveness in the Student Affairs units will become an ongoing process that involves the divisions of Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Planning and Enrollment Management, and the Concord campus. The Student Success Assessment Committee will regularly review
the results from this on-going assessment. The timeline for all Student Affairs units to complete one assessment cycle is January 1, 2008.

**Augmented Concord Campus Advising**
Finally, several steps are being taken to address the problems with major advising at Concord. Departments are encouraging faculty members to teach the majority of his/her teaching load for one quarter at the Concord campus and be available for student advising. Nursing and the History department have created resident faculty positions during this past year through a rotation system. In addition, the Concord Campus is utilizing a portion of its salary savings from open positions to fund the equivalent of a salary for one course for lecturers in the largest majors who have been trained to advise students in these majors.
CHAPTER 5
CAMPUS CLIMATE

This chapter describes the actions undertaken by CSUEB to fulfill with the following Criteria for Review.

CFR 1.5. Diversity.
The results from the comprehensive campus climate surveys inform the University’s understanding of the experiences and perceptions of its diverse students, staff, and faculty.

CFR 4.3 Planning Informed By Data.
The strategic plan for the university now includes “inclusive campus climate that values student, faculty and staff, and fosters multicultural learning and competence” as one of its seven mandates.

CFR 4.5. Institutional Research.
The results of the campus climate surveys are informing decision making and actions.

INTRODUCTION
In its Capacity and Preparatory Review Report (December 2004), CSUEB proposed a comprehensive campus climate study in order to assess the university’s progress towards fulfilling its Mission, Values, and Vision. The 2006 Campus Climate Survey represents the first systematic campus climate study at CSUEB.

In Fall 2005, a diverse Campus Climate Research Team began developing the Campus Climate Surveys. The Team consulted with the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the President’s Executive Council, the Provost and Deans’ Council, and the Student Affairs Leadership Team. The Campus Climate surveys were designed to understand student, staff, and faculty perceptions of five aspects of campus climate: (1) academic/career, (2) advising (addressed in the Student Success chapter), (3) diversity, (4) information resources, and (5) facilities. The Campus Climate Survey also complemented an earlier survey conducted by the Academic Senate Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. To what extent does the institution provide an environment that is actively conducive to study and learning?
2. How does the institution ensure that issues of diversity are appropriately engaged and that a climate of respect for a diversity of backgrounds, ideas and perspectives is fostered among its members?

METHODS
Campus Climate Surveys
The Campus Climate Research Team administered a web-based perception survey to the entire campus community. All students, staff, and faculty who had working email accounts received an email invitation to participate in the survey on March 2, 2006.

Response Rates
Students: Of 12,535 students, 2,176 completed the survey, yielding a response rate of 17.4%. Compared with enrollment data, white, female, and older students participated more heavily than students of color, particularly African American students.

Staff: 358 of 839 staff (43%) participated in the campus climate survey. All divisions were represented proportionately. However, management was over-represented as 26.6% of participants stated they belong to this group compared to only 7.1% who are officially classified as such. White female staff were over-represented as well.

Faculty: 195 full time faculty members completed the survey for a response rate of 46.8%. African American faculty were particularly under-represented.
Faculty Diversity and Equity Survey
Members of the Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee developed a 56-item self-administered, highly structured questionnaire with two open-ended questions, which was hand-delivered to each faculty member in Winter Quarter 05. These results are reported in the faculty section under diversity climate.

RESULTS

In analyzing the survey results, the university interpreted the responses as follows:
• Positive experience – where two-thirds or more of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed with a statement about an issue;
• Mixed experience – where respondents were split between agreement and disagreement; and
• Needs attention – where more than half of the respondents disagreed with the statement or reported a negative experience with the situation.

Common Questions
Each of the surveys asked students, staff, and faculty a series of common questions about the university’s library and physical facilities. [Cross Survey Table A6 and A7]

Positive Experience
• Library. Generally, students, staff, and faculty had strongly positive experiences with the Library and the services it provides, with the exception of media resources (where students were less positive – see below).
• Physical Facilities. Students, staff, and faculty generally agreed that the physical environment is an asset, there were enough pedestrian walkways; and they feel safe when crossing the streets on campus.

Mixed Experience
• Parking. Most students and staff could find parking easily. However, a smaller majority of faculty (56%) said they were able to find parking within a few minutes.

Needs Attention
• Clean Campus. Just over half of the staff agreed that the campus is kept clean and free of trash. However, less than half perceived the buildings where they work or take classes are adequately maintained, and experienced bathrooms as clean, adequately maintained, and well supplied.
• Media Resources. Just under half of the students were satisfied with media resources.

STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS

Academic Climate: [Student Survey Tables 1-6]

Positive Experience
• Perceptions of Faculty. 85% or more of the students felt that faculty are fair regarding disabilities, sexual orientation, gender, and race/ethnicity. Over 90% of the students thought well of the faculty in their major and believed that their departmental faculty are interested in their welfare and professional development. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the students reported faculty as available, approachable, and enthusiastic about teaching.
• Over 80% of the students agreed they would choose the same academic major if they had to do it all over again.
• Clear Requirements. 74.5% students received clear information and communication about their degree requirements.
• Employment Assistance. Nearly 70% of the students felt positively about the help they received in general.

Mixed Experience
• Faculty Perceptions: Just under 65% of the students reported that faculty provide an environment that allows them to express themselves freely; and under 60% were satisfied with feedback they receive. A little over half of the students believed that faculty in their department are interested in their personal development.
• Frequency of Offerings. A little over half of the students were satisfied with the frequency of course offerings in their degree programs.
• Career Information. About 65% of the students felt positively about the information from their departments regarding career opportunities, general life management skills, and the variety of programs for finding appropriate employment.

Diversity Climate [Student Survey Tables 10-14]

Positive Experience
• Diversity and Comfort. Over 80% of the students reported that CSUEB supports diversity and the needs of minorities at CSUEB; they felt confident in maintaining their own
personal characteristics and they didn’t feel awkward because of their racial, ethnic or cultural background. About three-fourths of the students felt comfortable disclosing their sexual orientation to peers (although most were heterosexual) and were confident discussing racially sensitive topics on campus. About two-thirds believed they have role models on campus and that their opinions are valued.

- **Subtle Discrimination.** Over 70% of the students believed subtle discrimination is not tolerated at CSUEB.
- **Recommend CSUEB.** Over 80% of the students would recommend CSUEB to peers.

Mixed Experience

- **Religion.** Fewer students were comfortable talking about their religion than about race and sexual orientation.
- **Diverse faculty.** Just over half of the students were satisfied with CSUEB’s efforts in hiring diverse faculty and felt that CSUEB promotes an atmosphere of cooperation and collaboration among students.

Needs Attention

- **Welcoming.** Nearly half of the students did not know or had no opinion about how students from diverse backgrounds are treated. At the same time, only one-third of the students viewed CSUEB as being welcoming to students from diverse backgrounds.
- **Registering Complaints.** Over 70% of students did not know about CSUEB’s efforts at addressing complaints of discrimination regarding race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or sexual harassment.

**STAFF SURVEY RESULTS**

**Career Climate** [Staff Survey Tables 1-4, 8, 9]

Positive Experience

- **Work Environment.** Over 80% of the staff felt positively about their professional relationships with their co-workers and direct supervisors; and that their contributions are appreciated by their supervisors. About 80 percent also felt they have autonomy and independence, and are given an opportunity to be in charge of tasks or projects. About three-fourths felt they receive sufficient information to do their jobs and two-thirds rated their actual duties as matching their job description.
- **Fairness.** Over 80% of staff viewed their evaluations as fair.
- **Working with students.** Over 70% of the staff felt positive about the opportunity to work with students and were satisfied with the quality of those interactions.

Mixed Experience

- **Technical Support.** Just under 65% of the staff were satisfied with the technical support and assistance they receive.
- **Job Environment.** About 60% of the staff were satisfied with the feedback they receive about their jobs; felt positively about the advice and/or mentoring they receive; reported that there isn’t any favoritism in promotions; and believed morale is good.

Needs Attention

- **Job Environment.** 60-65% of the staff felt that the university is not well-managed and that those who openly criticize the administration fear retribution. Nearly half of the staff believed that they are not equitably compensated; and only one-fifth report that they receive information about promotions and upgrades. Further, nearly 60% of the staff felt it is necessary to work late or through lunch to complete their work; under half felt that CSUEB recognizes meritorious performance; and under one-third felt integrated into the life of the campus.
- **Administration.** Less than 45% of the staff were enthusiastic about opportunities to provide input into decisions that affect their work; and only about one-third felt positively about the quality of the administration and the information that the administration shares with staff.

Diversity Climate [Staff Survey Table 8 and 9]

Positive Experience

- **Diversity.** Over 85% of the staff believed that there is an honest effort to hire a diverse staff and they appreciate faculty diversity.
- **Over three-fourths of the staff felt that CSUEB is a good place to work.**

Mixed Experience

- **Subtle Discrimination.** 60% of the staff agreed that CSUEB does not tolerate subtle discrimination.
- **Staff Composition.** 55% staff reported that staff composition does not reflect the student body.
- **Discrimination Complaints.** 46% of the staff did not know or could not provide an opinion about CSUEB’s efforts at addressing complaints of discrimination regarding race, ethnicity, and gender. Additionally, about one-fifth believed the campus does not do enough to address complaints of discrimination based on race, ethnicity or gender.
- **Responding to Sexual Harassment.** 46% of the staff did not know or could not provide an opinion about how well CSUEB responds to charges of sexual harassment, while one-third believed that CSUEB responded to charges of sexual harassment.

