REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW

California State University Channel Islands

May 1, 2007

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

Initial Accreditation

Team Roster
William Plater, Chair; Patricia Patterson, Assistant Chair; Jackie Donath, Sandra
Kamusikiri, Deborah Olsen

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution
according to Commission Standards and the Core Commitment for Institutional
Capacity 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

SECTION I: OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

<u>IA. Description of Institution and Visits</u>

California State University-Channel Islands (CSUCI) is the newest campus in the 23-campus CSU system, which consists of 405,000 students and 44,000 faculty and staff. The campus has grown and evolved in all areas since its formal opening in August, 2002, when classes were offered to 1,320 full time transfer students. As of fall 2006 there were 2,868 undergraduates and 255 post baccalaureate students who study in one of 16 undergraduate majors. The first class of students who enrolled as freshmen at CSUCI will graduate in May, 2007. Currently there are 69 tenure track faculty and 178 full time and part time lecturers. The university expects to hire approximately 15 — 20 additional tenure track faculty for AY 2007-08.

The commitment to the mission of CSUCI, a truly "lived mission," greatly impressed teams from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. During the Capacity and Preparatory Review, a team visited CSUCI March 6 - 8, 2006. During the visit, team members met with faculty, administrators, students, and staff who discussed the self-study report and the campus' ability to fulfill its core commitments to capacity. A second visit took place March 14 — 16, 2007, for an Educational Effectiveness Review, which is the focus of this report. Team members met with faculty, staff, students, and administrators who discussed CSUCI's ability to meet institutional and programmatic objectives and how review processes, including data collection and reflection of evidence, are used to enhance educational effectiveness. In addition, the team read materials and interviewed campus representatives on the progress that had been made on each of the recommendations of the Capacity and Preparatory Review.

The visiting team's general opinion is that CSUCI is home to a cadre of dedicated faculty, staff, administrators, and students who are doing exemplary work and are committed to student success and to serving the region's diverse population. There is ample evidence of widespread endorsement of the mission and its educational objectives. Educational experiences both inside and outside the classroom are student-centered and directed toward ensuring that CSUCI graduates possess the characteristics associated with the four pillars upon which the mission is centered (i.e., integrative learning, experiential and service learning, multicultural perspectives, and international perspectives); that students will have participated in experiential and service learning opportunities and are capable of using integrative approaches grounded in multicultural and international perspectives to solve an array of problems.

After two visits to CSUCI, the visiting team acknowledges the graciousness of faculty, staff, administrators, and students who gave so willingly of their time to respond to the team's questions and share their views about the progress the campus is making in meeting its educational objectives. The team is grateful to the CSUCI WASC Accreditation Committee and, in particular, its WASC liaison, who before, during, and after the visits assisted the team in numerous ways. Finally, the team thanks the President and members of the administration for their boundless enthusiasm and commitment to engaging in the process as an authentic strategy for improving educational effectiveness and student success.

I.B. Quality of the Educational Effectiveness Presentation and Alignment with the Proposal

CSU Channel Islands' 2006 *Educational Effectiveness Report* adopted the comprehensive approach and followed the same format as used for both its 2002 *Candidacy* report and its 2005 *Capacity and Preparatory Review,* thus facilitating the team's ability to compare institutional developments over an extended period and to note specifically the ways the institution had

acted to address concerns raised at both the candidacy and the preparatory review stages. The consistency of format and overall institutional approach to accreditation ensured that all of WASC's Standards and Criteria for Review were addressed.

As with the *Capacity and Preparatory Review* report, the team found the *Educational Effectiveness Report* to be well organized, well written, and well documented, providing ample electronic linkages to evidence that supports the declarations and conclusions. *The team commends Channel Islands for its institution-wide commitment to and implementation of learning-centered practices that place it far ahead of many much older and better-established universities within CSU, the state and nation.* The team specifically applauds Channel Islands for the preparation of its effectiveness report and its overall use of evidence (including electronic formats) to provide the team with the information required to conduct the review. Additional information was made available on site to augment the electronic resources (e.g., a sample of student co-curricular portfolios, the 2006-07 *General Education Assessment Pilot on Integrative Learning,* a *Summary of Program Assessment Activities,* the *Assessment Plan Blueprints for Academic Programs,* the *Guidelines for Program Review,* and the *Seven-Year Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes).*

The *Educational Effectiveness Report* consisted of three essays that were intended to address Channel Islands' commitment to the central WASC principles of evidence of appropriate educational objectives at the university and program levels as well as the adequate application of review processes and use of data to ensure program delivery and student learning consistent with the awarding of certificates, baccalaureate, and masters degrees. The first essay documents the institution's alignment of programs, resources, and support with a defined set of learning objectives that are derived from the institution's mission and thus addresses Standard I and in particular Criteria 1.1 through 1.3. Within this essay, the institution also provides an important and relevant analysis of how Channel

Islands is working within the overall initiative of CSU, system-wide, to facilitate graduation. Specifically, CSU Channel Islands has taken advantage of the statewide project to augment, assess, and rededicate its campus programs and resources to support the overall objective of student success through completing degrees.

The second essay documents the actual processes of review and the uses of data to ensure that programs are being delivered with integrity and that students are meeting the stated learning outcomes at the course, program, and institutional levels [CFRs 1.6-1.8]. Most of the team's report will focus on this aspect of the review and Standards 2 and 4 in particular. In comparison with the capacity report, the *Educational Effectiveness Report makes* assessment of student learning its primary focus, while updating the institution's alignment of programs with objectives.

The third essay provides an overall integration of perspective for CSU Channel Islands and, further, reflects on two key issues related to educational effectiveness: (1) continued, planned growth of the university (in terms of student enrollments, physical facilities, and overall institutional maturation); and (2) continued implementation of a "culture of evidence" as a sustained and continuously expanding commitment while the university grows. The university has intentionally created a very special culture and shared set of community values (all based on mission) that will have to be nurtured, monitored, and reinforced as the campus grows in the number of programs that it offers, in the size of its student body and faculty, and in the inherent complexity of organization and management that come with growth [CFRs 1.5 and 1.7-9]. The team finds ample evidence of the solid commitment of all faculty and staff to the mission and the special community of shared values, and it is convinced overwhelmingly that the university has put into place administrative practices, organizational structures, and plans for growth that will ensure the

maintenance of its core mission [CFRs 1.1-2, 1.4, and 1.6-8]. These are reflected in the very detailed *Seven-Year Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes* with a complex but well-designed and ultimately very practical set of procedures, committees, and checks-and-balances to ensure delivery of effective assessment at the program and campus levels, in the still-emerging but equally clear expectations for faculty participation in assessment (as reflected, for example, in the Retention, Tenure and Promotion documents being developed for each program), and in the commitment of resources to support the mission and assessment of learning (e.g., compensated Program Assessment Officers for each academic program and the establishment of key administrative officers with dedicated responsibility for assessment at several critical points in the campus administration) [CFR3.5].

