Developing Lines of Inquiry
(Offsite Review)

Directions: This form is to be completed by the team at the conclusion of its daylong Offsite Review of the institutional report and supporting materials. The form will be sent to the institution and a response to section IV will be sent back from the institution eight weeks in advance of the Accreditation Visit. This form can be in a bulleted list, outline or narrative format.

OFFSITE REVIEW (OSR)

Institution under Review: **CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EAST BAY** _____

Date of Review: **OCTOBER 29-30, 2014**_____

Team Chair: **DR. DOROTHY LELAND**_____

The Offsite Review team recommends the following actions be taken:

_**X**__ Proceed with the Accreditation Visit scheduled in: ___**APRIL 2015**_____

___ Reschedule the Accreditation Visit to: _____

The reason(s) the Team recommends rescheduling the visit is/are:
_____

_____

I.   <u>Overview of the lines of inquiry and observations.</u>

This document identifies Four (4) lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit (AV) that are derived from the institution's report. In addition, this document includes questions or issues the team discussed during the Offsite Review (OSR) that may be pursued during the AV. The team does not expect or invite a written response to these questions before the Accreditation Visit. The only written materials that the team expects from the institution before the visit are those listed in Section IV: "The team requests that the institution supply the following additional documents and information before the Accreditation Visit."

II.   <u>Commendations</u>. The team commends CSU East Bay for its accomplishments and practices as demonstrated by the institution's:

- preparation of a comprehensive, well-developed institutional report and high degree of transparency, openness, and integrity of broad campus involvement, employed by CSUEB in the accreditation process;

- genuine striving to study and explore issues that impact the institution's core commitments to high educational quality, institutional accountability, and quality learning environment;

- consistent shared governance among trustees, administration, faculty, and students, as demonstrated by the inclusive processes employed in institutional decision-making and planning;

- firm student-centered focus and commitment to transforming lives of students through accessible higher education and high quality of teaching and learning;

- well-grounded, comprehensive commitment to diversity explicitly stated in CSUEB's documents of mission, vision, data collection, and resolve for diversity parity among students, faculty, staff, and administrators;

- campus-wide collaborative development of Institutional Learning Objectives, confirming a sturdy linkage between curriculum and student learning through its selection of the challenging *critical thinking* as the first campus-wide core competency area to assess and inclusion of the SLOs in all course syllabi;

- stewardship initiatives and creative response to address state budget reductions through fee increases, grants, and private gifts to avoid massive campus operational reductions.

- exemplary accomplishments in the midst of changing leadership and financial uncertainty.

III. Lines of inquiry. The team has identified the following lines of inquiry for the Accreditation Visit:

A. Resource Allocations, Finances, Sustainability

- How have the changes to the financial funding model and the different system-wide measurement criteria (such as time to degree) impacted CSUEB's ability to serve the *underserved populations* in the community?

- When will the campus implement the Planning for Distinction budgeting model? How will resources for the *Planning for Distinction (PFD)* initiative be allocated? What is the next step? Please clarify: why was the PFD process used? why is it important?

- The campus has reflected on the meaning and quality of its programs through three initiatives: *program review, institutional learning objectives,* and *planning for distinction*. How do these initiatives relate to one another? How will these initiatives be sustained? How will the results of each be implemented?

- How sustainable is the funding or the study of ILOs and PLOs, given the concerns related to faculty workload and funding?

- How will CSUEB balance resource-related constraints or opportunities with commitments to realizing and enhancing the CSU East Bay mission?

B. Student Affairs, Student Learning

- How does CSUEB envision the future growth and support of Student Affairs? What is the status of planning for the next step of the student life and co-curricular programs and their link to the mission of CSUEB?

- How will the Division of Student Affairs address improving student retention, particularly for specific targeted populations of students (African American, Chicano/Latino, freshmen, transfer, graduate, and international)?

- What is CSUEB's Enrollment Management Plan? What is envisioned for serving the various diverse communities and cities/neighborhoods in the East Bay?

- What is being done to improve the graduation rate of undergraduate and graduate students? How does the rate differ for various disaggregated

groups of students of color? Describe the various efforts that are being deployed to address disparities?

- o What is being done to increase the success of freshman learning communities? Are there special efforts to address the needs of first generation college, underrepresented minority freshmen, and/or freshmen with extreme developmental education needs?

C. Institutional Research/Data Needed for Assessment

- o *Degree Programs*: 1) what is the relationship between data and resources; 2) how will CSUEB use program data to address the need for clear analysis and the ranking of programs? How will CSUEB evaluate the annual assessment reports and provide feedback to the departments regarding achievements and challenges?

- o How is the institution accommodating the transition, including transition to new leadership and the *gap* created by the search for a new Director of Institutional Research? How do program review data and results impact institutional and departmental decisions and services?

- o What is the follow-up plan for implementing *closing the loop* activities and the long-term assessment process proposed for the *critical thinking* ILO? What is the plan for implementation and evaluation of the diversity and written communication ILOs and their challenges and achievements?

- o How will Institutional Research (IR) assessment data of departmental and undergraduate and graduate programs make manifest the achievement and challenges of ILOs and PLOs? Is there a plan to implement and evaluate the inclusion of PLOs and ILOs in course syllabi (similar to inclusion of GE learning outcomes in GE course syllabi)?

- o What improvements has CSUEB made in achievement, challenges, and assessment of student learning (as discussed in the *CSUEB Self-Study*, pages 79 to 81)? What are the "strides" made in data management toward building a sustainable assessment structure—what more need to be done to expedite the program?

D. Graduate Programs, Institutional Coherence, Regional Vision

- o How are the Graduate Advisory Council and Institution Research Office addressing assessment and review of the graduate programs and their achievements, issues, and challenges?

- How will CSUEB incorporate graduate level competencies? Will it be by program or university-wide?

- What is the University's regional vision? How does this drive curriculum, admissions, and resource allocation?

- What does CSUEB see as its gaps related to Standard 3 (3.1, 3.2, 3.5)?

- How and when will the Concord Campus Plan be implemented? Has there been an update and follow-up of the plan since 2011?

- What are the plans for other offsite centers, particularly the downtown Oakland location?

- What evidence does the Campus have that the region wants a curricular focus on STEM? How prepared is the campus to provide this leadership?

IV. <u>Request for additional documents and information</u>. The team requests the following documents and information before the Accreditation Visit. The documents listed in this section are the only written documents and information the team expects before the Accreditation Visit. The team neither expects nor invites written responses to the questions or issues raised in this report.

- Updated strategic plan and strategic initiatives.

- Update on the progress of the Planning for Distinction process.

V. <u>Individuals and groups to meet during the visit</u>. The team requests that the following groups and individuals holding the specified positions be included on the schedule for the Accreditation Visit. In developing the schedule for the visit, the team may identify additional individuals or groups with whom they wish to speak.

a. Faculty, students, staff, administrators, trustees.

b. Leadership of the Concord Campus.

c. Leadership of the Planning for Distinction Initiative.

d. Faculty leading STEM initiatives on campus.

e. Community leaders with whom the Campus interacts.

f. The team requests that CSUEB propose other appropriate groups and individuals to meet with the team to address the Lines of Inquiry listed in Section III.