Needs Attention

- **Welcoming.** About 40% of staff did not know or had no opinion about CSUEB’s efforts to welcome staff of color; and 20% felt that not enough is being done to welcome staff of color.
FACULTY SURVEY RESULTS

Academic Climate [FT and PT Faculty Survey Tables 1, 2 and 4]

Positive Experience
- Meet with Chair. Over 90% of the faculty reported sufficient opportunities to meet.
- Promotion, tenure, and retention. Two-thirds felt they understand the criteria for PTR.
- 70% of the faculty felt positively about academic freedom on campus.

Mixed Experience
- Collegiality. Just under 65% of the faculty felt positively about their professional relationship with colleagues.
- Promotion, Tenure and Retention Process. Between 55 and 60% of the faculty agreed that they received adequate mentoring and that the PTR process was fair and equitable.
- Faculty Leadership. About 55% of faculty members feel positively about the Academic Senate leadership.

Needs Attention
- Students. Barely half of the faculty felt positively about the quality of their students.
- Teaching Environment. Less than 45% of the faculty were satisfied with class size; and only one-third were satisfied with the teaching load. About one-third felt they received support for curriculum and course development, but only 20% faculty believed they had adequate time to so. Only about 15% of the faculty were satisfied with the quality of classrooms.
- Administration. Overall about one-third of the faculty were satisfied with the communication with the administration and only one-fourth were satisfied with the administration’s responsiveness to the needs of the faculty and consultation on policy decisions; and barely one-fifth agreed that there was transparency about the administration’s budgetary allocations.

Diversity Climate [FT and PT Faculty Surveys Table 10 and 11]

Positive Experience
- Student diversity. Between 80 and 90% of the faculty felt that faculty in their department appreciate student diversity.
- Women. 80 and 90% of the faculty felt that women are equitably represented on university committees; and that their colleagues treat them respectfully.
- Efforts. Over 70% agreed with their department’s outreach efforts to hire diverse faculty.

The earlier FDEC Survey results confirmed these positive experiences:
- Nearly all faculty believed diversity to be important and three-fourths perceived CSUEB to be committed to enhancing diversity in terms of race and ethnicity.
- 87.3% of faculty felt accepted by CSUEB students, 84.5% felt accepted by CSUEB staff, and 74.7% felt accepted by faculty whose racial or ethnic background differs from theirs.
• Welcoming Environment. Three-fourths of both male and white faculty considered CSUEB welcoming compared with two-thirds of women and faculty of color.

Mixed Experience
• Support. Nearly 65% faculty reported they receive departmental support to incorporate multiple ethnic-and gender-perspectives into the curriculum.
• Equity. Over 60% of the faculty supported equity for faculty of color and female faculty, and felt that their department engages in outreach to hire diverse faculty. About half of the faculty agreed that there was equitable representation of faculty of color on university committees, but only one-third agreed that there was representation of faculty with disabilities on university committees.

The FDEC Survey confirmed these mixed feelings:
• 63% of the faculty felt their input was respected, even if it differs from others.
• 57% of the faculty reported there is an adequate number of faculty members on campus who reflect their ethnic or racial background and 53% felt that the composition of faculty should mirror the overall CSUEB student body.

Needs Attention
• Retribution. Nearly half of the faculty feared retribution if they were openly critical of the department administration.
• Compensation. Less than 45% faculty felt they were compensated equitably.
• Welcoming. 35-40% of the faculty felt that CSUEB is welcoming to faculty of color and female faculty.
• Subtle discrimination. Only one-third believed that is not tolerated.
• Morale. Less than 30% of the faculty reported good morale.
• Complaints of Discrimination: 20-25% of the faculty approved of CSUEB’s response to complaints of discrimination based on race or ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or sexual harassment. However, a majority did not know or could not provide an opinion about how the University handles such complaints.

The FDEC Survey results offered some additional insight regarding discrimination.
• Experiences with Discrimination or Harassment. Faculty who had experienced discrimination indicated that it came from the following sources: 17.6% students; 16.9% administrators; 16.9% faculty in their department; 15.4% faculty outside their department; 12.6% staff outside department, and 11.1% staff within their department.

Findings by Demographic Groups
An analysis of the data by ethnic origin, gender, and sexual orientation revealed only a few statistically significant differences.

Perceptions of Subtle Discrimination
• Female students, staff, and faculty were less likely to disagree with the statement “subtle discrimination is tolerated on campus” than males.
• White students were the most likely to disagree with the statement “subtle discrimination is tolerated on campus”. 66 African American students were least likely to disagree; Asian students came next; followed by Hispanic students whose responses were more similar to white students.
• While a majority of staff and faculty disagreed with the statement that subtle discrimination existed at CSUEB, there was enough evidence to suggest some ambivalence among minority faculty and staff as to whether subtle discrimination did or did not exist at CSUEB.

Gender Differences
• Female faculty were more likely to disagree than male faculty with the statement: “female faculty receive the same support as male faculty”.

Ethnic Differences
Students’ responses are not statistically significant when analyzed by ethnicity. However, the extent of their agreement or disagreement shows some important differences.
• African American students agreed least with the statement that “faculty were fair regardless of race/ethnicity in all courses.” Asians, followed by Hispanic students disagreed less with this statement. Each ethnic group had more students who were ambivalent about the statement than white students.
Sexual Orientation
There were few gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning respondents, so they were all combined into a single category (Other). This produced enough cases to do analyses.

- 57.5% of heterosexual regular faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the proposition that “faculty of color are equitably represented on university committees”, while 59.1% of those who were gay, lesbian, bisexual, and questioning disagreed or strongly disagreed.

REFLECTION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Limitations
Perception surveys measure individual responses at a given point in time. The FDEC survey was conducted in Winter 2005 and the Campus Climate surveys in Spring 2006. CSUEB’s new president arrived in July 2006 and put his cabinet together over his first year in office. Thus, some of the findings reported in this chapter reflect perceptions about the prior campus administration rather than current leadership. Moreover, these surveys did not probe the reasons for the responses, which would be helpful in proposing remedies. Also, there were too few respondents from some ethnic groups and sexual orientations to do meaningful statistical analysis for these groups.

University Dialogues
In order to disseminate the survey results and encourage a campus conversation about the data, members of the Campus Climate Research Team presented the results to 12 campus groups. At the end of each forum, the group was asked to respond to a simple question: What do these data tell you CSUEB needs to do? Responses from these conversations were used to inform the university’s reflections.

- Upon hearing the results the participants in the 12 discussion groups expressed pride in knowing that the students think highly of the faculty; that students view them as role models and find them fair, approachable, helpful, and caring; and that students feel that CSUEB prepares them for working and living in a diverse society, which is core to the university mission.

- During the presentation of the results, the discussion groups emphasized that their responses regarding the management of the university applied to the administration that was in place in March 2006 and not the current administration.

- The survey results generated strong interest, which enabled the university community to discuss issues based on evidence rather than individual perceptions.

ACTIONS

Actions Taken

- Survey data is on the web and available for further analysis.
- Major campus clean up and renovation is underway in response to survey findings (landscaping, new campus signage, painting of classrooms, new classroom furniture).
- The new administration has aggressively addressed communication, accountability, and other management concerns expressed in the survey.
- Two of the university’s strategic planning mandates highlight Campus Climate: “An Inclusive Campus Climate that Values Students, Faculty, and Staff and fosters Multicultural Learning and Competence” and “Vibrant University Villages.”

- Each division is using the findings from the campus climate surveys as well as other WASC studies to inform their divisional strategic plans.
- As discussed in the capacity chapter, faculty and staff diversity has increased significantly over the past four years.

Actions Planned

- Focus groups will be conducted with particular populations in areas of concern where the university needs more understanding of the reasons behind the results.
- The campus climate survey will be repeated every three years with the 2006 results as benchmark data.
- The Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee is developing a Diversity Plan based upon data from their survey and from the Campus Climate Survey.

The campus climate survey will be repeated every three years with the 2006 results as benchmark data.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION: CAPACITY FOR A NEW ERA

What has CSUEB done to address the issues raised by the WASC Commission during the capacity review in 2005?

The WASC Commission, in response to CSUEB’s Capacity and Preparatory Review Report, identified four capacity issues: (1) implementation of strategic planning, (2) workload, (3) the Concord campus, and (4) multiculturalism. The issue of faculty diversity is covered in this chapter; however, the issue of multiculturalism was covered in depth earlier in the chapter on academic quality. This chapter focuses on how the university has reinforced its capacity with respect to the first three issues. The table at the end summarizes CSUEB’s actions regarding the Criteria for Review, including the specific criteria the Commission identified.