In summary, the overall institutional presentation, beginning with the *Educational Effectiveness Report* but including all of the presentations, discussions, and supplementary materials, accurately reflected the conditions the team observed during the site visit and were consistent with the evidence we found in print and electronic materials (e.g., course syllabi), in interviews with faculty, students, alumni, and staff, and in casual observations of the way members of the academic community interacted with each other as well as with the team. The report and other materials were consistent with the proposed model of a comprehensive review and fulfilled all expectations regarding the appropriate evidence and institutional integrity [CFRs 1.7 and 1.9].

The team was impressed by the extensive involvement of staff, faculty, students, and community members in the preparation of the report and other materials, including then-active participation in meetings and discussions [CFRs 1.7 and 1.9]. The team was especially impressed with the students and alumni, all of whom demonstrated a very sophisticated and comprehensive understanding of the institutional objectives, the student leaning outcomes,

and the complex but effective process for assessing performance. Indeed, there was ample evidence among all of the constituencies that the "culture of evidence and assessment" is woven into the very fabric of the institution—even to the point that students have incorporated these processes in their own student organizations, informal learning projects, and group interactions [CFRs 2.12 and 2.14]. Over 100 faculty, staff, students and community members, all of whom volunteered for the assignment, participated in the accreditation committee responsible for preparing the institution for the educational effectiveness review. Attendance of faculty, staff, and students at scheduled site visit meetings was a clear indication of extensive involvement—and interest—of all concerned parties [CFRs 4.7 and 4.8].

The team appreciates the way CSU Channel Islands has taken advantage of the WASC accreditation process in all of its stages as a mechanism for institutional improvement and commitment to mission. The reviews have been organized as rigorous exercises in self-improvement and the responsible administrators have exceeded the team's expectations for reflection, self-analysis, and improvement. In fact, the campus has gone beyond the WASC procedures to intentionally use external reviews and peer learning by seeking participation in projects like the CSU "Facilitating Graduation" initiative despite the additional burdens this project imposed for gathering materials and involving faculty and staff at a very busy time in its establishment as a campus. One improvement regarding transfer student advising and acculturation, for example, is being addressed as a result [CFR2.14].

IC. Preparatory Review Update

Following the 2006 Capacity and Preparatory Review visit to CSUCI the visiting team submitted its *"Report of the WASC Visiting Team: Capacity and Preparatory Review"* (April 26, 2006) to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. This report was then

submitted to the CSUCI campus along with a July 7, 2006 letter from the WASC Executive Director. In these documents several recommendations were listed as issues that the campus should consider as it entered the Educational Effectiveness Review: clear evidence of the extent of student achievement in Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program (major) and degree levels; identification of the structural role of the Centers in achieving the university mission and student learning outcomes; examination of the structure of mission-critical councils and committees to achieve institutional goals; evidence of a robust system of collecting, analyzing, coordinating, and using data; and exploration of the possibility of a strategic investment of special funding at the critical stage of capacity building.

These issues were addressed by the campus in Appendix 1 of the *Educational Effectiveness Report* and further explored by the team during its visit. The following provides the team's assessment of the progress made in regard to issues raised in the *Capacity and Preparatory Review Report* and the WASC commission letter:

Student Achievement and Student Learning Outcomes. A committee of faculty was convened and produced a detailed and clear report on the campus's efforts to demonstrate its use of course-, program- and degree-level student learning outcomes. At the course level, an audit undertaken by the Provost's office indicated 95% of fall 2006 course syllabi have clearly stated student learning outcomes; a similar spring 2007 review reported that 98% of the courses now specify student learning outcomes. The visiting team reviewed dozens of course syllabi across all programs and found that all of the syllabi examined had at least adequate statements of expected student learning outcomes. In fact, no course proposal will be approved by the Curriculum Committee unless it specifies student learning outcomes. Many syllabi, however, did not address learning objectives at the program or degree levels. The recently appointed Chief Assessment Officer for Academic Affairs will now work with

program chairs to ensure that there is meaningful assessment at the course level and to refine statements of learning objectives—especially with regard to also linking course objectives with the program, general education, and degree objectives. Programs in English, Business, Math, Biology, Computer Science, Education, and Environmental Science and Resource Management have used a variety of direct assessments including portfolios, essays, capstone work, and projects to demonstrate the extent of student learning.

In fall 2006, CSUCI undertook assessment of one of the pillars of its mission—integrative ability—and the campus will use this recently completed assessment to examine the General Education Program, mission-based centers and institutional outcomes. Despite the fact that this inaugural review of a key degree-level learning goal is very recent, the visiting team was able to observe enough work to assess its substantive nature and to be assured of an effective process for continued improvement. The team expects that the plan to conduct a review of one of the four pillars each year will ensure a systematic and comprehensive approach to review. Collaboration between the Program Assessment and Review Committee (PARC) and the Chief Assessment Officer for Academic Affairs is intended to ensure that a sustainable infrastructure of on-going program assessment is implemented. Both the President and Provost share responsibility for ensuring that the ' work is completed and used for institutional improvement [CFR 3.10].

At the baccalaureate degree level, two mission-based, fundamental learning outcomes have been identified:

- Identify and describe the modern world and issues facing societies from multiple perspectives including those within and across disciplines, cultures and nations (when appropriate).

- Analyze issues and develop and convey to others solutions to problems usingg the methodologies, tools and techniques of an academic discipline.

The first outcome was assessed in fall 2006 through an instrument designed by the Center for Integrative Studies in an examination that crossed the unit and disciplinary boundaries of the university, in order to include co-curricular programs and the mission-based centers as well as the majors. The focus of this assessment — the integrative aspect of general education, as noted above — will serve as a model for subsequent comprehensive assessments of learning outcomes. Masters degree programs will become part of the university in 2007, and plans are already underway to assess program and degree-level learning.

