

REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
to
California State University Long Beach

October 6-8, 2010

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Judith A. Ramaley, Chair
Irma Guzman Wagner, Assistant Chair
Jená Burges
Meredith Michaels
Marilyn E. Miller
Jacqueline M. Mimms
Barbara Wright, WASC Staff

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page Numbers

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. Description of Institution and Visit | 3 |
| B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report:
Alignment with the Proposal
Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report | 4 |
| C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review | 6 |

SECTION II. EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

- | | |
|---|---|
| A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry | 7 |
| Core Commitment I: Organizing for Effectiveness
(Includes discussion of Financial Impact of the Economic
Recession and the State Budget Crisis) | |
| Core Commitment II: Staffing for Effectiveness | |
| Core Commitment III: Assessing Student Success
(Includes discussion of Institution's Systems for Enhancing
Educational Effectiveness) | |
| B. Program | |

THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW TEAM REPORT

SECTION I. OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

I. A. Description of Institution and Visit

History and Mission. California State University Long Beach (CSULB) was established in 1949 as Los Angeles-Orange County State College and offered 25 courses to 160 students taught by 13 faculty members. Over the years, CSULB acquired a number of name changes and nicknames, including “The Beach” - an enduring and appropriate term referring to its proximity to the Pacific Ocean which is three miles away. Since its beginning, CSU Long Beach has grown to become one of the largest of the 23 campuses in the California State University (CSU) system. According to *University Facts*, the total enrollment figure for spring 2010 was 31,586 students. Seven academic colleges offer 87 baccalaureate degrees, 38 programs leading to educational credentials, 67 master’s degrees, and one independent doctoral program. Distance Education and off-campus courses are available in selected programs to undergraduate and graduate students. CSU Long Beach is a highly diverse institution representative of the communities it serves in Southern California. The institution’s July, 2010 EER Self-Study reported a student population that includes 5.1 percent African-American, 18.9 percent Asian/Asian American, 29.9 percent Caucasian, 20.4 percent Mexican American, 0.6 percent Native American/Alaskan Native, 8.2 percent Other Latino/Hispanic, 6.6 percent Pacific Islander/Filipino, and 10.3 percent Unknown/Other. CSU Long Beach has been designated by the U. S. Department of Education as a Hispanic-Serving Institution.

Throughout the years, CSULB has received considerable recognition for its academic programs and service to students and has become a “Campus of Choice” where applications far

began in June 2002 when the WASC Commission reaffirmed accreditation and set the EER for spring 2010. In June 2005, this review was rescheduled for fall 2010. The university submitted the Institutional Proposal in October 2006 to WASC. In December 2008, CSULB completed an Institutional Report, or Self-Study, for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) stage of the reaccreditation process. The CPR site visit took place on March 4-6, 2009. The WASC Commission, in June 2009, acted to receive the CPR Team Report, continue the accreditation of CSU Long Beach, and schedule the Educational Effectiveness Review for October 6-8, 2010.

Description of Visit. The visiting team was composed of six members. With the exception of one member, the team had also participated in the spring 2009 Capacity and Preparatory Review. In preparation for the site visit, team members reviewed the institution's proposal, prior accreditation and Commission actions, recent reports including the 2008 CPR Institutional Report, the 2010 EER Institutional Report or Self-Study, many appendices, and web-based data and documentation. Additional information was obtained at the time of the EER visit through materials in the Team Room and numerous interviews with campus-wide constituencies. The team met with members of the WASC Steering Committee, related contributing committees, representatives of various offices, student, faculty, and administrative leadership groups, faculty participating in Program Review and General Education, and conducted open meetings for faculty and staff and for students. Team members also interviewed persons involved in the Distance Education and Ed.D. in Educational Leadership programs, and the off-campus M.A. in Education with an option in Mathematics Education. One of the team members visited the off-campus master's degree program at Stanford Middle School in Long Beach.

The team would like to acknowledge the hospitality and candor of the people it met with during its visit. Special appreciation is extended to all of the individuals in campus offices that provided information and materials before and throughout the EER visit. CSU Long Beach's spirit of collegiality was evident in the professional welcome and assistance extended to the visiting team.

I. B. The Institution's Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the

Proposal (IR) for Reaffirmation of Accreditation and the document's intended outcomes. An over-arching question for each Core Commitment

especially since it continued to develop rapidly after the report's submission - the rest of the "chapters" were filled in when the team went to the campus.

I. C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

When the WASC Commission met in 2009, issues raised during the CPR visit and presented as recommendations in the CPR Team Report were accepted and incorporated into the recommendations made by the WASC Commission. The accrediting body, in its action letter to

unfolds. Although a campus budget plan was included in Appendix F of the EER Report it is not a financial plan developed in response to the economic downturn.

Recommendation 4. Diversity Plan: The WASC Commission recommended the development of a *plan for increasing diversity among faculty and staff (CFR 1.5)*.

CSULB expanded data gathering to obtain information about diversity from a larger representation of the campus. The Faculty and Staff Diversity Plan, discussed in the Core Commitment II essay and presented in Appendix E of the EER Report was designed and completed in summer 2010. The plan was developed based on widespread involvement across the university and includes specific actions to be taken in a number of areas. (A description and analysis of these and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.)

Recommendation 5. Plan to Strengthen Communication and Outreach: The Commission recommended a *plan for strengthening communication and outreach to all members of the University community (CFRs 1.7, 3.8, 3.11)*.

CSULB's case study with "the financial crisis" as its focus, served to investigate the effectiveness of campus communication. Multiple communication strategies were used to engage the entire university community, the Academic Senate, faculty and staff, students, and department chairs. (A description and analysis of these and other efforts appear in Section. II. A. of this report.

requirement that CSULB, as part of the CSU system, be queried about the impact of the financial recession on the institution. Information contained in this section of the report covers the two main questions noted above as well as those suggested by WASC: 1) How has the financial recession affected your institution? 2) How has your institution responded? 3) What plans are in place in case the current state of affairs becomes permanent?