East Bay’s approach to strategic planning has responded to the Commission’s concerns by:
• Creating a clear institutional framework for planning that specifies leadership roles;
• Developing inclusive processes of communication and participation;
• Initiating academic, enrollment, and student services planning;
• Restructuring financial management, resource allocation, and fundraising; and
• Expanding the university’s ability to monitor performance and adjust policies, programs, and practices through improved data collection and analysis.

CSUEB offers instruction at the original campus in Hayward, the Concord campus, and the downtown Oakland Professional Development and Conference Center. Overall strategic planning applies to the educational mission of the entire university. In addition, the differing roles and circumstances at Concord are discussed toward the end of this chapter.

APPROACH TO STRATEGIC PLANNING

Cal State East Bay’s new president has created a robust approach for integrated planning. The Framework for the Future is the first accomplishment of this process, establishing strategic mandates that make the university’s mission, vision, and values operational, as noted in the Introduction. The administrative divisions and advisory and governance committees have aligned their plans and resource allocation decisions with the seven mandates.

- An efficient, well-run university with a culture of accountability;
- Strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access;
- Vibrant university villages;
- An inclusive campus climate that values student, faculty, and staff and fosters multicultural learning and competence;
- A tradition of teaching, learning, and academic quality – emphasized and reinforced;
- A quest for distinction realized; and
- A university of choice through regional stewardship.

CSUEB’s streamlined strategic planning model, depicted below, involves the following essential elements, summarized with the university’s progress as of June 30, 2007. CFR 4.1
CAL STATE EAST BAY’S APPROACH TO STRATEGIC PLANNING

1. **Leadership.** Reorganization of the administrative structure to facilitate planning and implementation; alignment of resource allocation with strategic purposes. CFR 1.3

2. **Involvement.** Regular consultation with Academic Senate; involvement of students, faculty, staff, and the broader community in strategic discussions. CFR 3.11

3. **Analysis.** Initial focus on key university concerns; additional steps in Fall 2007 to broaden the university community’s understanding of its regional position. CFR 4.3

4. **Aspiration.** Publication of mission statement and application of seven mandates from town hall meetings to refine the university’s image. CFR 1.1

5. **Action plans.** First step from goals to implementation, including immediate activities and five-year outlook. CFR 4.2

6. **Resource allocation.** Faculty and staff, technology, and space as well as funds; new allocations for 2007-08 operating budget aligned with three key mandates. CFR 3.5

7. **Monitoring and adjustment.** Indicators being developed to evaluate progress and make adjustments in policies and programs in the following year. CFR 4.4; CFR 4.5

At CSUEB, academic and enrollment planning drive support services, faculty and staff recruitment, budget development, information systems, physical planning, external relations, and fund raising, as illustrated by the figure below. Academic planning, in the first tier, reflects the mission of the university. Enrollment follows, with students at the center of the second tier, supported by academic and student services, and by the faculty and staff who offer them. The third tier includes the underlying infrastructure. The university recognizes that many of the relationships shown by the arrows are reciprocal; e.g., while students need instructors, services, and facilities; maintaining high quality, respected faculty, strong co-curricular programs, and a well-maintained campus can attract and keep students. CFR 4.2
To increase CSUEB’s organizational capacity, the new president restructured the cabinet, elevating Planning and Enrollment Management (PEM) and Information Technology Services (ITS). PEM’s leadership enables the other divisions to undertake strategic planning that aligns university priorities with academic and enrollment goals. The planning function is connected to institutional research and information technology, providing the data and analytical capacity for effective decisions. As shown in the figure below, each division has accepted responsibility for coordinating detailed action plans for each of the seven mandates, emphasizing the integral relationships across divisions in making the plan work.

### Lines of Communication

The new administration has reinforced the importance of consultation with the faculty – a mainstay of collegial governance. The president is a member of the Academic Senate and its Executive Committee and attends meetings routinely, offering a full report on university activities and requesting the input and advice of the faculty. The administration has also invited WASC committees and Academic Senate committees to make presentations to the president’s cabinet. Between scheduled meetings, the president, his chief of staff, the provost, and other vice presidents communicate frequently with the chair of the Academic Senate.

### Responsibility for Action Plans to Fulfill Mandates from Cal State East Bay’s Strategic Framework for the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cal State East Bay - Administrative Divisions</th>
<th>An efficient, well-run university with a culture of accountability</th>
<th>Strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access</th>
<th>Vibrant University villages</th>
<th>An inclusive campus climate that values students, faculty and staff, and fosters multicultural learning and competence</th>
<th>A tradition of teaching, learning and academic quality - emphasized and reinforced</th>
<th>A quest for distinction realized</th>
<th>A university of choice through regional stewardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>ACADEMIC PLAN; HR (Faculty)</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Enrollment Management</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td></td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td></td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>EXTERNAL RELATIONS/ PRIVATE SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Finance</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>MASTER PLANS</td>
<td>HR (Staff)</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>MASTER PLANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
<td>FINANCIAL DATA WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>STUDENT DATA WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>Lead Division for action plan and coordinating implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>Denotes important support role for this division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>Denotes lesser support role for this division</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responsibility for Action Plans to Fulfill Mandates from Cal State East Bay’s Strategic Framework for the Future
During Fall 2006, President Qayoumi sponsored twenty-one “town hall meetings” in Hayward and Concord to engage the university community. Students, faculty, staff, alumni, major donors, and volunteers met with the president in small groups. Comments were carefully recorded and later synthesized into the seven mandates in the Framework for the Future. The issues raised in the town hall meetings converged with the WASC educational effectiveness themes and points that emerged from the SWOT process (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) in June 2005. Further, during 2006-07 the California State University organized a system-wide strategic planning discussion called “Access to Excellence” and sent teams to the campuses to provide advice for facilitating graduation. The comments at East Bay’s meetings were consistent with earlier campus discussions. [Access to Excellence findings]

In addition, President Qayoumi publishes a presidential message every two weeks on the university’s website with an explicit (and continuing) invitation for feedback. Each time The View is published, appropriate member(s) of the cabinet investigate the concerns and communicate directly with the person(s) who have submitted them.

With these new and reinforced avenues of communication, the campus leadership is confident that the concerns raised by the Commission have been addressed:

- **Dissemination of mission statement.** The seven mandates from the town hall meetings are being used to further define the university’s identity and unique learning opportunities offered in Hayward, Concord and Oakland. These documents are published on the university’s website and in campus communications. CFR 1.1

- **Formal and informal channels of communication.** The WASC Commission noted that CSUEB went “outside the normal channels to identify the aspirations and concerns of the campus community” (Commission letter, p. 4). As noted above, governance structures have been strengthened and other communications formalized. CFR 3.11

- **Degree audits.** CSUEB is using a new PeopleSoft advising module to evaluate transcripts when students apply from community colleges and to track progress. PEM has assigned extra staff to ease the backlog and evaluate new students. PEM also developed a weekly tracking report to monitor progress. CFR 2.13; CFR 2.14

- **Financial aid.** Using the PeopleSoft system in Spring 2007, CSUEB was able to offer awards to new students on the same time table as other CSU campuses, thus increasing CSUEB’s competitiveness with applicants who need to evaluate their financial aid awards as part of their college selection process. CFR 2.13

- **Distribution of overhead funds.** Since 1992, the CSUEB Foundation (the unit that administers grants) has provided the university with a Research Incentive Contribution (RIC) in an amount equal to indirect cost recovery. The RIC provides funding for professional liability insurance, Academic Affairs, college deans, and principal investigators.

**ENHANCED ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, ENROLLMENT PROSPECTS, STUDENT SERVICES, AND REGIONAL RELATIONS**

**Academic Planning CFR 4.2**

The Provost has initiated an academic planning task force consisting primarily of faculty and administrators in Academic Affairs with support from PEM. The Academic Senate Executive Committee has made planning a major agenda item for its retreat in July. The task force will contribute to program development and curriculum planning, help to shape the campus master plan, and guide priorities for fundraising. It is being charged to do the following:

- Frame the academic questions CSUEB needs to address (Fall 2007).
  - The overall level and rate of enrollment growth for the university and the composition of the student population – using demographic and workforce analysis for the region;
  - The distribution of enrollments by college and discipline – program size and mix – drawing from analysis of applicant quality and demand at the disciplinary level;
  - The role of university-wide programs for all students – beyond General Education, including important university values such as multicultural learning;
  - Pedagogies and learning modes – including active learning, mediated instruction; and
  - Academic support and resource allocation – including analysis of the implications of growth for support areas and private funding opportunities.

- Facilitate a university discussion of issues, scenarios, and their implications (Fall 2007).
  - Sponsor university forums on workforce needs of the Bay Area as an economic region and examine implications for educational opportunities at CSUEB (Fall 2007).
  - Identify alternative scenarios that illustrate the choices the University needs to make in order to further its academic mission (Fall 2007).
  - Assess the implications of alternative scenarios for physical master planning for Hayward and Concord – and potentially, Oakland and other locations (Winter 2008).
• Recommend priorities, including support functions such as library resources, information technology, advising programs, and areas for private support (Winter 2008).

Enrollment Prospects
Enrollment planning directly follows academic planning, but also has more immediate implications. After falling below its CSU target for several years, CSUEB’s enrollment for 2006-07 was up by 3 percent and an additional increase is projected for 2007-08. Enrollment planning now involves annual and quarterly enrollment targets for each college and at Concord, and includes specific expectations about summer enrollment, as summer is the lead term in the college year that coincides with the fiscal year. CSUEB is tracking course offerings and enrollment by college and location throughout each application and registration cycle so that college and departmental leaders can make adjustments to meet student needs.