The most impressive element of the university's response to this recommendation was the development of the *Seven Year Plan for Assessment,* which integrates assessment and reflection on student learning and creates the structures to collect data and to support the reflection and action that are the hallmarks of an authentic culture of evidence. This plan includes a time-line for the assessment of the four pillars that conceptualize the essence of the experiences and characteristics of CSUCI graduates through mission-based center involvement. These assessments will be integrated with students' experiences in their program of study as well as their involvement in co-curricular activities, resulting in an assessment of student learning that encompasses the learning that takes place inside and outside the classroom. *The visiting team suggests that as graduate programs become a larger part of the fabric of the university, they should be considered a part of the Seven-Year Plan for Assessment with a time-line for assessment added in a systematic way. This addition will assist the university in fully meeting the Criteria for Review described in 2.2, 2.4, and 2.7.*

The document also sets out a plan to assess student learning in the General Education program. The first project, undertaken during AY 2006-07, was to assess "Integrate content, ideas, and approaches from various cultural and disciplinary perspectives." Examples of student writing were used to examine the extent of student learning associated with this outcome. *The visiting team is encouraged by the processes in place to discuss assessment results and ensure that the assessment loop is closed.* The initial assessment of "integration" provides a practical model for "closing the loop" in other assessments. Finally, the components of program review and the attendant assessment of program outcomes are detailed in this report and supported by an extensive "Guidelines for Program Review" document that was prepared in February, 2007. Program review will begin fall 2007 and the visiting team encourages the campus to ensure that indicators of achievement of student learning objectives are established that allow both the program and external reviewers to provide feedback and recommendations based on evidence-based discussions. Compliance in this regard will fully implement the values inherent in Criteria for Review 2.3, 2.4, and 2.7.

As noted, the visiting team appreciates the fact that as a new institution CSUCI is undertaking many of its substantive reviews for the first time and hence its assessment is based more on plans than on actual results over a full cycle of multi-year reviews. Based on completed products and well documented plans, policies and procedures, the team is satisfied that the institution meets WASC standards 2, 3 and 4.

Role of the Centers. The report on *The Role of the Centers,* prepared by a committee of representatives drawn from across campus, describes the university's progress in strengthening the explicit connections between four mission-based centers and what CSUCI now identifies as the "four pillars" of its mission: integrative approaches, which are the

province of the Center for Integrative Studies; experiential and service learning, which will be overseen by the Center for Civic Engagement and Service Learning (this center was approved shortly before the visit and after the Educational Effectiveness Report had been submitted); multicultural perspectives, which are supported by the Center for Multicultural Learning and Engagement; and international perspectives, which are the responsibilities of the Center for International Affairs.

Thus, each of the four Centers supports mission elements of the University by some combination of:

- Support for, and facilitation of, mission-centered scholarship and research;

- Support for and facilitation of mission-centered teaching and learning;

- Development of relevant assessments in programs and the baccalaureate degree.

For example, The Center for International Affairs promotes "cross-cultural and global understanding in all fields of study, assists faculty in developing the international dimension of their teaching, scholarship, and service activities, diversifies the student body to include outstanding students who represent a broad range of geographic, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds, and coordinates activities that enhance campus global awareness and augment the international life of the campus and local community." (Appendix: 19). The Center for Integrative Studies developed a strategic plan for 2006-2007 which included collaboration with the General Education Assessment Committee to pilot assessment of integrative student learning and a plan to begin to assess the baccalaureate by developing learning outcomes and assessment tools in consultation with program chairs. Since the Capacity and Preparatory Report, the Center for Multicultural Learning and Engagement developed a plan for 2006-2007 which focused on organizing a cross-divisional committee to

help the Center define multiculturalism and diversity in meaningful, relevant and assessable ways. The newly approved Center for Civic Engagement and Service Learning will focus on the ways it can foster the development of civic engagement, and enhance experiential and service learning throughout the University's curriculum and co-curricular activities and programming. *The visiting team urges the campus to move quickly to put the most recently approved Center for Civic Engagement and Service Teaming on a full and equal footing with the other three centers to ensure the even development op the four "pillars" of the campus mission.*

Review of Councils and Committees. The "Response to Recommendations" section of the Educational Effectiveness Report includes a letter dated August 9, 2006, from the President asking the University Planning and Coordinating Council (UPACC) to review the university's non-Senate committees and to advise him as to what actions he might take to ensure that committee service at CSUCI remains both meaningful and effective. The Provost and Vice President made a similar request to the Senate.

UPACC set a goal of having the review of all campus committees completed by the end of the fall 2006 semester, and it is now working to ensure that there are no duplications of effort, that all committees and councils have reasons for being, and that reporting lines are clear and appropriate. The Senate's Strategic and Tactical Planning Committee voted to disband at the end of the 2006-2007 academic year. Other committees are still in the process of review.

Data analysis system. As was typical for the university in responding to the Capacity and Preparatory Review Team's recommendations, a committee made up of various members of the CSUCI community was convened to examine this recommendation and filed a report included in the *Educational Effectiveness Report.* The committee reviewed the university's processes, structures and resources before reaching its finding that in most

significant aspects CSUCI uses data to support its mission-based decision-making. The WASC Report asserts that CSUCI has an information system in place that addresses the immediate- to mid-range university data needs for decision-making [CFR 3.6 and 3.7]:

- by accommodating existing data (both institutional data and assessment data);

- by being scalable for use once large-scale institutional data and assessment data becomes more widely available;

- by participating in the CMS;

- by developing campus-based procedures to collect, and analyze data;

- and perhaps most important of all, by using existing data in our decision-making.

The "WASC Committee Report" believes that CSUCI is optimizing its resources and finds that CSUCI is poised for the next phase of growth in data acquisition, storage, and retrieval for University decision-making.