WASC Recommendation 1: *Evidence throughout the university of data collection, analysis and use for decision-making (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).*

Actions. Since evidence regarding this recommendation was threaded throughout the Self-Study, each team member looked for evidence within her assigned area of emphasis. Team members kept a common set of questions in mind as they met with people who participated in the study itself, individuals who have used the findings to develop actions to be taken, and people who are participating in the implementation of the strategies or programs developed as a result of the study. In general, the team sought to discern how the campus advisory and decision-making bodies work when they are not engaged in a self-study. The team explored the extent to which the campus has moved from a “culture of data” toward a more comprehensive “culture of inquiry” or “culture of evidence” approach to defining their goals and creating strategies for achieving them. An overarching question was: To what extent is the leadership across all constituencies learning from this experience and how are they applying what they have learned as CSULB moves into its next budget and planning cycle?” Specific questions are as follows: 1) What information was collected during the self-study process and how was that information obtained? 2) How is the information being utilized? 3) Who has reviewed, interpreted, and applied the results of the self-studies to decisions related to each core commitment? 4) What process is in place to learn from the experience of implementation of any strategies developed and implemented on the basis of the findings of each study?

Findings: As part of its self-study, CSULB designed an approach to a much broader and more frequent exchange of information about the budget situation and the choices being considered for managing a \$58 M budget cut. The self-study dovetailed with the budget crisis, and while it is not possible to tease out whether the budget crisis or the WASC self-study process (most likely some combination of both) drove the changes, the changes appear to all be for the good. The change with the greatest impact has been in the areas of communication and transparency.

The responses to providing more information, more often and to more people using multiple channels of communication yielded valuable feedback and the expression of concerns about the impact of the choices being considered. In turn, this has led to some new strategies for promoting deeper understanding and the ability to use the data that have been collected and compiled to guide these discussions. For example, a new “chairs toolkit” is being designed that will configure information at a departmental level in a more usable form across the many disciplines represented at CSULB. In the past several years, there have been significant changes in how the campus community uses data and information as well as how that material is interpreted and applied.

Starting a decade ago, in recognition of the uncertainties of the state budget and the changing demographic patterns affecting enrollments and the interactions of institutions within CSU, CSULB initiated an approach to planning that was deliberately designed to be nimble and easily adaptable to new information and changing conditions. Rather than adopting a three year horizon, the plan is updated annually and changes in emphasis and priority of the initiatives undertaken in support of planning goals are adjusted based on the results obtained in the implementation of each project or initiative. This model has created a more flexible and adaptable model for building the annual budget. Over 90 percent of the goals have been addressed and significant results obtained. The budget process is integrated with this strategic planning process, which starts in the fall with a review of the prior year’s goals and continues with a vetting of priorities and putting issues on the table for discussion. The groups’ recommendations are predicated on an assessment of what is realistic, both politically and fiscally. In a typical year, the fall is dedicated towards planning; the spring towards making budget decisions, within the overall planning parameters set by the President. The planning and budget process has been adapted to respond to the current circumstances that the campus faces and the goals have shifted from ambitious forward-looking priorities to plans to maintain current capacity. The more ambitious goals are now contained in a new (beyond the three-year horizon) section of the plan supporting a meaningful convergence of enrollment planning, facilities usage, and IT environment and it guides the priorities set in the capital campaign which is currently in its silent phase. The President has placed a strong emphasis on growing the CSULB Endowment which is considered quite low for an institution of CSULB’s size and the Provost has place a high priority on supporting faculty scholarship and growing external research support. Other

concludes with a comment that “there is no doubt that there is room for improvement as this unprecedented and very threatening situation is addressed, but the balance of evidence is that the campus has managed quite effectively on the whole.”

The case study yielded the following conclusions, as articulated in the EER Self-Study document submitted to WASC in July 2010 (p. 9): 1) Faculty, staff, and students have been represented in the key committees that have dealt with the crisis. 2) The campus has engaged in a wide range of frequent communication strategies to the entire campus community and to targeted audiences... through a variety of communication vehicles (face-to-face, e-mail, web pages). These communication strategies are considered to have been effective in reaching “the vast majority of campus individuals.” 3) The campus has effectively coordinated individuals from different divisions of the university to achieve key campus goals critical to successfully handling the budget crisis. 4) Efforts to disseminate information to, and solicit input from, various groups are generally perceived as contributing to a participatory culture on the CSULB campus.

Each of these conclusions was evaluated during the site visit. A significant amount of time has elapsed since the study was completed and more information is now available regarding the economic situation in California and in the CSU system. The test applied was whether the patterns and activities reported as a consequence of the case study have continued and whether a habit of reflection and continued observation has been instilled in the repertoire of the campus as a result of the case studies during the two phases of the WASC reaccreditation process.

Findings: The conclusions presented in the case study were affirmed through conversations with senior administrators and, to a somewhat lesser extent, from observations of faculty, staff and students. A number of “take-aways” were mentioned by senior administrators. Among the lessons learned from the more expanded approach to engaging members of the campus community in understanding and responding to the budget crisis were that reaching a larger audience refined and improved the choices made in responding to budget cuts; the process has changed how the campus community gathers and uses information; there was clear affirmation of the campus values (student success in particular) and the role of a shared commitment to access and opportunity in guiding responses to the budget and to directives from the Chancellor’s Office and a growing understanding of the value of clear learning goals assessment in promoting student success and highly valued degrees.

The broader consultative process is an effective response to the realities of the current budget climate. CSULB operates in a volatile external environment characterized by last minute switches in funding levels and directives from both the Legislature and the Chancellor's Office regarding enrollment targets. The institution has worked on a more comprehensive and broad-based approach to keeping members of the campus community informed and engaged in understanding the conditions that the institution faces and the choices that are being considered for managing those conditions. During FY 2009-2010, in accordance with Core Commitment I, the consultative process was expanded to include additional opportunities for discussion and exchange. A retreat was held by the Academic Senate that yielded fifteen pages of comments about the proposed budget reduction plan. The senior leadership of CSULB then reviewed the comments, looking for clusters of related responses and indications of any points of convergence. The three areas that were identified were support for faculty, the need to increase the campus-specific student fees, and support for student success. After further discussion with governance groups, this input guided the development of the final budget package. The process of consultation is quite complex.