Student Services
Student Affairs supports the enrollment growth and expanded access mandate through community outreach and by providing support services to students and graduates. Co-curricular services and programs focus on the whole student and emphasize continuous learning. Campus life and student development programs cover cultural competency, inclusiveness, civility, and leadership. The Student Affairs Strategic Plan stresses these:

• Student Retention Services CFR 2.12; CFR 2.13
  o University Advising Center offering more half-hour appointments vs. 15-minute drop-in visits in response to Student Learning Outcomes surveys;
  o Expanded advising, especially orientation and the Freshman Year Experience;
  o Reports to track student employment within the first six months of graduation.
• Student Development (which also contributes to retention) CFR 2.11
  o More on-campus housing, especially for freshmen: opening Fall 2008;
  o Student leadership program: implementation during 2008/2009;
  o Workshops for faculty to help address student conduct issues (prevention), and for students to teach appropriate behavior (civility).
• Health and Wellness
  o Recreation-wellness facility: design phase Summer 2007, opening Fall 2009.
• Student service needs for daytime undergraduates at the Concord campus.

University Advancement: External Relations
Part of University Advancement’s responsibility is to support the mandates regarding the university’s distinctiveness and regional stewardship. University Communications focuses on the first with initiatives for building awareness, student recruitment, media relations, internal and external communications, and university web development and management. The Government and Community Relations team engages with regional business and community associations, and with legislators at all levels of government in coordination with the CSU.

TRANSPARENT DEVELOPMENT AND ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES

While discussions of resource allocation often focus on finances, CSUEB includes faculty and staff, technology, and space as well. CSUEB emphasizes that these other aspects of resource allocation also follow the strategic direction of the university. For example, absent additional funding, the university can alter space allocations and faculty and staff assignments to the programs most central to achieving academic, enrollment, and accountability goals.

Fiscal Resources and Allocation Process CFR 3.5
In 2004, the Academic Senate formed the Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA) to enable faculty to participate in CSUEB’s budget allocation process. President Qayoumi worked with the faculty to establish a new University Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee (UPABC) that is playing a proactive role in budget matters. It is chaired by the Provost and includes faculty from COBRA, administrators, staff, and student representatives.

The Administration and Finance division has developed a three-year budget plan to achieve stability for the university in concert with enrollment growth. All 2007-08 budget requests focus on three of the seven strategic planning mandates: “an efficient, well-run university with a culture of accountability”; “strong growth and full enrollment with personalized learning and expanded access”; and “a tradition of teaching, learning and academic quality – emphasized and reinforced.” The first two mandates are intertwined because CSU operating budgets are dominated by enrollment-based funding from the state and from student fees. CFR 3.5

At an operational level, new financial management systems have improved transparency, facilitated shared governance, and enabled informed planning and assessment. CFR 1.8
• Implementation of financial reporting in a consistent and easily understood format;
• Adoption of new software that facilitates budget monitoring so that departments and programs have access to the current status of their accounts;

• Commitment to institutionalize budget benchmarks, performance indicators, and trends analysis in the integrated planning, assessment, and budgeting process.

**Human Resources and Workload**

The WASC Commission observed that “a decline in the number of faculty had coincided with an increase in class size, governance responsibilities, and scholarly aspirations” (Commission letter, p. 6). CSUEB is committed to provide faculty and staff with professional development opportunities and the support they need to do their jobs. However, the university must work within the salary ranges, benefits, job classifications, and workload expectations established at the system level through collective bargaining. CSUEB has completed 27 tenure-track searches for 2007-08; and the provost has authorized 40 more for 2008-09. While some of these positions replace retiring faculty, the net increase in full-time faculty from Fall 2004 to Fall 2006 was 20. Adding permanent faculty strengthens departmental resources for advising, curriculum development, and other academic services.

**Faculty and staff diversity.** The WASC Commission noted “a lack of formal policies and organizational capacity, focusing on the recruitment and retention of an ethnically diverse faculty” (Commission letter, pp. 5-6). CSUEB has conscientiously reinforced policies adopted previously and implemented new policies and practices to address this concern.


• CSUEB Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, Screening and Selecting New Faculty: A Guide for Department Chairs at CSUEB (Encinio, October 2006).

• Tenure Track Search Committee Orientation by the Office of Academic Affairs.

• Strengthening the charge to the Academic Senate’s Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC), under the leadership of the Affirmative Action Liaison Officer (AALO).

In the past four years, East Bay has appointed over one hundred new tenure track faculty of whom about one-third are white women, one-fourth women of color, and one-fifth men of color. Women now comprise 48 percent of the full-time faculty and faculty of color have increased from 30 to 40 percent. By Fall 2006, more than half of the full-time staff were non-white staff and the proportion of women had increased to over 60 percent. CFR 3.2

In our Capacity and Preparatory Review, we reported that the total number of full-time minority tenure/tenure track faculty increased by one (1) from Fall Quarter 01 to Fall Quarter 03. Since that time, due to increased efforts to recruit faculty of color we have made significant gains. From Fall Quarter 03 to Fall Quarter 06, full-time U.S. minority faculty increased by 16 which is a 16% gain. During this period, African-American faculty increased by 20%, Asian/Pacific by 19.2%, American Indian by 100%, and Hispanic remained the same. In addition, in Fall Quarter 06, 14 faculty were listed as International, the majority of whom are faculty of color although they are not included in the numbers above. [Faculty diversity Table]

**Faculty and staff workload.** East Bay is also in the process of clarifying how workload is distributed. The Academic Senate and the Provost’s office have initiated a study of the use of assigned time for university and college activities. The Associate Provost sponsors department chairs’ academies to assist them in setting clear expectations regarding promotion, tenure, and retention policies. Staff workload is being eased as the budget recovers: 75 full-time staff positions were added between Fall 2004 and Fall 2006. CFR 3.1; CFR 3.3; CFR 3.4.

**Technology** CFR 3.6; CFR 3.7

The new Information Technology Services division provides the electronic infrastructure for teaching, learning, and administration, and is the central location for the university’s administrative data systems. ITS designed its service delivery structure in consultation with the colleges, administrative units, the University-wide Information Technology (UIT) advisory committee, and the Academic Senate. This process included year-long pilot implementations for two colleges and one administrative division. ITS support and service delivery expectations are guided by Service Level Agreements with a “centrally-coordinated/locally-directed” tagline. The UIT has updated its five-year strategic plan to align with the seven mandates.

**Campus Master Planning** CFR 3.5

**Current projects.** The Student Services and Administration Replacement building (SRB), scheduled for completion in 2009, will consolidate all student enrollment and advising services except for academic advising provided by the colleges. CFR 2.13 The Warren Hall Seismic project will upgrade the remaining structure to meet the current needs of the University. The Concord science laboratories are being upgraded to support a future four-year Nursing program. Private funds support upgrading spaces in the Concord Student Union to provide informal spaces for collaborative learning and to enhance food services and retail on site.
Master planning. In 2006-07 CSUEB launched master planning initiatives both for Concord and Hayward. Each takes into account the academic planning needs for the entire university. Both campuses face some similar physical challenges, particularly those involving access and transportation. However, they vary in other ways that require different emphases. Concord is a small campus on a relatively remote but large piece of land in central Contra Costa County. The master planning questions there thus focus on issues such as the physical capacities and constraints of the site, its potential for future growth, and how the site can best serve the emerging higher education needs in this part of the region.

Hayward is a mature campus facing questions about redevelopment. Efforts are underway to expand student housing, create more student activities, add instructional capacity, reconfigure circulation, and reshape the physical identity of the campus. The Hayward master plan will be guided by the academic planning discussed earlier. The eighteen-month process will include public involvement, extensive analysis of the Hayward site, recommendations regarding land use, transportation, building locations, design guidelines, and an environmental impact report.

University Advancement: Private Support CFR 3.5

In addition to its external relations role described above, University Advancement is responsible for guiding fundraising. The university and its philanthropic auxiliary, the CSUEB Educational Foundation, adopted a plan in June 2006 to become “campaign ready” for the university’s first comprehensive fundraising campaign, to be launched in 2008-09. Campaign priorities will be grounded in the seven mandates of the Framework for the Future and in university academic and master planning processes. Preparation for the campaign includes identifying and cultivating prospective major donors, expanding the Educational Foundation’s board of trustees in anticipation of its leadership role in the campaign, and creating a new corporate and foundation relations unit and a planned giving program.

EVIDENCE OF MEASURES AND MONITORING

The Commission letter identifies the need for CSUEB to use plans to prioritize budget allocation, monitor progress toward goals, and improve its effectiveness. The new University Planning, Assessment, and Budget Committee (UPABC) brings this range of responsibilities under a single advisory committee, whose members recognize how complementary knowledge about planning and assessment can inform budget recommendations. Successful implementation of East Bay’s strategic planning also depends on the ability of all administrative units within the university to translate the seven strategic planning mandates into specific operational actions and to monitor their accomplishments. This work is being aggregated into a smaller set of university indicators or performance measures that East Bay can use to monitor progress annually toward fulfillment of the mandates.