The visiting team reviewed a number of documents and also discussed the use of data during a number of meetings [CFR 3.6]. The team found marked improvement in the past year regarding CSUCI's ability to gather, analyze, and reflect upon data to make evidence-based decisions. The addition of a staff member to the Office of Institutional Research has undoubtedly assisted in the availability and use of data. However, in order to fully implement the tenets described in CFRs 4.3 and 4.5, *we encourage additional attention to the development of performance indicators that can be used as part of the assessment of student learning and as part of the program review process.*

Strategic investment of special funding. At the end of May 2006, the President met with the CSU Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. At that time

he presented an analysis of the University's need for special funding. As a result of that meeting, CSU staff prepared legislation that would relieve the University from an obligation inherited from the old State Hospital and recognize that the fixed costs for a new campus are significantly out of proportion with those of established campuses and thus in need of commensurate funding. While it is not clear whether legislative relief will take place during the coming session of the legislature, it is expected that a funding solution will be devised by the end of 2007. The Chancellor also acknowledged the capital needs of the campus and persuaded the Board of Trustees to provide an exception to their policy on capital projects for the benefit of California State University Channel Islands. As a result, the University will receive sixty-two million dollars from the passage of State Bond Proposition 1D in support of five projects this year and next. In addition, these actions reveal that the Chancellor's Office recognizes that in order to sustain the excellence of the programs at CSUCI, the University requires extraordinary funding.

SECTION II: EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

II.A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry: Essay 1

Mission/Outcomes/Alignment. It seems natural to expect that the goal of a public, comprehensive university is to make a difference, both in society and in the lives of individuals. In the case of CSUCI, the development of a campus-based mission is "complicated" by the university's relationship with the CSU system and the particularities of the demands placed on that system by the Master Plan and the Legislature of the state of California. CSUCI has crafted a mission statement that integrates the fundamental responsibilities of a campus in the California State University system with the creation of a particular, individual institution, serving a specific region with a unique group of principle- and value-based programs and activities.

Describing its mission as, "Placing students at the center of the educational experience, California State University Channel Islands provides undergraduate and graduate education that facilitates learning within and across disciplines through integrative approaches, emphasizes experiential and service learning, and graduates students with multicultural and international perspectives, " cited on p.6 of the CSUCI Educational Effectiveness Report—2006 (EER—2006). Both explicitly, through the achievement of its mission, and implicitly, as a campus in the CSU system, California State University Channel Islands meets generally understood standards in the creation, sustenance and intentions of its educational programs [CFR 2.1].

During the team's two visits to CSUCI it is evident that the campus is mission-focused. Faculty, students, staff, and administrators have embraced the tenets and values espoused in the mission and these values drive decision-making in academic planning, budget planning, and space planning. All three processes are aligned with the mission as stakeholders attempt to design and implement curricular and co-curricular programs and activities in which meeting the mission is a critical part of all discussions.

To align its curriculum and support services with its mission, CSUCI developed "mission-based learning outcomes" (EER—2006, p.7) Within this framework the university has focused on two major learning goals for its graduates [CFR 2.5]. This section will focus on the first, which is to "Identify and describe the modern world and issues facing societies from multiple perspectives including those within and across disciplines, cultures and nations (when appropriate)." (EER—2006, p.7)

CSUCI has developed an innovative structure to support this learning goal by creating three "mission-based" centers between 2004 and 2006—the CIA (Center for International Affairs), the CIS (Center for Integrative Studies) and the CMLE (Center for

Multicultural Learning and Engagement. A fourth center, CCESL (Center for Civic Engagement and Service Learning) was just recently approved and should be fully formed by fall 2007, if not earlier. As proposed, the centers appear to offer a framework of support that connects various university departments and programs along a number of overlapping and potentially interconnected activities and initiatives [CFRs 2.2 and 2.3]. The creation of the centers is an innovative and significant step toward creating what educational commentator Parker Palmer calls "communities of shared practice."

However, despite significant effort to clarify the function, structure and missions of these centers, the precise way in which the centers will accomplish their purported support of "key mission elements" is still a bit unclear to the team. While the centers appear to have the potential to cross and blur the defined responsibilities--or turf—that traditionally belong to departmental units and to facilitate integrative and interdisciplinary course experiences and activities, the promise of the centers appears to be fulfilled mostly at the basic, structural or event level, rather than at a more complicated, more evolved curricular one. *The team encourages further discussion and development of the structural role of the centers to ensure that they truly serve as guardians of the university's mission. In addition, the team recommends that the role of the provost in overseeing the effectiveness of the centers be further clarified, although the team notes that all of the center directors report directly to the provost and this matter has already been addressed as an organizational issue.*

The university mission and the structures that the university community has developed reveal CSUCI's desire to develop effective educational practices that confront both the subtlety and complexity of the learning process and the realities facing its students [CFR 1.1]. The first learning goal seems a response to those perceptions - and an effort to reform both the content and delivery of a truly meaningful, contemporary baccalaureate

education [CFR 2.4]. *We encourage a focused effort to assess the effectiveness of student learning related to mission-based center activities.*

The updated analysis of the "Alignment of CSUCI Curriculum with Institutional Mission-Based Learning Outcomes" indicates that both major and General Education courses meet one or some combination of the university's learning goals [CFR2.2]. The clear connection, both intended and actual, between the mission and the university curriculum, is embodied in the matrix of Table 1 (EER—2006, p.9) and reveals the layers and intersections of educational intention and degree programs at CSUCI. In addition, there is ample evidence, both in written documents provided to the visiting team as well as in conversations during the visit, that student learning is being examined at both the general education and program level. As is typical on almost all campuses, assessment indicators vary in type, complexity, and elegance across programs. And while still in the nascent stages of a systematic examination of student learning (partially because of the youth of the campus) it is evident that assessment of student learning is ingrained in the institution at all levels and across all divisions. Student work is being examined as indicators of the effectiveness of student learning and adjustments are being made on the basis of this evidence [CFRs 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6]. *The visiting team encourages CSUCI to go beyond course level examinations of student learning and ensure that outcomes are articulated and assessed at the program and institutional levels.*

The Program Review process, for which clear guidelines are found in Academic Senate Policy 03-35, approved in February 2007, and to be implemented in fall 2007, will also assist with enhancing the ability of CSUCI to use student learning evidence for assessing educational effectiveness. *The team is encouraged by this policy and sees it as an opportunity to truly personify the alignment of program planning, institutional planning and resource allocation.*

One particularly important factor in the future success of CSUCI is the campus's ability to continue to recruit a committed and interdisciplinary faculty and a staff with strong skills and willingness to support the university's collaborative mission [CFR 3.1 and 3.2]. The first years of the university's existence have been shaped by the special processes the campus employs to identify and hire a faculty who will "embrace the CSUCI mission and values" (EER—2006, p11). The team's campus visits clearly provide evidence that all members of the CSUCI community are remarkably focused on the university's mission and there is a heartening agreement on fundamental community values like civility, respect, and support [CFR 3.2 and 3.3]. *However, the pace of faculty and staff hires seems to be (barely) matching the phenomenal growth in the student population. The campus has not managed to fill all the faculty positions it has funded and this is a matter of some concern to the team, especially given the service workload which faculty have accepted, even as the team appreciates and supports the care being taken to find a proper match between the CSUCI mission and candidates who are actually offered appointments.*