As an example, CSULB has historically had among the lowest campus-based student fees within CSU. Although the administration has reported the institutional consequences of this pattern over the years, this time, there was a response. The explanation for this shift was that broader participation and the active involvement of the President set the stage for people to take this issue seriously. As one administrator put it, "People really listened this time." The decision by the President regarding where to set campus-based student fees will be informed by the responses from the Academic Senate Retreat (favorable to an increase), a student referendum (did not endorse a fee increase), the Student Fee Advisory Committee (recommended a modest increase to support a "Beach Legacy" fee), input from the Deans Group (supportive of an increase) and input from the Resource Process Planning Group (supportive.)

WASC Recommendation 3. *A financial plan for dealing with budget cuts to the CSU system and other impacts of the economic downturn (CFR 3.5).*

Actions. The Self-Study included a section on the economic crisis and its impact on CSULB as well as a description of the CSULB planning and decision-making processes and the goals that have been set for the year in response to the President's call for a "managed approach that protected student success (p.7)". The team sought to determine what has been done to

protect student success and how student success was defined and monitored. Questions were asked about what data are collected, who analyzes those data, and how data are used to assess the possible impact of various budget solutions on this key parameter of institutional life. CSU Long Beach is one of 23 CSU campuses and relies heavily on State funds and fee revenues to support its operating budget. State funds (increases/decreases) flow from the State to the Office of the Chancellor and are then appropriated to each campus. System-wide mandatory fee levels are set by the Board of Trustees. Proposals to increase campus-based fees require a recommendation by the President and, then, approval of the Chancellor. As part of the CSU system, the campus is

Despite the apparent reprieve from the State in 2010-2011, the visiting team encourages the campus to continue its longer term planning (CFRs 3.5, 3.8).

At the time of the EER site visit, the State was actively considering a budget compromise for 2010-2011 (almost four months into the new fiscal year and two months into the academic year) that would restore \$305M to the CSU system and would provide an additional \$60M to support enrollment. Of the \$305, \$106M would be one-time Federal Stimulus Funds. In response to the increase in enrollment funding, CSULB will open enrollment for the spring semester and seek to enroll significantly more students. The campus view (shared by the team) is that the major challenge facing the campus could come in 2011-2012 when the State will continue to face significant deficits under the oversight of a new - and unknown - administration. For 2011-2012, the campus has indicated its intent to increase the number of new freshmen, thereby increasing fee revenue. At the same time, it is likely that the CSU Board of Trustees will consider an increase in systemwide fee levels and the campus may consider an increase in campus-based fees. CSULB recognizes that the focus on student success, faculty support, and instruction translates into the need to be more efficient and centralized, administratively. The campus cited several examples of intentional restructuring - purchasing of parking permits, UPASS (an agreement for students to utilize city bus service), upgrading the student administrative system to be more self-service, off-site hosting of student e-mail, engaging in strategic energy partnerships with the local utility company, and so on. At the same time, the campus continues to monitor key administrative areas to ensure sufficient personnel, as an example, with the opening of spring enrollment, student services will face an enormous workload.

The campus recognizes that it is subject to external factors, like actions by the State and the Federal government that are not within its control, and it does not believe there are alternative revenue strategies that would position it to “buy” its way out of the fiscal challenges it faces. Notwithstanding, CSULB is actively working to expand enrollments and to provide the research infrastructure to support faculty in successfully competing for extramural funds. These efforts focus more on achieving excellence, th

commitment to these priorities, student services were exempt from cuts in the current year and this year's strategic planning process has begun with a discussion about

Faculty recruitment, at any campus, faces multiple challenges requiring guidance. CSULB's diversity plan articulates an intentional course of action to direct the university's approach in increasing recruitment and hiring of a diverse faculty but does not describe specific goals or targets. Specific action steps mentioned earlier in this report; however, are forward-thinking but faced with significant challenges. For example, the availability of doctorates among women and people of color is limited and not likely to change in the near future. Additionally, given the lingering fiscal and budget constraints, it is unclear how successful CSULB will be in implementing proposed faculty recruitment initiatives. In conversations with numerous campus representatives, the team found a commitment to implement as much of the diversity plan as possible within available resource capability, as illustrated by offering recruitment sessions to search committees within each college to help them build diverse applicant pools. University-level sessions with college representation are already in place. Although the budgetary situation has adversely impacted recruitment efforts for new faculty and staff at CSULB, leaders are optimistic that the diversity plan will assist the campus in recruiting and hiring qualified and diverse faculty and staff applicants to the campus.

In addition to recruitment, the diversity plan notes the importance of retention. Mentoring is highlighted as a planned action to support retention and a new campus climate survey is intended to shed more light on factors that encourage or discourage new faculty to leave. The extent to which information gathered for CPR self-studies and in focus groups following the CPR visit was built into the proposed biennial campus survey is unclear but the EER team remains confident that messages heard have not been lost. The approach used in collecting information between the CPR and EER visits was collaborative. Tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and staff were invited to help design, develop, and participate in an extensive qualitative data collection effort (CFRs 1.3, 2.8.) While the approach fosters a sense of ownership and tends to accurately reflect the needs and concerns of employees, it also raises the expectations of participants that actions will result. At this point, how data collection will lead to the use of information in decision-making is a question for the future, due to the newness of the diversity plan.

In analyzing the EER Report, it was apparent that CSULB attempted to represent candidly the concerns raised by campus constituents. While some faculty members in the focus groups perceived a highly positive campus climate, there were those who disagreed. The report

acknowledged limitations inherent in focus group research and pointed out that the voluntary participation and small sample size of participants might not be representative of the total

interview process augments an existing program by including questions pertaining to campus climate and diversity on campus (p. 6). Given the comments voiced by faculty of color and LGBT faculty, it would appear that much information can be gained by also including the same questions in the faculty exit interviews.

With reference to staff, CSULB has seen an increase in managers of color although opportunities for advancement to management positions remain limited. The highest increase has been among Latinos/as managers. In spite of limited opportunities for advancement, there is a low turnover rate among the staff (Diversity Plan, p. 2 and EER Self-Study, p. 16).