Institutional Data Collection and Analysis

Cal State East Bay’s research process for the other studies in this report is documented in each chapter. The initial data collection and analysis for strategic planning has been rigorous using qualitative methods. The SWOT analysis in 2005, town hall meetings in 2006, and “Access to Excellence” discussions in 2007 generated extensive input from the campus community regarding the issues CSUEB needs to address. Staff members recorded hundreds of comments from the SWOT analysis and town hall meetings and used content analysis to group them and assess the frequency and strength of each concern. This careful scrutiny of verbal remarks allowed the university to identify the most important issues and synthesize them into the strategic mandates in the Framework for the Future. In addition, where independent data or other studies were available, the university validated and quantified some of the claims in the Situation Analysis section of the Framework for the Future.

CFR 4.3

The new Division of Planning and Enrollment Management provides the institutional capacity to connect future data gathering and analysis with strategic decision making.
This connection was strengthened by the move of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA) to PEM and the hiring of a new director for IRA. Furthermore, the institutional e-portfolio webpage was recently redesigned and expanded in order to provide more data for university decision-making. In addition, the Institutional Research and Assessment Office will provide the data needed by the Academic Programs and Graduate Studies Office to support student learning assessment, routine academic program review, and research projects, such as those involved with the educational effectiveness component of the WASC review. CFR 2.7; CFR 4.5; CFR 4.6

CSUEB also has assumed a leadership role in shaping the CSU data warehouse around the data and analysis needed for informed decision-making. East Bay is collaborating with the CSU central office to demonstrate the transferability of tools already developed at other campuses, thus saving the CSU system both time and money. The project includes implementation of reporting software that will have high level “dashboard” indicators as well as more detailed reports that can be accessed through secure web-based queries. CFR 4.5

THE CONCORD CAMPUS – SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Planning for the Concord Campus

In early 2004, the university appointed a blue ribbon task force, representing the university community broadly and including chief academic officers of regional community colleges, to draft the Concord Strategic Plan, which was completed in March 2006. This plan will be reviewed in the context of the overall University academic plan, focusing on questions regarding the balance of course offerings at the Concord and Hayward campuses, and the provision of support services. [Concord Strategic Plan] A second process will lead to a land use and facilities Master Plan for the 386 acre Concord site. At this writing, consultants have calculated that topographical, environmental, and transportation constraints reduce potential site build-out to between 4,500 and 6,000 FTES. A third study focuses on adding a lower division curriculum at Concord. This is an innovative approach for an off-campus center in California, so the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) has asked East Bay to address specific aspects of this proposal.

Communication and Coordination with Concord Campus

The WASC Commission noted that communications between the Hayward and Concord campuses have not always been timely and effective. The new president and the executive team have visited Concord frequently to understand campus needs. Further, mechanisms are being developed to inform the Concord campus about departmental class schedules so that potential time conflicts and/or limitations in offerings can be corrected in a timely manner.

Allocation of Resources to Concord Campus

The Concord campus has a clear instructional mission and is headed by a dean who reports through the division of Academic Affairs. Concord manages its own operating budget for some services but currently has no separate instructional budget. Accordingly, academic colleges and departments are responsible for funding and staffing courses at both Hayward and Concord. In order to address the challenges associated with this resource allocation process, a new budget model for the Concord operation is under consideration.

Evidence of Measures and Monitoring at Concord Campus

Enrollment management reports, including course scheduling, registration, and enrollment targets now treat the Concord campus as a college, with additional disaggregation by program as appropriate. Concord leaders recognize that sample size sometimes limits the extent to which separate groups can be analyzed in special studies. Nonetheless, as the separate identity of the Concord campus matures, it makes sense to include an explicit evaluation of that program’s delivery at the Concord campus during it’s academic program review.
SUMMARY

Cal State East Bay is implementing a strategic planning process that strengthens its ability to guide its future growth with confidence and certainty. New institutional policies and procedures have been established to support enrollment growth and financial stability. In addition, the university has clarified communication lines, which has led to increased faculty, student and staff participation in the budget and other important decisions in which they have a stake. Reliable and integrated information systems will be continually updated to incorporate the latest technology to further enhance campus communications. Planning and resource allocations are now based on strategic priorities, shared mandates that define CSUEB’s identity, and evidence of educational effectiveness. CSUEB has clearly demonstrated its ability to learn and change based on a thorough understanding of its programs, its faculty, students and staff, and its educational effectiveness.

The studies described in this report represent the concerted efforts by CSUEB faculty and staff to strengthen institutional capacity and increase effectiveness through the strategic delivery of services. The program review process described in Chapter 1 has already produced more effective and timely assessments of academic programs. The Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) is now able to monitor program performance more closely and pinpoint areas needing improvement. More importantly, program success can be gauged more directly in terms of learning outcomes. The goal of the MOUs that follow the reviews is to provide an action plan for program improvement.

The university also continues to support innovative ways to engage freshmen in learning communities, which provide skills that increase their chances of eventual graduation as described in Chapter 2. Effective writing and communication are critical to subsequent academic success but it is also important that faculty provide the continuity that students need to acquire these skills. Since Fall Quarter 2000, the freshmen class has generally outperformed all other students who took the Writing Skills Test. Peer group reinforcement is also a critical factor that is made possible by organizing courses in interrelated clusters that foster group learning. Summer workshops were re-established for faculty teaching in the freshman cluster program and a five-year program review was submitted to CAPR.

Cal State East Bay educates students who possess diverse cultural, ethnic and racial backgrounds. The surveys and analyses presented in Chapter 3 indicate that, in fact, CSUEB offers numerous courses with a multicultural content. Nonetheless, multiculturalism remains a descriptor that needs to be defined both in terms of broad perspectives and student competencies. A working definition is proposed that embraces respect for diversity, social responsibility and a commitment to social justice. There is also an effort underway to consolidate information regarding multicultural course content and faculty profiles on a website that enables students to more easily identify and select courses that reflect their specific interests or needs.

The studies presented in Chapter 4 indicate that students have access to multiple sources of advising that are widely distributed around campus. They rely heavily on the web, catalog, departments, University Advising Center, and the Student Information Lobby. The consolidation of many student-serving offices in the Student Services and Administration Replacement Building will help coordinate these and other services so that students can make informed decisions about how to best fulfill their general education requirements. Faculty also need to be better informed about the universe of advising resources, especially the Early Alert email notification system, EOP and EXCEL advising services. Students who receive these services show higher rates of retention and graduation than those who use other services. A Student Success Assessment Committee has been formed to develop benchmarks for student success by integrating indicators from several different advising sources, among other initiatives.
CSUEB takes very seriously its responsibility to insure that all students are treated with respect and dignity. The Campus Climate Survey, described in Chapter 5, was the first comprehensive study of its kind undertaken by the university to gather baseline information regarding student, faculty and staff perceptions related to academic, career, and diversity issues. This survey provides detailed information regarding these perceptions that lead to positive experiences, ones that result in mixed experiences, and ones that need attention. The Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee is developing a Diversity Plan for the campus based, in part, on data from the Campus Climate Survey. Finally, the university has already addressed a number of the areas that needed attention, and each division is using the findings of the campus climate surveys and information from the other studies in this report to inform their strategic plans. Students, faculty and staff have reported a palpable improvement in campus morale with the initial implementation of these efforts.