Strategic planning has been central in CSUCI's start-up period—and in large measure, the success of a number of campus efforts and initiatives since 2002 can be attributed to the campus's commitment both to strategic, long-range planning and to short-term planning. As a result, CSUCI has made great strides since its inception precisely because of its systematic planning process. As noted in the 2005 Capacity and Preparatory Review Team Report, strategic planning is occurring at all levels of the university on a regular and meaningful basis. References to strategic planning in the *Educational Effectiveness Report* attach the university's mission as well as the more mundane aspects of day-to-day operations [CFR 4.2].

The university is also remarkably proactive in presenting its mission and expectations to students, parents and community stakeholders. In the *Educational Effectiveness Report,*

CSUCI presents compelling evidence in the form of strategic planning documents, reports and conversations which document its commitment to being an institution with a consistent set of "expectations for learning and student attainment" [CFR 2.3].

CSUCI strengthens the consistency and coherence of its commitment to its mission through its unique and effective alignment of its co-curricular programs and healthy and focused collaborations between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The elegantly conceived "Dimensions of Development" structure frames and supports Student Affairs programming and places Student Affairs squarely in the center of the university. CSUCI has effectively enlarged and operationalized a rich and deep sense of the meaning of "academic programming" and the result is a seamless melding of curricular and co-curricular planning and programming both in and outside of the classroom. There is substantial evidence in the *Educational Effectiveness Reports* Exhibits section that both the curricular and co-curricular components of the university have developed and are implementing meaningful review, assessment, and improvement activities [CFR 4.2 and 4.3].

WASC Standard 4 is reflected in CSUCI's strategic planning process (plans were reviewed in the Capacity and Preparatory Review process), which has undergone some reworking in the past year. Not only do all units on campus prepare and report on five year plans, but in December 2006 the campus prepared a report entitled, *Seven Year Plan for Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes,* which holds the promise of adding another dimension to the periodic reflection on the institution's progress toward its educational goals [CFR 3.8, 3.11, and 4.1] and its engagement with and commitment to educational commentator A.W. Chickering's "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education."

The institutional commitment to good practice extends to support for faculty development [CFR 3.4] The Office of Faculty Development was established in the summer

of 2002 and the newly hired Faculty Development Director will begin in the fall of 2007. Other campus units, such as the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, the university Library and Information Technology services also support faculty development. All newly appointed tenure-track faculty were provided with re-assigned time in the 2006-2007 academic year to facilitate course preparation and research and creative activities. A robust faculty mini-grant program, travel funds, retreats, sabbaticals and workshops all illustrate the university's support of the institution's fundamental commitment to ensuring a sustained and sustainable educational organization.

CSUCI has dedicated a great deal of its psychic and fiscal resources to support teaching and learning. For example, in fall 2006, the Dean of Faculty instituted a series of meetings that resulted in a "Malting Teaching Public" initiative. Several program plans have been developed and were in the early stages of implementation in spring 2007 including an open classroom day; professional learning community structures known as "critical friends" groups; "teaching circles" which provide support for the exploration of themes arising from engagement with teaching and learning; and the Making Teaching Public electronic journal proposal, which will create a website repository devoted to teaching [CFR 2.8 and 2.9].

Teaching is also at the center of the retention, tenure and promotion (RTP) process and the university has developed a campus-wide RTP policy and process which has enough inherent flexibility to allow programs to develop their Own explicit processes and policies if they so choose—all within the campus-wide policy. All faculty members develop Professional Development Plans which are consistent with their programs' standards and which organize their efforts to meet the university's expectations for retention, tenure and promotion [CFR 1.4, 2.8, and 2.9].

A final demonstration of the campus' commitment to achieving its goals and devotion to its mission can be found in the alignment of university strategic planning and more mundane planning activities with its educational goals [CFR 4.2]. All university divisions have developed strategic plans (reviewed during the Capacity and Preparatory phase), as have some programs. The University Planning and Coordinating Council (UPACC), co-chaired by the Provost and a faculty member [CFR 3.11], ensures that campus resources are distributed in ways that support the CSUCI Strategic Plan. Its recommendations are based on reviews of qualitative and quantitative data and reports from various units. In addition to UPACC, the President and the Provost [CFR 3.8] have led the faculty in preparing updated Academic Master Plans on a regular basis since the university's inception in 2001. In fall 2006, the President received the most recent incarnation of this effort, the *CSUCI Revised Academic Master Plan 2007-2014.* These activities reflect the commitment of the campus to assessing all units with responsive flexibility while framing the process with a deep, rich, and complex understanding of the purpose of assessment and its use for improvements in educational effectiveness (CFRs 4.4 and 4.6).

IIB. Evaluation of the Institution's Systems for Enhancing Teaching Effectiveness and learning Results: Essay 2

Commitment/Policy/Structure. While the first years of CSUCI's efforts have been focused on the creation and delivery of an integrated, innovative interdisciplinary curriculum, the university is now poised to continue and deepen the systematic and meaningful review of its programs and achievement of student learning goals. The campus's philosophical commitment to this type of review is embedded in its policy on continuous improvement and in the "Assessment of Results" section of the 2003-2008 campus strategic plan [CFR 4.1]. The university's *Educational Effectiveness Report* delineates the most significant ways in

which CSUCI has begun to move from theoretical commitments to manifestations of the process of data-based reviews [CFR 2.10].

Certainly CSUCI has structures in place to support this effort. In response to a concern raised by the Team during the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review, the campus has begun development of a comprehensive assessment plan that engages student learning outcomes at all levels of University activity—from the course to the degree level. Drawing on consultations with two recognized experts in the field of assessment—Drs. Trudy Banta and Mary Allen—CSUCI has developed an assessment structure of responsibility and engagement that reaches from the faculty to the President and includes all the appropriate individuals, committees and support units [CFRs 3.10 and 3.11]. CSUCI's current model describes refinements to the Assessment Council, described in greater detail below, as well as the designation of a Chief Assessment Officer, to coordinate campus assessment activities.