Workload concerns are recognized by CSULB as factors affecting a number of working conditions including quality of service and retention of employees. The “2009-2012 Strategic Priorities and Goals” document identifies the following need: “Continue to examine and address faculty and staff workload and worklife conditions.” The EER Report also addresses the issue of workload and it is gratifying to see the workload issue contained in both documents, since concerns continue to plague the university. The loss of temporary faculty due to the 2009-2010 budget reductions resulted in increased workload for the remaining faculty. Mandatory furloughs, coupled with meeting the heavy demands of instruction, scholarly and creative activity, and professional service, most likely exacerbated the situation (CFRs 2.8, 3.1., 3.2, 3.3). The EER Report begins to address this issue; however, the university needs to be aggressive in developing a strategy for dealing with the workload concerns heard by the team during interviews with faculty and administrators.

The EER Self-Study essay on “Staffing for Effectiveness” included a summary of actions taken relative to recruitment, professional development, and equity and diversity. One of these was the approval of a new university Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) policy. Within each college’s department, faculty are outlining expectations and voting on specific delineations of reassignment, tenure, and promotion criteria. The process of revising RTP policies and procedures on any campus is an overwhelming and sometimes insurmountable task, but CSULB will have the new RTP process in place by 2014 and will have accomplished it in a spirit of cooperation and collaboration. This revision aligns with the institution’s mission which advocates “...educational opportunities through superior teaching, research, creative activity and service” (CFR 1.1). The team commends the actions taken regarding such an important aspect of faculty workload. CSULB has, for a number of years, given newly-hired tenure-track faculty

outcomes to provide tangible evidence that diversity goals are being met. In order to demonstrate how data collection will move toward decision-making, implementation plans could include “information flow and feedback loops.” This would build on what has already occurred at CSULB in engaging a broader sector of the campus community in responding to data as well as identifying where decisions are made at various levels.

Various campus representatives indicated that, in order to be successful in addressing diversity issues, it might be necessary to use a distributed approach to implementation and monitoring at division, college, and campus levels. This approach would involve the participation of various campus stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring process. This approach would also involve the participation of various campus stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring process. This approach would also involve the participation of various campus stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring process.

allowing users to generate reports for use in decision-making. This capacity, in turn, forms the basis of the CSULB Institutional Dashboard which allows members of the campus community to track developments in such areas as graduation trends, enrollment trends, retention, and faculty appointments. Users are able to generate reports that are disaggregated along a variety of criteria (by academic unit, student level, student economic status, etc.) in order to track the success of student groups or specific initiatives (CFR 4.5).

Data have also been made available for detailed and immediate planning purposes (CFR 4.3). The Interactive Enrollment Planning Report supports the management of classes and schedules. CS Links provides data on class enrollment patterns and room utilization for enrollment managers, as well as data on individual students for academic advisors. Standardized program-specific data reports have been designed for inclusion in the program review process.

The report outlines actions taken by the campus in response to data from various sources (CFR 4.4). National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) data indicating that CSULB students scored below comparisons on measures of student-faculty interaction resulted in the initiation of a popular Provost's Summer Research Award supporting undergraduate and graduate student collaboration with faculty members on research projects. Data showing marked improvement in the success of students participating in a pilot of the Beach Learning Community (BLC), a program for students who require remediation in both English and Mathematics, resulted in plans to expand the program to all eligible students in 2010. The success rates and satisfaction levels of students in pilot Graduation Writing Assessment (GWAR) courses have resulted in improvements to the courses and portfolio assessments along with a proposed revision to the GWAR policy under discussion by the Academic Senate, which would allow students to enroll in the GWAR course without having to attempt the Graduate Writing Exam first. Data regarding the different needs of students in different majors, and on how those needs influence student success in remedial and General Education mathematics courses, led to a restructuring of the pre-baccalaureate math curriculum into two pathways, one for students whose majors require them to prepare for taking calculus and one for other students who need only to prepare for meeting General Education math requirements. Most of these changes have resulted in substantial improvements in student passing rates for the remedial courses in which they were enrolled.

A few other efforts have been less successful. For example, the use of data to identify and improve low-success courses has not resulted in lasting improvement in student success; some

departments, however, are continuing their own efforts along these lines, as the campus community considers the research suggesting appropriate next steps to take in improving student success in such courses. The team encourages the university to build on departmental momentum in using data to improve low-success courses in ways that better support student learning.

Another action connected to Recommendation 1 is the “Highly Valued Degree Initiative,” launched as part of the CSU’s Access to Excellence efforts to improve graduation rates and reduce achievement gaps for historically underrepresented students. The initiative is organized into five areas: Curriculum Pathways, Support Services, Advising, Faculty Development, and Research and Evaluation (CFR 4.6). This effort and the data used to guide and support it are described in a separate section on Student Success, below.

Findings. The description of initiatives resulting from analysis of data, both in the Educational Effectiveness Review report and in numerous meetings and conversations during the visit, suggest that the campus is using data for making decisions and monitoring progress in improving institutional support of student success. The actions described above provide evidence that CSULB can do that effectively.

It is probably not an accident that many of the successful initiatives grounded in solid data have been collaborative across different functions, units, and areas of expertise. The team heard in many venues about the cross-functional and mutually supportive collaborations that have moved these initiatives forward and made them so rewarding for participants. Beginning such efforts by looking at solid data takes a problem out of the realm of story and anecdote, which is by definition told from the perspective of an individual or particular group and can make it difficult for those with other perspectives to see the story in the same way. Beginning instead, with a set of data that participants can agree is accurate or representative can open the way for very different approaches to converge on novel and creative solutions. The team saw evidence of this effect in a number of successful campus initiatives.

Recommendation 2: *Evidence of institution-wide assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and institutional levels, and including general education and program review. Direct methods, analysis, and use of findings for feedback, decision making, and improvement should be demonstrated (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.6, 4.7).*

Actions

Review are described in a separate section, below). Progress was gradual at first, but the report

The EER Report also announced the development of institutional learning outcomes drawn from CSULB's Mission, Values, and Vision Statement. The outcomes are listed in the report and have been posted on the university website (CFR 2.3).