*Cal State East Bay is setting new standards for a new era.*
## Evidence From Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
<th>Actions Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. CAPR 9 document adopted by Academic Senate.</td>
<td>1. Fall 07: 2006/07 MOU meetings scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. CAPR Chair met with college councils to describe program review process.</td>
<td>2. Fall 07: Workshops for program chairs undergoing review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Annual Reports submitted.</td>
<td>3. 2007/08 MOU meetings will occur within two months of Academic Senate acceptance of CAPR report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initial MOUs written.</td>
<td>4. Faculty Development Office will offer increased number of special workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>1. Summer workshops for faculty teaching in the freshmen cluster program have been re-established for summer 2007.</td>
<td>5. Educational retreat for new CAPR members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. GE Director submitted Five Year Program Review for CAPR, Spring 2007.</td>
<td>6. All CAPR 9 documents on the web.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The Curriculum and Instruction Committee is reviewing the feasibility of library staff providing information literacy courses to each cluster in AY 2007/08.</td>
<td>7. CAPR Chair will meet with Program Chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>1. “Common Ground” website highlights multicultural activities and issues and features a searchable database of:</td>
<td>1. Continued discussion in Academic Senate committees about ways to integrate and coordinate efforts to increase multicultural competencies and assess the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Courses with multicultural, international, gender, or sexual orientation content.</td>
<td>2. Faculty Development workshops will focus on ways that multicultural learning experiences can be better integrated into the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Courses satisfying specific GE requirements. including the Cultural groups and women requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Available campus resources and events that support multiculturalism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Success ~ Advising and Retention</td>
<td>1. Establish Student Success Assessment Committee.</td>
<td>1. Complete One Click Stop for Advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Changed architectural plans for new building to include One-Stop Shop for all non-major advising.</td>
<td>2. Ensure that eligible African American males and Hispanic students obtain access to High-Intensity Advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Enhance utilization and analysis of Early Alert system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Augment Concord Campus Advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence From Studies</td>
<td>Actions Taken</td>
<td>Actions Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Campus Climate                         | 1. Survey data tables are on the web and available for further analysis by members of the university community.  
                                           2. Major campus clean up and renovation is underway including landscaping, new campus signage, painting of classrooms, new classroom furniture.  
                                           3. New administration is aggressively addressing communication, accountability, and other management concerns.  
                                           4. University strategic planning mandate highlight Campus Climate: “an inclusive campus climate that values students, faculty, and staff and fosters multicultural learning and competence.”  
                                           5. Each division is using survey results to inform their divisional strategic plans.  
                                           6. Increased faculty and staff diversity. | 1. Focus groups will be conducted with particular populations in areas of concern where the university needs more understanding of the reasons behind the results.  
                                           2. Campus climate surveys will be repeated every three years with the 2006 results as benchmark data.  
                                           3. The Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee of the Academic Senate is developing a Diversity Plan based upon data from their survey and from the Campus Climate Surveys. |
| Evidence reviewed includes: institutional research data, Previous planning documents; Current Planning process; Facilitating Graduation Report; and WASC Commission letters. | New institutional framework for strategic planning using the Seven Mandates. | Each year the Vice-Presidents will prepare plans aligned with the Seven Mandates. |
|                                        | President’s Cabinet reorganized to include planning and information technology. |                                                                                  |
|                                        | Inclusive processes of communication and participation (Town Hall Meetings, The View, SWOT Analysis, and Access to Excellence Meeting), new University Planning, Assessment, and Budgeting Committee (UPABC). |                                                                                  |
|                                        | Three year plan for reaching budget stability. |                                                                                  |
|                                        | Academic, enrollment, and student services planning. | 1. Development of new Academic Plan during 07/08.  
                                           2. Development of New Hayward Campus Master Plan by 08/09.  
                                           3. Developing One-Click web advising 07/08.  
                                           4. One-Stop Shop advising in new Administration and Student Services Building 09/10.  
                                           5. Student Leadership Program 08/09.  
<p>|                                        | Academic and Master Plan for Concord Campus |                                                                                  |
|                                        | Restructuring of financial management, resource allocation, and fundraising | First Capital Campaign beginning 07/08 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence From Studies</th>
<th>Actions Taken</th>
<th>Actions Planned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence reviewed includes: institutional research data, Previous planning documents; Current Planning process; Facilitating Graduation Report; and WASC Commission letters.</td>
<td>Expansion of university’s ability to monitor performance through improved data collection and analysis (Institutional ePortfolio)</td>
<td>Each year the Vice-Presidents will prepare plans aligned with the Seven Mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Degree Audit System (PeopleSoft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Financial Aid data system (PeopleSoft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New financial reporting system.</td>
<td>Integration of budget benchmarks, performance indicators, and trend analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 additional faculty and 75 additional staff hired from Fall 04 to Fall 06 to reduce workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study on Use of Assigned Time for faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. New policies and procedures adopted to increase faculty diversity</td>
<td>Faculty Diversity Plan 07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. 16% increase in faculty of color from Fall 03 to Fall 06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ACADEMIC QUALITY ~ PROGRAM REVIEW

10 CSUEB faculty members and programs have long
    engaged in assessment of academic activities and
    learning. In recent years, degree programs have
    refocused this effort to address student learning
    outcomes that cross course boundaries and reflect
    competencies achieved during completion of the
    academic program. This involves the assessment
    of overall program effectiveness and includes the
    perspectives of program alumni and their employers
11 A numeric scale is used for 14 of these questions.
    Responses to these questions are totaled and a
    percentage is calculated, which represents the program’s
    level or quality with respect to success of student
    learning.
12 Annual reports are appended to the current Five
    Year Review, and consists of three parts: narrative of
    program’s progress toward achieving the program’s
    goals; summary of student learning assessment results;
    and institutional tracking of data such as FTES and
    number of majors.
13 Each self-study includes Background, 5 year plan, Self-
    study; External reviewer’s report; and program response.
14 MOU meetings are attended by the Provost, Dean,
    Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and
    Graduate Studies, Chair of the Degree Program and
    CAPR Chair.
15 While additional MOU meetings were expected
    during 2006/07, they did not occur because there
    was a change in provosts (the new permanent Provost
    assumed his role in March 07) and the Dean of one of
    the colleges resigned. MOU meetings for all programs
    reviewed in 2006/07 are planned for fall 2007. It is
    anticipated that an MOU meeting will occur within 2
    weeks of approval of a program’s Five Year Review by
    the Academic Senate.
16 It had become the custom that a program could ask
    and be granted a delay in their 5 year review for a
    variety of reasons and without the Dean’s involvement.
    This practice undermined the goals of the 5-year review.
    The Academic Senate passed a new policy making the
    granting of an extension the exception and the request
    for delays a formal process involving the deans.
18 10 programs were reviewed in 06/07: 5 had been
    scheduled for previous years and 5 were current year
    reviews. One program review was granted a delay until
    2007/08 which is a marked improvement over past
    years.
19 Also CAPR called for several measures considered
    crucial and minimal for reviving the program:
    administrative assistance for recruitment; increased
    release time for the Director to revise the curriculum;
    and increased budget.
20 The 2006/07 CAPR Chair communicated to college
    Deans and other members of the administrative team
    the importance of allocating resources, particularly
    tenure track positions, with consideration to whether
    or not a program had submitted an Annual Report. At
    this point it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of
    the Annual Reports in terms of informing the resource
    allocation process within colleges, and tracking
    program progress during the next five year review
    period.
21 The total number of degree programs excludes the
    Special Major BA, BS, MA, and MS.
22 CAPR members sincerely wanted to assist the
University in returning to a planned schedule of program reviews by minimizing requests for delays and adhering to a consistent review schedule.

23 CAPR commends these academic programs and encourages continued development of assessment activities. It is also clear that many programs are making good progress and CAPR anticipates that data appearing in the Annual Reports of these programs will show further improvement. Finally, there are programs that have not yet demonstrated that student-learning outcomes have been attained.

ACADEMIC QUALITY ~ GENERAL EDUCATION

24 CAPR and other entities on campus must strengthen their capacity to conduct meaningful assessments and to advise programs on how best to obtain and interpret assessment data. CAPR will continue its efforts to increase the capabilities of programs to collect and assess data regarding learning outcomes.

25 It takes consistent direction and staying the course to achieve the goal. The process of academic programs enthusiastically embracing the revised Five Year Review Program and modifications in their assessment activities will not happen in a year. We are optimistic that 2007/08 and beyond will see the linkage among student learning outcomes, program review, and allocation of college and university resources become even tighter and more transparent.

26 GE is subject to 5-year program review by two university committees and includes evidence from external constituencies. Courses that meet the GE content requirement are approved by the Academic Senate and its Committee on Instruction and Curriculum.


28 Ten highly diverse junior faculty with expertise in the Humanities, Social Science, Science, Cultural Groups and Women, and Social Responsibility were chosen by their Deans and given assigned time or stipends to participate in a GE ~ FLC led by Sally Murphy, Director of General Education and Gale Young, Chair of CSUEB~WASC Committee.

29 GE ~ FLC sought to devise a valid, reasonable, and reliable way of assessing the GE outcomes that would be useful for the rich mix of discipline-specific courses that also meet the GE requirement. Final Report, General Education Faculty Learning Community, 2005-2006.

30 Rubrics were chosen because faculty at many CSUs and other institutions across the country have found them to be simple and easy to use. Rubrics often do not require any changes in courses or assignments and they allow participating faculty to remain anonymous. And of equal importance, rubrics have the potential to provide CSUEB with comparable and meaningful data about the educational effectiveness of the distributed GE program.

31 All CSUEB students must pass a junior level writing proficiency requirement to graduate. One way of fulfilling this requirement is to take and pass the Writing Skills Test (WST).

32 The researchers focus on innovative academic assistance programs, specifically those employing learning communities and collaborative learning strategies, to see what impact they have on the long-term retention and success of under-prepared urban community and state college students. Lumina Longitudinal Study, http://pathways.syr.edu/

33 The California State University system requires that every student take at least one general education course that examines the contributions of various cultural groups and women to society. At CSUEB, all students must take at least one course among the 18 general education courses that examine the contributions of racial minority groups, gays and lesbians, and women to U.S. culture and history.

34 Students report in the Entering Student Survey and the CSEQ study that they have made significant gains in their ability to find, evaluate, and use information from a variety of sources. CSUEB students who received assistance from library staff in designing research assignments showed significant improvement in preparing research reports compared to a national comparison group. General Education CIC Report, 2006/07.

35 Engstrom C. and Tinto, V. Learning Communities for Academically Underprepared Students. Pathways to College Success Project, Syracuse University, 2006.

36 Data from the cultural groups and women’s assessment and the Lumina Study interviews suggests that CSUEB students who receive explicit support and instruction in issues relating to living and working in a diverse society enlarge their contacts with people who differ. General Education CIC Report, 2006/07.