The Assessment Council has developed three significant policies to support the university's commitment to data-driven review and improvement. First, the Office of Institutional Research has been designated as the official "warehouse" and repository of all completed studies. Second, the Assessment Council has been charged with oversight and scheduling of campus surveys dealing with institutional research issues. Finally, and most substantially, the Assessment Council will oversee the five-year periodic review cycle of each division's assessment plan, providing summative information to the President. Focusing on the adequacy of campus assessment efforts, the measurement of well-defined outcomes, and attention to the uses of results, this element of the Assessment Council's responsibilities has the potential to ensure that the campus will be able to demonstrate both its commitment to learning and improvement and provide a roadmap for internal change [CFR 4.3]. As expected, these processes involve all appropriate stake-holders, including community

members [CFR 4.8], and provide significant faculty engagement with the processes of teaching and learning and ensure that faculty members are accountable for necessary and continuous improvements in learning [CFR 4.7].

The CSUCI *Educational Effectiveness Report* (pp.32-38) also documents the university's efforts to ensure that the student learning assessment roles and responsibilities of all segments of the campus are specifically, clearly and functionally defined. During the team's visit, the pervasiveness of student learning assessment at the campus was evident in both policy and practice. For example, not only do students understand the importance of assessment and evidence-based decision making but they also use this approach in making refinements to student activities [CFR 2.12]. The campus has also engaged with the California State University system's assessment initiatives, demonstrating its understanding that both internal and external constituencies have a significant stake in the assessment of student learning and program improvement and recognizing how the campus can work within the CSU framework and authority, direction, and review of the CSU Board of Trustees [CFR 3.9].

Curriculum Assessment. Review, and Continuous Improvement. Because assessment is conducted at the level of courses, majors,'General Education, and the degree in the curricular domain and is a central element of the co-curricular domain as well, it is always a challenge to create an infrastructure that can coordinate multiple levels of effort and facilitate communication among the different sectors of the university. Despite explicit attempts to better coordinate assessment across the university referenced above, the organizational structure (EER—2006, p. 32) remains complex. While such complexity is not necessarily an impediment to effectiveness, the significant promise of faculty's current assessment work at the course- and program-level must be supported by a clear sense that their efforts are used

to improve the university as a whole. The danger in any large, complex committee structure is that its activities will become divorced from core instructional and academic functions and marginalized in the faculty's mind. The team's discussions with faculty, staff, administrators, and students lead us to believe that CSUCI is aware of this inherent challenge; thus, they have explicitly built in feedback loops directed toward ensuring that assessment activities are mission-based and focused on educational effectiveness [CFRs 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4].

The university is to be commended for encouraging faculty to document assessment activities, including committee work and course-based outcomes evaluations, in their tenure and promotion materials [CFR 2.8 and 2.9]. Similarly, the university demonstrates its institutional commitment to assessment, review, and improvement by providing re-assigned time and other incentives for faculty engagement in assessment [CFR 3.2 and 3.11]. This concrete reinforcement of the value of assessment to the campus is notable, particularly as CSUCI has worked to provide positive motivation for faculty to engage in assessment, rather than punishing those which do not. The establishment of a fairly high set of expectations for faculty in this regard reinforces the need to ensure—through the committee structure and mission-based Centers—that faculty are continually updated about university interests and priorities and given the opportunity to align their teaching with these priorities [CFR 4.2 and 4.3]. Faculty are responsive to data and information and keeping them abreast of what is institutionally important will encourage the assessment of key areas at critical junctures. Moreover, knowing that the university has used their findings in the past will make the faculty more likely to undertake assessment, review and improvement activities in the future [CFR 4.1 and 4.3].

The CSUCI *Educational Effectiveness Report* and discussion during the team's visit provide compelling evidence of the truly fine assessment efforts undertaken to date, such as

the Directed Self Placement for English Assessment, course-level assessment activities, and general education assessment of the Institutional Mission-Based Learning Outcomes. These efforts and those planned for the future will require considerable care, nurturance, recognition and support. External reviewers from WASC and from the state-mandated review on Facilitating Graduation have all expressed concern about the potential for faculty "burn out" as a result of the stress and energy they are expending to build the campus. The university addressed this issue in the Educational Effectiveness Report, so it is aware of the need for vigilance [CFR 3.3]. *Nonetheless, the team urges that further thought and care be given to the sustainability of this level of energy.*

While all universities and colleges need to assume less and question more about the learning that goes on in the classroom, CSUCI is well-placed to be a particular beneficiary of assessment. First, assessment offers the university the tools that both ensure and demonstrate that the more experimental and innovative aspects of the curriculum are achieving the purposes they were designed to accomplish. Second, these first steps on the path to connect course, program and degree-level assessment suggest that CSUCI could distinguish itself as a leader in this arena and become a model of how a culture of evidence can be created within a university environment that is compatible with faculty support and creativity. *The team commends CSUCI for its institution-wide commitment to and implementation of learning-centered practices, which are systematically assessed to enhance student learning and program improvement.*

General Education Assessment Activities. At CSUCI,"general education assessment has taken place at several levels. At the campus level, syllabi have been examined by the General Education Committee to ensure the inclusion of learning objectives (as noted earlier, the campus reports that 98% of all course syllabi for spring 2007 include student

learning goals) and to verify that courses continue to serve the curricular and learning goals under which they were approved. The insight that courses "drift" overtime is no doubt true and CSUCI has created a Senate Policy that states that all courses will be reviewed every five years. One possible benefit of this type of fidelity review is a more universal and consistent view of the instructional content and intentions of the general education curriculum. It may be helpful to have the faculty reviewers who staff this project informally discuss their impressions of the general education course syllabi with other faculty in an open forum.

The general education curriculum is also being assessed using a writing-based performance measure, based on secondary analysis of student assignments collected from two courses that enroll a wide cross-section of the University's students. The first mission-based goal, "Identify and describe the modern world and issues facing societies from multiple perspectives including those within and across disciplines, cultures and nations (when appropriate)" (EER—2006, p.7), is simultaneously being assessed in majors and in general education. Extant student writing specimens were identified from two upper-division general education courses. Focusing on students' interdisciplinary training, this ingeniously designed study is an excellent model of the ways in which faculty can think creatively about the calibration of student learning by drawing on materials and assignments readily available as elements of "normal" coursework. The other "thorny" issue that arises when assessing programs such as general education, which cut across disciplinary areas, is how one can implement necessary change. Post assessment discussions involving faculty from several disciplines, who have all demonstrated their ability during the hiring process to think in interdisciplinary ways should serve to mitigate this challenge.