Findings. In exploring the institution's response to this recommendation for Core Commitment III, the team consulted the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators 2008;

experience. In response, the department created a discipline-specific writing program within the department. Students who have been through the program are just now reaching their fieldwork experience, so formal assessment of the program's impact on student learning will occur soon (CFR 2.6). Examples like this one provide evidence of the institution's progress toward building a culture infused with curiosity about student learning, with evolving practices of data collection and analysis, and with the subsequent actions steps that characterize meaningful assessment. The team encourages the university to sustain the momentum of this progress.

Another dimension of the university's assessment progress relates to the way that its identification of learning outcomes has supported the coordination of multiple sections of the same course (CFR 4.7). In a number of settings, reference was made to the development of "signature assignments" common across all sections of a key course. In the case of the Liberal Studies program, for example, the five core liberal arts areas are assessed through signature assignments for each area as part of a three-unit capstone experience. Analytical rubrics are used to score the assignments in group scoring sessions, and the results are used to adjust the assignments and reading materials for subsequent offerings of the course across multiple sections.

Meetings during the visit also provided insight into why the report includes no GE assessment results yet, what progress has been made toward getting such results, and how programs are using the information that is already available. The hiatus in assessing General Education outcomes under the old model allowed the General Education Governing Committee (GEGC) to become aware of - and to consider how to incorporate - all the assessment and analysis connected to GE that was already going on in connection with other activities. Currently, each department assesses achievement of General Education student learning outcomes in the GE courses that it offers, and the assessment results for General Education courses are included in departmental assessment reports. Departments are also contributing to the development of curriculum maps, which are intended to show which departments address the same learning outcomes so that communities of practice can be formed to engage in collaborative assessment of those particular outcomes; in the meantime, however, as one member of the GEGC noted, the maps also provide major programs with a "silhouette" that shows gaps where their students may not be getting adequate attention to the development of specific skills, and awareness of those gaps can guide advising and curricular changes even before the

communities of practice are identified and convened. On the whole, the visiting team was impressed with the progress that has been made toward developing a sustainable model for assessing and improving General Education, and it encourages the university to build on this work through collecting and analyzing student learning data, convening communities of practice, and including the General Education program itself in the Program Review cycle.

In addition to the assessment work being done in academic programs, learning outcomes assessment is also being incorporated into the work of all Student Services units. Two case studies were presented in the EER Report, demonstrating the integration of Council for Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) frameworks with learning outcomes. One of the case studies traces the efforts of the Educational Opportunity Program to improve the math and English skills of its students. The fact that results were better for math than for English provides useful information that should help the program work with Academic Affairs to strengthen the program's ability to improve students' writing skills (CFRs 2.11, 4.6).

While the team found a number of ways in which assessment progress exceeded the level represented in the EER Report, we also found that this was not the case with the institutional outcomes. The institutional outcomes that have been identified since the CPR visit have not been explicitly connected to course, program, General Education, or co-curricular experiences or outcomes. CSULB needs to map the institutional outcomes onto the other levels of outcomes that have already been established so that assessment of outcomes at other levels can also provide information about the extent to which students have achieved what is expected of a CSULB graduate through all dimensions of their university experiences.

Also, while CSULB has set benchmarks for improving graduation rates and closing the achievement gap for traditionally underrepresented groups, programs have not yet set targets or benchmarks for student learning outcomes as critical measures of student success (CFR s 2.2, 2.6). Accordingly, the university is encouraged to articulate its expectations for student learning achievement at the general education, major, and institutional levels, compare assessment results with those expectations, and use such analyses to inform decisions about institutional priorities in ways that parallel campus uses of graduation rate data.

II. B. Program Review

Recommendation 2: *Evidence of institution-wide assessment of student learning outcomes at the program and institutional levels, and including general education and program*

Assessment and Program Review, and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies, and the visiting team applauds these developments.

Findings. The visiting team examined Program Review documents prepared by the Advanced Studies in Education and Counseling, Civil Engineering, and English departments (completed in 2007, 2008, and 2009, respectively) as part of its evaluation of the program review process at CSULB. The selection of these programs allowed the team to examine how Program Review was implemented by a graduate-level program (MA ED, Education Administration option), a professional program (BS in Civil Engineering), and an undergraduate liberal arts program (BA in English). Members of the visiting team also met with faculty and administrators associated with each program, with members of the Program Assessment and Review Committee, and with the current Director of Program Review and Assessment.

The visiting team found that Program Review is assuredly used to improve program effectiveness. Faculty members in the MA ED program now devote one faculty meeting per semester to reviewing students' mastery of student learning outcomes and their progress against established benchmarks. Further, they noted that the Program Review process provides an opportunity for them to develop a priority list of resource needs (e.g., faculty, academic support services, computer laboratories, library resources, etc.) with significant emphasis on assessment, accountability and data-driven decision making, and that these needs are communicated to the Resource Planning Process Committee for consideration. The undergraduate Civil Engineering program used the Program Review process to identify student learning issues, analyze the curricular components and pedagogy involved, and make changes in course design to provide additional active learning opportunities. They subsequently tracked the results of student response to the changes and used that analysis to further adjust the program elements, leading to improved student outcomes. The institution supported these program activities with assigned time, approval of curricular proposals, and additional administrative resources for other adjustments identified by the program.

sites to provide accessible, accurate, and reliable data for program review and other purposes. The English department also struggled with the quality and relevance of its external review. The Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC) confirmed that the quality of external reviews has been uneven and, in order to address this gap in the process, PARC is working on a template for external reviewers to use in preparing reports that more consistently meet departmental and institutional needs (CFRs 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).

II. C. Student Success

WASC expects that at the time of an EER visit, institutions will have deepened the analysis of its own data, and that it will have obtained comparative data on graduation and retention rates, year-to-year attrition, campus climate, and so on. The WASC-required campus response is described below.

Consistent with its mission as a “diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public

- 2) Support Services - to identify student support needs, with special attention to needs of low income and underrepresented minority students.
- 3) Advising - has the goal of ensuring that all students, especially low income and underrepresented minority students receive needed advising.
- 4) Faculty Development - to identify the most effective instructional methods that contribute to retention and learning, especially for low income and underrepresented minority students.
- 5) Research and Evaluation - to support the other task forces with data.