37 By providing explicit institutional support, reward, and recognition for teaching freshman, faculty are encouraged to collaborate across courses, disciplines, and colleges and design new structures and strategies for freshmen entering the freshman learning communities at Cal State East Bay.
ACADEMIC QUALITY ~ MULTICULTURALISM

38 See the Capacity chapter for the progress we’ve made on faculty diversity. See the Campus Climate survey for detailed results related to the climate for diversity.

39 The Faculty Equity and Diversity (FDEC) Survey developed and conducted by the FDEC Committee of the Faculty Senate. Results included in the campus climate chapter.

40 General Education CAPR Report, p.39.

41 Given a majority minority campus population, these data are not surprising and support our intention to continue to provide more opportunities for students to move beyond acquaintance to serious engagement with each other on issues that arise from our diversity.

42 This study is detailed in the General Education Chapter.

43 Engstrom C. and Tinto, V. Learning Communities for Academically Underprepared Students. Pathways to College Success Project, Syracuse University, 2005.

44 Ibid. Our students report significant personal encounters with those who differ from them and significant gains in their knowledge about human diversity and classroom instruction.

45 Final Report, General Education Faculty Learning Community, 2005-2006, CSU East Bay.

46 The proposed outcome for social responsibility identified the necessary knowledge and propensity towards social responsibility as evidenced by becoming a socially responsible contributor in the area of citizenship, social justice and ecology.

47 Sexual Orientation and Gender were combined because there were so few entries in each category.

48 See Locating Multicultural Learning in the Curriculum.

49 Members of the Student Affairs Leadership Team have special skills and expertise that they share with staff and the campus community. For example, the Vice President and Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs specializes in working with ethnic and racial minorities; the Director of Counseling and Psychological Services has expertise in working with LGBT populations; the Executive Director of Advising and Retention Services has extensive experience working with foster youth and low-income students; and the Director of our Student Disability Resource Center has worked extensively, at the state and national level, with organizations that serve and advocate for students with disabilities.

ADVISING AND RETENTION

50 The membership of the AART Team is essentially the same as the Student Success Team for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. Its membership was ethnically diverse as well as representative of all relevant constituencies.

51 The particular questions focused on what are the major factors affecting the retention and graduation rates of all students, particularly students at risk (in other words, African-American students and Latino male students)?

52 In Spring Quarter 2006, the Human Investment Research and Education (HIRE) Center at CSU East Bay conducted a study to determine if Early Alert notification of classroom performance improved the academic performance, class completion rate, and persistence and retention data. Administrative data from Fall Quarter 2005 and persistence and retention data from Winter Quarter 2006 were used to compare outcomes for students that received an early notification with a random sample of students that did not. In addition, the number of faculty who use the Early Alert system will continue to be monitored.

53 The average percent of students who returned after the first year for a second year of study (i.e., first year retention rate) was determined for first-time freshmen and for transfer students. The average 6-year graduation rates of freshmen from the 1997-2000 cohorts and the average 5-year graduation rates of transfer students from the 1997-2001 cohorts using data from Institutional Research and Assessment were also determined.

54 The one exception occurred with Asian students; data were not available by gender, so a single combined average for male and female students was used for the analysis.

55 The control population consisted of approximately the same sample size, ratio of males to females, gender and ethnicity breakdowns, and socioeconomic status as the comparison EXCEL population.

56 The average persistence rate was figured as the sum of the graduates and continuing students divided by the number of students in the entering class and graduation rates.

57 We analyzed the percentage of students who reported using six different locations one or more times per year for these types of advising (note: students could report using more than one location).

58 Also housed in this area are a student disability resource counselor, a Counseling and Psychological Services counselor, a career services counselor, and the Student Health Center. A financial aid advisor also makes monthly visits to the Concord campus.
One of the disadvantages of the advising structure and process at the Concord campus (as with the Hayward campus) is the lack of adequate advising staff. The number of advisor positions at the Concord campus was reduced due to budget cuts, and these positions have not been filled. Fortunately the General Education program did fund one of its GE advisors to spend some time doing GE advising at Concord this past year. It is anticipated that this arrangement will continue next year, and this advisor will be especially critical for the launch of the freshman nursing cluster at Concord.

There was a complicating factor in this analysis. Entering freshmen received at least one Early Alert from their General Studies (Freshman Year Experience) instructor, regardless of course performance, but this was not true for other students, because faculty were given discretion regarding which students to contact. It was not clear whether students were selected to receive alerts because they were already performing poorly or just as a courtesy to all students. Clearly, this study needs to be repeated and the study methods need to be improved.

The report will include learning outcomes that are being achieved; areas that need improvement; strategies and changes that have been implemented to improve student learning and recommendations to increase effectiveness of services. A copy of the final report will be distributed to the Vice Presidents and the Student Affairs Leadership Team.

For example, it will be useful to know why students preferred some sources of advising over others and how they might rank them in terms of helpfulness. And significantly, students who were referred to EOP and EXCEL clearly benefited even though these advising programs do not get nearly as many referrals from faculty compared to other sources. Finally, university faculty and staff need to learn more about the types of advising students receive who succeed in graduating.

This advising model has been adopted by the undergraduate Business Administration major and the Liberal Studies major, and will likely be expanded to additional majors in the coming year.

### CAPACITY FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

This finding suggests that larger numbers of Whites drove the overall analysis.

There were not enough African American staff or faculty to do a comparison. But each of the other ethnic groups among staff was like their ethnic student counterparts; most generally disagreed with the statement that subtle discrimination existed at CSUEB.

This could include the results from positive experience, mixed experience, and needs attention.

References to the WASC Commission are from the letter to CSU East Bay, dated June 30, 2005.

The FDEC is charged to assess the university’s commitment and practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, and to offer advice and assistance in areas where progress is less than desired.

The AALO (initiated in 1988-89) is charged with assisting departments in seeking ways to broaden the pool of applicants for each advertised position. The AALO meets with the chairs of search committees and entire search committees to discuss plans for the early stages of the search process.

### CAMPUS CLIMATE

The Campus Climate team was comprised of 5 staff members, 5 administrators, 2 students, and 13 faculty members with ethnic representation as follows: 7 African Americans, 5 Hispanics, 3 Asians and 10 Whites.

In the FDEC survey, faculty identified three components they felt most strongly should be included in CSUEB’s definition of diversity: race, ethnicity, and gender. Disability status, age, sexual orientation, and religious affiliation were considered important as well.

This finding suggests that larger numbers of Whites drove the overall analysis.

There were not enough African American staff or faculty to do a comparison. But each of the other ethnic groups among staff was like their ethnic student counterparts; most generally disagreed with the statement that subtle discrimination existed at CSUEB.

This could include the results from positive experience, mixed experience, and needs attention.

References to the WASC Commission are from the letter to CSU East Bay, dated June 30, 2005.

The FDEC is charged to assess the university’s commitment and practices for recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, and to offer advice and assistance in areas where progress is less than desired.