Other layers of student learning assessment being utilized at CSUCI include a standardized achievement test (the MAPP) [CFR 2.6] and an attitudinal self-report survey

[CFR 2.10]. The team understands that at the direction of the Chancellor's Office, these and other measures, including CLA, are being implemented and that CSUCI has volunteered to use CLA with junior transfer students to assess their progress in a way that can be used to compare with native freshmen. *The visiting team encourages CSUCI to continue to identify appropriate peer institutions and to sustain the process of conducting benchmarking studies as a way to add external reviews to the process of student learning assessment.*

Assessment of the major. At the program level, the campus has successfully provided incentives to implement initial assessment activities with funds from the Smith Family Assessment Plan Preparation Program. Each program has chosen one objective, selected or designed a compatible measure, collected data, and reflected on the meaning of that data, its implications and any program changes that may be required. The range of strategies employed by different programs was commendable and were well-framed by both the specific learning goals chosen and the traditions of each discipline. For example, departments like art gravitated fairly naturally to exhibition and portfolio measures, while other programs used common exam questions or holistic group evaluations of student products. Departments varied somewhat in their abilities to use the data to draw useful and/or actionable inferences, but time and experience should help all departments become more sophisticated consumers of data.

A very significant change since the team's last visit is the creation of very specific program review procedures [CFR2.7]. Program review will begin during fall 2007 when four departments begin the process. The *Guidelines for Program Review* provide very clear descriptions of the content of the self-study, which contains four elements fashioned after WASC's four standards: 1) Defining Program Purposes and Ensuring Educational Outcomes; 2) Achieving Educational Objectives; 3) Developing and Applying Resources to

Ensure Sustainability; and 4) Creating an Organization Committed to learning and Improvement. Each element has associated criteria for review and a list of potential documentation and reflection ideas. The campus is currently developing "dashboard indicators" of institutional effectiveness, which will be collected centrally and available in common formats from the Office of Institutional Research.

The program review process will include an external review, which will be followed by a review by the Program Assessment and Review Committee. Recommendations from these two review bodies will be forwarded to the program chair, Dean, Academic Senate chair, and Provost. A critical element of the review process is program improvement. Thus, after all parties have read the documents and suggested recommendations, program faculty, the Dean, and the Provost will meet to discuss the recommendation and create an action plan to which all parties agree. As described in Senate Policy, this agreement "will be embodied in a memorandum of understanding which will be in effect until the completion of the new review cycle." These processes embody best practices in assessment and ensure that continuous improvement is the foundation for review [CFRs 2.2, 2.7, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4].

An issue that remains murky is how the potential confluence of mission-based centers and program assessments will (or even can) be melded together in program review. While realizing that the relationships between the centers and programs is complex and evolving, *the Team none the less feels that it is important to clarify how these inter-related but independent entities will be able to express their unique identities and aspirations in a single campus report framework.* The Centers are intended to provide a superstructure for interdisciplinary activities and so it is hard to see how then" goals can be subsumed within specific program reviews. If different aspects of the Centers' missions are in different programs, which would solve some logistical

issues, this approach could unintentionally reinforce the traditional program/discipline paradigm that CSUCI is so conscientiously working to replace.

Assessment in other areas. Because assessment, review, and improvement have been built into the University's structure, processes and policies from its inception, CSUCI demonstrates both its awareness of WASC expectations and best practices across the institution [CFR 2.3 and 2.7]. In this regard, several areas of the university deserve specific mention.

In the WASC Capacity' and Preparatory Review, the Team highlighted the special collaborative relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs at CSUCI. This year's visit deepened the Team's appreciation of the importance of this effort and the exciting advances made by Student Affairs in assessing and reviewing its co-curricular programming and activities in the context of central curricular issues as well as student learning and student satisfaction. Co-curricular portfolios are an outstanding example of how students are asked to align their co-curricular activities with what they have learned in the classroom through the development of the co-curricular transcript. Students not only understand the importance of learning inside and outside the classroom, but also how academic affairs and student affairs complement one another [CFRs 2.11, 2.13, and 4.6]. *The team commends CSUCI for its sustained collaboration between and mutual respect of academic affairs and student affairs, giving CSUCI one of its most critical elements of continued success.* In addition, the details of training for residence directors in the Student Housing Program and the university plan to physically symbolize the nine dimensions of development in its construction of new student housing in Santa Cruz Village deserve special commendation. Similarly, the Student Leadership activities sponsored by Student affairs have borne visible fruit among alumni as well as current students.

Academic Affairs has also taken significant steps to improve the educational effectiveness of two of its non-classroom-based units, the Library and Academic Advising. The completion of the John Spoor Broome Library in January 2008 will enlarge the Library's already significant support for faculty and classes, student activities and the external community. Discussions between the Team and library faculty indicate that vital assessments, in addition to faculty and student surveys, have been taking place to ensure that the Library's resources and facilities support the University's educational mission [CFRs 2.3, 2.13, and 4.6].

Similarly, Academic Advising has focused its attention on the central/institutional-level needs of students as well as the program advising that majors often require. Data from the sophomore and senior assessment instrument being used during the 2006-207 academic year will certainly aid the development of an effective and supportive program [CFRs 2.3, 2.13, and 4.6). And, as noted earlier, the Advising Center has begun creating programming designed specifically to meet the needs of transfer students [CFR 3.14].

II.C. Other Issues Arising from the Standards and CFRs

The team discerned no gaps in the institution's presentation or in the evidence offered in documenting that it has met all of the Standards and Criteria for Review. In most respects, CSU Channel Islands exceeds expectations given its developing status as a new institution. Some areas were not the focus of this review but were addressed within the context of educational effectiveness and found to be substantially unchanged or, more often, improved since the capacity[7] review a year ago. Specifically, fiscal and physical resources are aligned well with educational objectives and institutional purposes [CFR 3.5] although CSUCI would benefit greatly from further resource investments by the state and CSU.