Successful student success initiatives already identified by task forces include the Beach Learning Community (BLC) that focuses on entering freshmen who need assistance in mathematics and writing skills. The BLC was designed in response to analysis of low-retention rates for these students. When the CPR visited in March 2009, the BLC was found to be a source of pride; at the time of the EER visit the team found that the BLC had been broadened to serve more students in baccalaureate programs. Retention services for Latino/a and African-American students have also been expanded. The designati

2010 that, “For over a decade, CSULB has doubled graduation rates and we have seen significant recent gains for many groups.” The ar

made a set of recommendations to the WASC Commission which became the starting point for the continued self-study that was undertaken and reported in the Educational Effectiveness Review. These recommendations have been addressed by the institution and findings are discussed in this report within Section II. Evaluation of Educational Effectiveness under the Standards.

At the exit interview on October 8, the EER Chair presented a team statement that reflects the impact of the entire review on the institution:

In our opinion, CSULB is opening up a new chapter in the practice of institutional development and the use of collaborative and reflective practice during a time of rapid and unpredictable change. Your approach to planning and the connection between your mission and the priorities you have set as well as the link between your goals and how you invest in your capacity are exciting. There is much that your colleagues in higher education can learn from you about how to move from anecdotes to data collection to effective use of data and the journey toward a culture of discovery and a habit of learning from experience. You are thinking your way into the future in an admirable way and we thank you for the privilege of getting to know you better.

Commendations

Core Commitment I. Organizing for Effectiveness

1. The planning and budget process used at CSULB is admirably suited to the difficult and rapidly changing social and economic environment in which the institution operates.
2. The introduction of a consultation model that allows for much broader and more frequent exchange of information and ideas about the budget situation and the choices being considered for managing the budget is compatible with the campus culture. The new working relationship with the Academic Senate as an effective sounding board has improved the ability of the administration to tell the budget story and to talk about critically important issues in a collegial manner. Campus leadership across all constituencies has learned to focus sharply on the critical questions of what is already known, what isn't known yet, who needs to know and what do they need to know, and what tangible results to expect.

teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service expectations. This new model will be fully implemented by 2014.

4. CSULB has developed a campus climate survey to follow up on the findings of the initial case study conducted for the EER review. The process of regular inquiry will guide the implementation and evaluation of plans to support faculty and staff.

Core Commitment 3: Assessing Student Success

1. CSULB has continued to acquire additional information to guide the development of strategies to promote student success.

2. CSULB has demonstrated a willingness to broaden the definition of student success from quantifiable outcomes such as graduation and time to degree to include a consideration of other elements, including the quality of the student experience, both curricular and co-curricular.

3. CSULB kept in close contact with their local community high schools and community colleges during a time of considerable confusion about how many new students would be admitted to the university.

4. CSULB has expanded the scope of consideration of quality and the definition of a “highly valued degree” to include both faculty expectations for their students and the perspectives of the external community, including employers.

5. The team notes with appreciation the strong evidence of increasing collaboration between academic and student affairs and between faculty advisors and student support staff in the design and implementation of programs that support the needs of incoming students and improve student success by increasing the involvement of students in a vibrant campus life.

6. The development of student learning outcome

many examples of the rapid introduction and enhancement of the assessment process and its impact on the curriculum and pedagogies.

7. General Education outcomes and assessments have been integrated into the program review process for specific degree programs and into annual assessment reports.

8. CSULB has developed exemplary approaches to cross-unit collaboration and effective engagement with the external community. The team especially wishes to recognize the effective use of the Enrollment Advisory Council and the internal Advising Council.

Recommendations

1. Demonstrate that students are achieving explicit expectations for learning. Student success can be viewed through a variety of lenses. Time to degree and graduation rates are important measures and reflect the most common accountability measures being imposed upon higher education by policy-makers. However, student learning and the design and responsiveness of courses of study to changing conditions in practice are also important. In addition to whether students complete their courses of study, CSULB will want to increase its attention to how well-prepared the students are for what lies ahead. Employment patterns and salaries are related to this issue but are not sufficient surrogates for measuring how well students are prepared (CFRs 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, and 4.7).

2. Broaden the definition of quality. The quality of an education can be studied from both an internal and an external perspective. CSULB may benefit from adding a more qualitative element to its evaluation strategies. Although reputational ratings and hiring patterns are good external reference points for quality and degree completion does connote one aspect of student success, current efforts to define curricular outcomes and to develop ways to collect and then assess measures of those outcomes can offer another valuable perspective on quality (CFRs 2.7, 2.10).

3. Continue to prepare for the future. Despite the apparent reprieve from the State for FY 2010-2011, it will be important for the campus to continue to develop budget strategies for the long

term, including alternative approaches to revenue generation. The campus may also benefit from continuing to evaluate the effect of faculty and staff reductions on the workload and responsibilities of the remaining workforce (CFRs 3.1, 3.5).

4. Close the feedback loop. The new communication strategies that were developed in FY 2009-2010 hold great promise for engaging a broader sector of the campus community in responding to data about the performance of the institution and its progress toward accomplishing its mission. The broadening of participation in planning and budgeting has yielded promising

APPENDIX A

OFF-CAMPUS SITE SUMMARY

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

1. INSTITUTION:

California State University Long Beach

2. SITE LOCATION (include physical address):

Stanford Middle School
5871 Los Arcos, Long Beach, CA 90815

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

Jacqueline M. Mimms, Ph.D.