The AALO (initiated in 1988-89) is charged with assisting departments in seeking ways to broaden the pool of applicants for each advertised position. The AALO meets with the chairs of search committees and entire search committees to discuss plans for the early stages of the search process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and CFR</th>
<th>Cal State East Bay’s progress to date</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD ONE ~ Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1 Mission | • Published on csueastbay.edu website and various program materials; expanded through 2006 town hall meetings into seven strategic mandates in Framework for the Future.  
• The 7 mandates in the strategic plan which align to the Mission, Vision, and Values statements are being used to further define the university’s identity and unique learning opportunities. | 6 |
| 1.2 Educational Objectives | • GE student learning outcomes are clearly recognized throughout the institution.  
• 10 GE outcomes pertaining to multicultural learning and competence are institutional objectives. | 2 3 |
| 1.3 Leadership | Reorganized Cabinet; hired three new Cabinet officers; added planning division. | 6 |
| 1.5 Response to Diversity | • The results from the comprehensive campus climate surveys inform the University’s understanding of the experiences and perceptions of its diverse students, staff, and faculty.  
• Analysis of the multicultural content in all catalogue descriptions for courses, program outcomes and mission statements.  
• Multicultural competence assessed in courses meeting “cultural groups and women” GE requirement. | 5 3 3 |
| 1.8 Integrity of Operations | • At the operational level, new financial management systems have improved transparency.  
• Established, University Planning Assessment and Budget Committee chaired by the Provost, with representatives from COBRA, staff, and associated students, to reinforce consultation. | 6 |
| **STANDARD TWO ~ Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions** | | |
| 2.1 Degree Program Content | Revised program review process (CAPR 9) ensures that all degree programs maintain appropriate content, length, and conform to disciplinary standards. | 1 |
| 2.2 Student Achievement | • Revised program review process (CAPR 9) requires that all programs have clearly defined requirements in terms of levels of student achievement.  
• All degree programs, including GE student learning objectives are published in the university catalogue. | 1, 2, 3 2 |
| 2.3 Expectations for student learning | The results from the campus climate survey focusing on advising and retention demonstrates that students have access to the information they need regarding curricula, advising, the library and information resources, and graduation. | 4 & 5 |
| 2.4. Shared Expectations for learning and faculty's collective responsibility | The faculty through its Academic Senate, established student learning outcomes and the requirement for demonstrating the levels of attainment | 1 2 |
| 2.6 Achieve Expectations | • Direct evidence from student work demonstrates that students achieve at or above the expected levels for G.E. competencies.  
• Direct evidence from student work shows that students achieve the multicultural competence outcomes at or above the level of expectation. | 2 3 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and CFR</th>
<th>Cal State East Bay's progress to date</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7. Program Review</td>
<td>Revised Program review process (CAPR 9) requires all degree programs to be reviewed through the academic senate and in collaboration with the Provost and College Deans and that all programs must provide evidence of student achievement for specified competencies in ways that represent more than simply an accumulation of course or credits.</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Integrates Co-curricular and Academic Programs</td>
<td>The results from the study on Advising and Retention demonstrate that students’ academic performance benefits from the support offered in the co-curricular programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.12 Advising and Information | - The results from the study on Advising and Retention demonstrate that the students receive useful and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.  
- University Advising Center offers more half-hour appointments vs. 15 minutes in response to student learning outcomes surveys.  
- Expanded advising, especially the orientation for the Freshman Year Experience. | 4, 6 |
| 2.13 Appropriate student services | - The results from the campus climate survey demonstrate that students are satisfied with the services they receive.  
- Instituted PeopleSoft advising module to evaluate transcripts. PEM has assigned extra staff to ease the backlog and evaluate new students.  
- Developed weekly tracking report to monitor progress.  
- Using the PeopleSoft system in spring 2007 East Bay was able to offer awards to new students on the same timetable as other CSU campuses, thus increasing East Bay’s competitiveness with applicants who need to evaluate their financial aid awards as part of their college selection process.  
- Initiated reports to track student employment within the first 6 months of graduation.  
- Provided more on-campus housing, especially for freshmen opening Fall 2008.  
- Student leadership program will be implemented during 2008/09.  
- Recreation-wellness facility is in design phase Summer 2007, and will open Fall 2009.  
- Assessed and improved student service needs for daytime undergraduates at the Concord Campus.  
- The new Student Services and Administration Replacement building (scheduled completion in 2009) will consolidate all enrollment and advising student services except for advising in the majors. | 5, 6 |
| 2.14 Serves transfer students | - The results from the study on Advising and Retention demonstrate that transfer students are receiving useful information in order to progress to degree completion.  
- Instituted PeopleSoft advising module to evaluate transcripts, when students apply from community colleges and to track progress. PEM has assigned extra staff to ease the backlog and evaluate new students.  
- Developed weekly tracking report to monitor progress. | 4, 6 |
| 3.1 Sufficient Qualified Personnel | - Over 100 new tenure track faculty hired in the past 4 years.  
- 75 full-time staff positions added between Fall 2004 and Fall 2006. | 6 |
| 3.2 Faculty quality and diversity | - Adopted and/or refined diversity policies.  
- Of the 100 new tenure-track faculty over four years, over three-fourths are women and/or persons of color.  
- Tenure/tenure track faculty of color increased by 16% from Fall 03 to Fall 06. | 6 |
| 3.3 Faculty policies | - Increased number of faculty to share workload.  
- In process of clarifying how workload is distributed.  
- Senate initiated study of use of assigned time. | 6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and CFR</th>
<th>Cal State East Bay's progress to date</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.4 Faculty development | - Clarified Research Incentive Contribution from overhead funds generated by grant-related activity.  
- Increased Faculty Development support for preparation of program reviews.  
- Increased Faculty Development support for implementing student learning assessment plans. | 6  
1  
1 |
| 3.5 Fiscal and physical resource alignment | - Developed three-year plan to achieve a balanced base budget; adjusted financial management practices; supported planning for Concord campus.  
- Established accountability measures.  
- New allocations for 2007/08 operating budget aligned with key mandates.  
- Academic Senate Committee on Budget and Resource Allocations (COBRA) enabled faculty to participate in CSUEB's budget allocation process.  
- Established new University Planning, Assessment and budget committee (chaired by Provost and includes faculty from COBRA, administrators and student representatives).  
- CSUEB is now "campaign ready" for its first comprehensive fundraising campaign, to be launched in 2008/09. Campaign will be grounded in the 7 mandates. | 6  
6  
6  
6  
6 |
| 3.6 Information Resources | Results from campus climate survey demonstrate that students, faculty, and staff are highly satisfied with the university's information resources. | 6 |
| 3.7 Information Technology | - The new Information Technology Services (ITS) division, which was elevated to a cabinet level position, provides the electronic infrastructure for teaching, learning, and administration, and is the central location for the university's administrative data systems.  
- ITS works collaboratively with the University-wide Information Technology advisory committee and the academic senate.  
- ITS is guided by Service Level Agreements with units.  
- ITS strategic plan is aligned with 7 mandates. | 6  
6  
6  
6 |
| 3.8 Decision-making structures and processes | Reorganized Cabinet; added University Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee (UPABC); reinforced faculty consultation through Academic Senate. | 6 |
| 3.11 Effective faculty leadership | - Regular consultation with Academic Senate; involvement of students, faculty, staff and the broader community in strategic discussions.  
- Governance structures have been strengthened and communications formalized so that there will no longer be the need to go outside the normal channels to identify the aspirations and concerns of the campus community. | 6  
6 |

**STANDARD FOUR ~ Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and CFR</th>
<th>Cal State East Bay's progress to date</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1 Reflection/planning | - Implemented streamlined strategic planning approach, based on analysis of issues and used by divisions to develop 2007-08 resource requests.  
- Regular consultation with Academic Senate; involvement of students, faculty, staff and the broader community in strategic discussions. | 6 |
| 4.2 Alignment of academic and other plans | - Established academic plan and enrollment as the central factors in university strategic planning and resource allocation and augmentation through private support.  
- Initiated and Academic Planning Task Force. | 6 |
| 4.3 Planning informed by data and evidence | - Established seven strategic mandates based on issue analysis; divisions charged to present measurable indicators of activities designed to address the mandates.  
- Initial focus on key university concerns; additional steps in Fall 2007 to broaden the university community's understanding of its regional position. | 6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard and CFR</th>
<th>Cal State East Bay's progress to date</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.4 Quality Assurance Process | • The revised Program Review Process (CAPR 9), with its MOUs and Annual Reports, serves as a deliberate set of quality assurance processes for program evaluation.  
• Institutional indicators being developed to evaluate progress and make adjustments in policies and programs. | 1  
6 |
| 4.5 Institutional research on effectiveness | • Implementing new data warehouse with People Soft Student Administration system including software to display performance measures; initiated reports to monitor and management enrollment.  
• The analysis of campus climate results have already informed decision making, actions taken and planned and are reflected the 7 mandates.  
• Moved Institutional Research and Assessment office to PEM.  
• Expanded Institutional Portfolio. | 6  
5  
6  
6 |
| 4.6 Leadership commitment to improvement | • Added Planning and Enrollment Services and elevated Information Technology to the Cabinet level; mandated university strategic planning involving all divisions and locations. | 6 |
| 4.7 Improvement in teaching and learning | • The faculty through the Academic Senate and program review process CAPR 9 take responsibility for on-going evidence-based inquiry into the process of teaching and learning. | 1, 2 |
# GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AALO</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Required by CAPR 9 from every degree program. These reports are housed in the Academic Senate office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Academic Services at Concord Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>Budget Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPR</td>
<td>Academic Senate Committee on Academic Planning and Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPR 9</td>
<td>This is the 9th document CAPR sent to the Academic Senate in 2005-06. “CAPR 9” is now used to informally refer to the most current 5 year program review document and process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaPS</td>
<td>Counseling and Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFRs</td>
<td>Criteria for Review (see WASC Handbook)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIC</td>
<td>Academic Senate Committee on Instruction and Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBRA</td>
<td>Academic Senate Committee on Budget Resource Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEQ</td>
<td>College Student Experience Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>California State University System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUEB</td>
<td>California State University East Bay including all three campuses: Hayward Hills, Concord and Oakland Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Equal Opportunity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDEC</td>
<td>Academic Senate Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-Time Equivalent as in; FTES Full Time Equivalent Students, FTEF Full Time Equivalent Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>General Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPED</td>
<td>Integrated Post Secondary Data System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRA</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Informational Technology Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEM</td>
<td>Planning and Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding, now a required part of the 5-Year Program Review process document. MOUs are housed in the Academic Senate Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>Promotion, Tenure and Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAA</td>
<td>Student Center for Academic Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Student Faculty Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAC</td>
<td>University Advisement Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPABC</td>
<td>University Planning, Assessment and Budget Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WST</td>
<td>Writing Skills Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTU</td>
<td>Weighted Teaching Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Also known at CSUEB as: 1) WASCafied as in the feeling of being mummified, wrapped, dried, and preserved in the details and jargon of the WASC process; 2) WASCHeimzers as in no longer being able to remember the CRFs, standards, exhibits, etc., or only able to remember WASC details and forgetting all else; 3) WASCed-Out as in no longer being able to do one more thing involving WASC; 4) WASC-Speed, as in WASC projects that take forever to finish but when completed, at the last minute, feel like space warps; 5) WASCitis as in being sick of WASC or being considered by others ‘as sick’ because you are working on WASC; 6) WASCers as in all 100 plus faculty and staff who are suspected of having WASCitis and considered contagious; 7) Up-the-WASCKazoo as in “we will be up the WASCKazoo if we turn in our report late.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>