The team has identified six concerns, none of which is serious and all of which have been recognized by the institution. The one concern about institutional data must be understood within the context of CSU Channel Island's relative youth. The team has no reservations about the institution's having met all threshold standards for the collection, analysis and use of data. However, as the institution matures the need for and relevance of increasingly specific and sophisticated data analyses will become apparent as the campus community increases its efforts to improve. There is already such an ingrained use of data in decision making and planning that the demand for information will drive increased capacity for institutional research. Already CSU Channel Islands has gone far beyond most mature universities in its use of data for accountability, improvement, and planning. The team's concern is that the faculty, staff, and administrators—indeed, even many of the student leaders—have already reached a point in their use of analyzed data that exceeds resources while Channel Islands is still in the early stages of developing its personnel, routines, and systems. But the team reiterates its conclusion that Channel Islands meets all standards for the collection and use of data.

SECTION III: MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After completing two visits, the visiting team has a deep appreciation for the sense of shared responsibility and purpose that is evident within the entire community. Traditional hierarchical relationships have been eliminated in many areas of university life in favor of collegiality and a sense of humanity that makes all members of the community equal citizens in service to student learning. The university's faculty, staff, administrators, and students have embraced the WASC process fully as is evident by the dramatic changes that have taken place in policies, procedures, and practices throughout the review process. Clearly, this is a community committed to educational effectiveness and united by its student-centered

mission. In addition, CSUCI is to be commended for its emerging relations with the region it serves and its dedication to civic engagement, including its work with community colleges, area school districts, local businesses, and governmental entities that makes the university an exemplary "steward of place." The team has come to appreciate and respect the dedication of all CSUCI members to fulfilling its commitment to student learning and student success. The team's major findings and recommendations are as follows

1. **Data use and analysis:** While there has been marked improvement in the past year with regard to CSUCI's capacity to generate data and numerical analyses, including the addition of staff to the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), the review team continues to have concerns about the ways in which data are being incorporated in planning and assessment activities across the institution (page 14). We fully appreciate the initial and necessary focus on being able to meet CSU system-wide requirements for data submission and report preparation, but attention should now shift to proactive and pre-emptive data collection, analysis, and dissemination as the campus moves into systematic assessments of programs, learning outcomes, administrative services, and overall institutional performance. We understand that routine reports are in the process of being defined for the university-wide performance indicators as well as program reviews, and we urge that these processes be accelerated and deepened with OIR being given a leadership role for report design and development to meet the specific needs of individual units and committees.

2. **Mission-based centers:** There has been marked improvement in the clarity of the roles that the mission-based centers are playing at CSUCI, and clearly there has been focused attention on the development of these mission-critical programs, which

serve as the custodians or guardians of the university's mission (pages 16-17). To ensure the distinctive status of the centers, we recommend that consideration be given to defining the structural role of the centers (pages 17, 29)—perhaps by a designation other than "center" (even though the designation of "mission-related center" is a good movement in this direction) and to further identifying the role of the provost as the university official mostly singularly responsible for the effectiveness and authority of the mission-critical centers. We also urge that the recently approved fourth center, which will oversee civic engagement, service learning and experiential learning, be moved quickly to full and equal footing with the other three centers so as to ensure the even development of the four "pillars" of the campus mission (pages 12-13).

3. **Faculty and staff energy levels:** While the level of energy and commitment of the faculty and staff continue to surprise reviewers, we also wish to urge that further thought and care be given to the endurance of these critical colleagues (pages 19, 26). The addition of new faculty and staff will help with the overall responsibility of meeting the unique CSUCI mission, but the faculty especially need to have sufficient time to renew their capacity for the level of engagement and participation demanded not only by a new university but one committed to collegiality and shared governance in every aspect of campus life.

4. **Sustainability of mission and values:** While CSUCI has taken concrete and compelling steps to ensure the sustainability of its mission and values (page 5), we recommend that this progress be strengthened and deepened by ensuring that the commitment to the CSUCI mission will endure past changes in leadership at the CSU level (especially the Chancellor and Trustees), the university level (especially the

President, Provost, and Vice President for Student Affairs), and at the faculty level (especially the founding faculty) (page 19). Clearly the unique hiring process has ensured a campus-wide commitment to the mission and a full understanding of the mission of CSUCI. We agree completely that no one will accept an appointment at CSUCI unless they share the commitment to a unique and defined mission. The current constancy of commitment to a shared vision and values is reassuring to those outside the campus community, but there needs to be constant attention to the sustainability of mission across leadership changes, resource fluctuations, and external challenges. We commend President Rush for his commitment to become personally involved in the hiring of all faculty and key staff, and we recommend that this practice be preserved even in the face of continuing growth.

5. **CSUCI relationship with CSU system**: (pages 14-15) With full appreciation for the special nature of CSUCI's mission and (brief) history, we recommend that the faculty and administration continue to think more creatively about its relationship with the CSU central administration and its sister campuses (pages 14-15) to claim a role as a campus of experimentation and innovation, possibly with a defined role as being a place that will export proven practices of effective student learning to others. More pointedly, care must be taken to ensure that CSUCI does not lose its distinctive status within the system—as some other campuses have despite their similar beginnings as distinctive places. And, as noted earlier, the role as well as the mission of CSUCI within the system needs assurances that it can endure beyond any changes in system level leadership.

6. **Assessment of student learning**: We appreciate the extraordinary improvement in the addition of explicit learning objectives to course syllabi (page 8). However, this is

only the first step toward the CSUCI mission-driven commitment to student learning. As a part of making teaching public and giving it co-equal status with research through peer review, we recommend that all course syllabi be made public, that learning objectives be further articulated beyond the course level (page 25) to the program level, the expectations for general education, and to the campus-wide goals for baccalaureate graduates with regard to integrated learning, experiential learning, international perspectives, and multicultural understanding. As discussed on page 10 of this report, we also recommend including graduate programs in the Seven Year Plan for Assessment as these programs become a larger part of the fabric of the university. In addition, we encourage CSUCI to identify peer institutions and begin the process of conducting benchmarking studies as a way to add external reviews to the process of student learning assessment (page 27).

As noted throughout the report, the visiting team found many improvements, policies, and procedures worthy of commendation. Of these, we would only reiterate the conclusion that CSUCI has developed both a level of institution-wide commitment to and implementation of learning centered practices that place it far ahead of many much older and mature universities. We commend the faculty, staff, administration, students, community supporters, and CSU administration for this commitment and we commend these same groups to sustain their shared commitment as the university grows in size, complexity, and aspirations.