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

The Master of Arts Degree in Education, Option in Mathematics Education, is designed for high school mathematics teachers to enhance their content and pedagogy knowledge. It is a 30-33 unit program and does not overlap with the Master of Science in Mathematics Education, Option in Mathematics for Secondary School Teachers. There are no other CSU campuses offering a program that is identical to the Mathematics Education Program at CSULB (e.g., with an emphasis on the combination of mathematics assessment, technology integration, investigation of research-based effective teaching strategies for meeting the mathematics needs of diverse students.) Although San Diego State University offers some similar courses, the primary emphasis is on understanding children's mathematical thinking. The CSULB program utilizes a 25-student cohort model at Stanford Middle School which allows candidates to work with the same students throughout the program. Candidates have multiple opportunities to learn from colleagues and share their mathematics teaching expertise. The target audience is classroom teachers, mathematics coaches, curriculum specialists, and teacher leaders in their school districts. The program is strongly supported

5. DATE VISITED and LENGTH OF VISIT:

Wednesday, October 6, 2010 -- 1 ½ hours

Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if follow-up is needed.
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)</p>	<p>Yes. Stanford Middle School serves as a middle school during the day hours and provides adequate space for the MAED in the evening. The classrooms seat approximately 30 students and are modestly equipped with essential tools necessary to conduct classroom teaching (e.g., blackboard, audiovisual equipment, etc.).</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)</p>	<p>Students at the off-campus site have access to the same level of advising, counseling, library and computing services as main campus students. Students interviewed stated that even though their classes meet at an off-campus site, they feel very connected to the main campus activities. They are kept informed through E-mails. In addition, the students collectively spoke about Dr. An's commitment to ensuring student success and indicated that she, and other faculty, are extremely responsive to their needs and make every effort to insure that their needs are met.</p>	
<p><i>Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)</p>	<p>Stanford Middle School is located approximately 1.5 miles from CSULB and is not visible to the main campus. However, as previously indicated, it appears that there is a strong connection between faculty and students. During the interview, students</p>	

	<p>provide feedback on program effectiveness in relationship to their abilities to implement the standards-based mathematics curriculum, technology and assessment in their teaching practices. Based on data analysis, constructive feedback from program participants and the local community, program revisions and improvements are implemented.</p>	
<p><i>Context of this site in the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>CSULB has a history of community engagement and maintains close contact with its local community and strives to meet the needs of students within their service area. As a result, several off-campus programs have been implemented. The Mathematics Education Program evolved after substantial community participation between the mathematics education faculty and local school representatives. The same mission and vision exists for on-campus and off-campus sites. Students utilize the same application and admission processes as main campus for graduate standing candidates. Faculty hiring and evaluation meet the same standards as on-campus.</p>	
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The University has placed considerable attention to developing student learning outcomes and assessing program effectiveness. Instructors determine tools to assess competency in course related activities and assignments related to SLOs. The Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan focuses on 8 SLOs and students who successfully complete the Mathematics Education program are expected to be competent in all areas. The program also uses the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Principles and Standards for School Mathematics guidelines.</p>	

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

The Master of Arts Degree in Education, Option in Mathematics Education program provides a unique opportunity for students to not only gain knowledge and skills in mathematics and pedagogy, but also allows candidates to conduct research and assess the learning needs of diverse students. The research component of the program was highlighted by program participants interviewed during the EER visit. For example, at least one student participated in an opportunity, made available through the institution to present research findings alongside a CSULB faculty member to professors and colleagues in China. The program director is hopeful that this practice of having students present their research will be extended to other program candidates in the future.

California schools are in dire need of teachers with mathematics backgrounds. This program addresses the shortage and takes into consideration the benefits of using a cohort model in an off-campus delivery format which is responsive to schedules of working professionals. The College of Education at CSULB's response to community needs is laudable.



APPENDIX B

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUMMARY

Institution: California State University, Long Beach

Team Member(s)/Reviewer(s): Jená Burges

Dates distance education materials were viewed: 9/27/10- 10/6/10

Viewed in conjunction with (check all that apply):

EER

Context—For example, number of programs offered via distance education, degree levels offered via distance education, FTE enrollment, faculty numbers and composition; average class size:

An externally accredited MSW program for working professionals is offered via Saturday classes at a distance through video conferencing at two sites, one in Sonoma with a cohort of 25 and one at Channel Islands with a cohort of 26. The program began in 1995 with cohorts at Humboldt and Chico, and later launched cohorts at other sites – most of which have now become independent programs run by the universities that once served as remote CSULB MSW sites; the distance MSW has now completed five full three-year cycles. In this fully-interactive model, the students are at the remote site with microphones at every desk and a video screen displaying the instructor and instructional materials, while the instructors – faculty in the on-campus Social Work program - facilitate from a campus studio. There are also two local site coordinators in the classroom, and field seminars of 8-10 students are taught by local practitioners. Students do local field placements of 16 hours a week for four semesters.

Several other programs have substantial onlin



2010 cohort. Full-time faculty contributing to the EMER program come from eight different departments on campus. The program also has a cadre of professional practitioners in emergency services administration and management serving as part-time faculty. Student enrollment (including students finishing the previous version of the program in addition to the new cohorts): 89 students in Fall 2009; 61 students in Spring 2010; and 36 students in Summer 2010 for a total of 186 students served for FY 09/10.

Description of distance education interactions—What was viewed, description of formats, other details to help describe nature and context of the review:

Guest access to “BeachBoard,” CSU-LB’s version of the BlackBoard Learning Management System that constitutes the platform for online courses, was provided beginning 9/27/2010 to allow review of an impressive range of online resources and support available to students (e.g., tutorials to help students learn to navigate the BeachBoard environment, instructions for various components, self-assessment tools, contact names and numbers, etc.). Because several individual online courses (including Elluminate sessions) were reviewed before and during the CPR visit, and no concerns were raised, it was not necessary to enter individual courses again. As noted in the CPR report, a common template used across all of the online courses facilitates students’ familiarity with these modes of instruction.

Since the time of the CPR visit, CSU-LB has designed several hybrid workshops for purposes of faculty development, and access to five of those was also provided beginning September 27. An active workshop for faculty in the Beach Learning Community (the program for freshmen needing remediation in both math and English) was surveyed, along with archived workshops for faculty developing Business courses and for new faculty. These hybrid workshops seem well-structured and effective, and, while they are not designed for students, such experiences do serve to acquaint faculty with the principles of online course design, which ultimately benefits their students.

Other materials reviewed or persons interviewed concerning distance education—Prior to visit, on-site, or after the visit:

Documents:

- A list of questions following up on questions arising from the CPR visit and the EER reports was sent to the ALO prior to the visit, and a thorough response was received.
- A brochure for the MSW program was consulted.

Persons interviewed:

- Debbie Hildreth Pisarcik, Distance Education Supervisor, College of Continuing and Professional Education
- Leslie Kennedy, Director, Instructional Technology Support Services
- Jeet Joshee, Dean, College of Continuing and Professional Education
- Ken Millar, Dean, College of Health and Human Services
- Sue Stanley, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services
- Marilyn Potts, Master of Social Work Distance Education Director
- Shireen Pavri, Associate Dean, College of Education

In addition, follow-up emails were exchanged with Dr. Stanley and Dr. Joshee.



Suggested Lines of Inquiry: Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs	Observations and Findings	Check (X) here if
--	----------------------------------	--------------------------



Verification of Student Identity. What procedures does the institution have in place to ensure that the student who registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the academic credit? Does the institution make clear in writing that these processes protect student privacy and notify students at the time of registration or enrollment of any projected additional costs associated with the verification procedures? (CFRs 1.7, 1.8)

CSU-LB uses LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol) which also is tied with TIM (TIVOLI Identity Manager) for authentication purposes for

Appendix C

2010 Educational Effectiveness Review (EER.) A member of the visiting team was assigned to study the doctoral program. This report is a summary of what was learned about CSULB's Ed. D. program at the time of the October 6-8, 2010 accreditation review.

Enrollment Status:

In 2007, 27 students were admitted into Cohort I. In May 2010, 13 students graduated from the first cohort; 6 additional candidates defended their dissertations in summer 2010. There are currently four cohorts with 98 students at varying degrees of completion. Efforts to begin a spring 2011 cohort are currently underway. Students come, primarily, from Los Angeles and Orange County area schools and higher education institutions including CSULB. A review of ethnic distribution among admissions revealed a high percentage of underrepresented candidates within each of the four cohorts.

Program Evaluation and Candidate Assessment

In an interview with the Dean of the College of Education and the Ed.D. Program Director and through reviews of program documents, it became evident that two kinds of effectiveness information are collected through: 1) Program Evaluation and 2) Candidate Assessment.

Program Evaluation. The "Ed.D. Program Evaluation Procedure: Student Evaluation of Instructor, Program Surveys, and Focus Groups" is found in the Ed.D. Faculty Handbook. The procedures designate the individuals or groups who receive specific survey, focus, or other kinds of data. These include the college dean, Ed.D. program co-directors, and faculty. The Advisory Board, consisting of a wide representation, meets at least twice a year to advise on programs aspects, including the evaluation of program effectiveness. It was apparent at the time of the EER review, that data are being collected and used for making ongoing improvements on a regular basis. Program surveys are web-based and completed on an annual basis in September. One example of the use of data is that in the first year of operation, administrative office support to students was inconsistent; however, that concern was addressed and corrected with comparative data showing an annual increase in satisfaction. CSULB surveys of instructional performance are used on a regular basis except during the summer when the university does not generate the "Student Evaluation of Instructor" forms. Instead, the Ed. D. Program Office distributes a duplicate form allowing the students to evaluate instructors.

Another example of data collection and program improvement is the review of the first set of

opportunity to review dissertation samples from both program strands and, if she had used the dissertation rubric, would have given high ratings in all criteria, including scholarly writing. Rubrics are also available for examining the quality of the qualifying paper/exam. The criteria for evaluating the qualifying paper/exam also address the quality and tone of scholarly writing. Information gathered from these reviews is studied by the program faculty for the purpose of improving instruction in related courses.

Candidate Assessment. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) are clearly delineated in the Ed.D. Program and constitute an important element of the Ed.D. Program Assessment Plan. The Student Handbook lists the SLOs and other program materials. The program, and consequently the plan, are relatively new and have not yet undergone a campus program review; however, the program administration is responding to requests from Academic Affairs pertaining to assessment. The College of Education has an Assessment Office overseen by an Assessment Coordinator appointed in 2007. The Coordinator is a tenure track faculty member who also teaches in the Ed.D. Program. An Assessment Committee is charged to review college level data and make recommendations on program and unit operations. Based on evidence, it appears that this program is “on track” to meet assessment process requirements in a timely manner and to continue to use data for the purpose of ensuring overall student success.

Program Resources:

Finances: The Ed.D. Program receives funding for instruction from student tuition/fees along with Chancellor’s Office support. Program applications, at this time, do not appear to have been impacted by the economic crisis. Financial aid information is readily available for students who, though working in professional positions, are making a considerable financial commitment.

Faculty: Eleven Core Faculty members (tenure-track) are assigned to the Ed D. Program along with 17 Affiliated Faculty from the College of Education and other CSULB colleges. Six adjunct faculty have been selected to provide instruction, as needed. According to the Dean, one new faculty position has been allocated to the Ed.D. program. When this position is filled, the Core Faculty roster should be complete. A review of faculty “brief vitae” and faculty expectations point to high expectations in the hiring process. A minimal qualification is an “ongoing record of scholarly work.” In December 2010, the College of Education will host the First Annual Symposium on Educational Leadership – Practice, Policy, and Research. The Call for Proposals was being advertised at the time of the EER visit. The EDD Personnel Committee reviews applications and develops a recommended list of qualified faculty to teach each doctoral course.

Physical Space: The doctoral program is housed in the Library in a modern suite of rooms designed for working professionals. Students can enjoy a lounge area with microwave facilities, a separate computer study room, and administrative and faculty offices and classrooms within the same complex. The room configuration is conducive to interactive or solitary study with

direct access to research, technology, and other learning materials and tools. Classes are scheduled for late afternoons, evenings, and weekends when students can attend and when the Library is usually open.

Materials Reviewed and Persons Interviewed:

Prior to the site visit, the College of Education sent links to online Ed.D. materials which were then reviewed along with website information regarding the program. Before and during the visit, the following documents were studied: Ed.D. Assessment Plan, Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Qualifying Paper/Exam Rubrics, Dissertation Rubrics, Student Handbook, Faculty Handbook, CDs of the Ed.D. Program Plan with Samples of Student Work, and charts containing various kinds of data analyses.

A meeting with College of Education Dean