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OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

The College of Continuing Education underwent a college-wide program review in the 2005/06 cycle and prepared a self-study in February 2013 that reflected the College’s efforts in 2010/11. In part, the delay in completing the self-study in synch with the normal program review cycle was the result of a transition in leadership in the College, from Dean Alice Tom to Dean Guido Krickx and the desire of the new dean to undertake a meaningful self-study in the context of the pilot program. The self-study prepared by the College of Continuing Education (CCE) was a collaborative effort, drawing on the dean and senior staff in its preparation. The College chose option C: “Focused Inquiry” for its self-study, following the guidelines of the revised Program Review Policy. The main components of Option C are:

- General information about the program, e.g., data on students, faculty, staff, facilities, etc. (most of which is supplied by Office of Institutional Research);

- A statement of intended student learning outcomes at the program level; methods for assessing them, including the use of direct measures; assessment results to date; and documentation of the use of assessment results in efforts to achieve program improvement (assistance with the preparation of which is available from the University Assessment Coordinator); and

- The results of a focused inquiry addressing issues of particular interest/concern to the program itself, in the context of what is currently important to the college and university.

CCE undertook an ambitious task in preparing a self-study which reviewed its “entire portfolio of degree and non-degree programs, certificated and services.” (p.3) The complexity and scale of that goal led the College to prepare a self-study that included:

- General information about the College’s programs, audiences and policies;

- A macro-level overview of the College’s programmatic framework, which delineated the ways in which different exemplar programs develop, deliver, assess and improve their offerings;

- The results of the College’s focused inquiry, examining the alignment of its programs, services and audiences. The College framed this inquiry with the question, “What innovative approaches within CCE’s Programmatic Framework align academic degree programs and non-degree offerings to the multifaceted needs of students, employers and academic partners?”
The College organized its self-study into three main sections:

- **General Information**, which included discussion of the College’s mission and goals, program offerings, students, staff, faculty, facilities, finances and responses to the previous program review;

- **Programmatic Framework and Assessment**, which provided information about the College’s program development processes and policies, clarified 3 major program areas, and examined exemplars in each area;

- **Focused Inquiry**, which reviewed the College’s findings, and recommended changes that would improve the quality of the College’s services and programs.

During the course of the review process, the Review Team consulted the following individuals, documents, and other resources.

**Individuals Consulted**
Dr. Guido Krickx, Dean, College of Continuing Education

Dr. Charles Gossett, Provost, Academic Affairs

Dr. Donald Taylor, Vice President, Academic Affairs

Senior Management Team, College of Continuing Education
  Michelle Gianini, CCE Contract Extension Programs
  Susan Gonzalez, CCE Conference and Training Services
  Christine Irion, CCE Extension Programs
  Chris Lee, CCE Business Affairs
  Jill Matsueda, CCE Academic Programs
  Dr. Jenni Murphy, CCE Strategic Communications and Emerging Markets
  Margaret Wong, CCE International Programs

Non-Credit Programs Staff
  Gabe Hernandez, CCE Extension Programs
  Barbara Lowell, CCE Conference and Training Services
  Keri Nomura, CCE Extension Programs
  Kim Smith, CCE Non-Credit Registrations
  Katie Walker, CCE ELI (English Language Institute) Programs
Academic Programs Staff
   a representative of CCE Academic Programs
   Emelina Logan, CCE Credit Registration
   Veronica Nava, Financial Aid
   Katelyn Sandoval, CCE Academic Programs
   Melissa Sheldon, College of Business

Academic Programs Faculty
   Terry Ahrens, Extension, Non-Credit Instructional Faculty
   Dr. Sueng Bach, College of Business/EMBA
   Dr. Shari Carinci, College of Education
   Susan Gomez, Child Development Department/ECDE
   Dr. Andrey Mikhailitchenko, College of Business/EMBA
   Christie Sanchez, Child Development Department/ Early Childhood Development
   Dr. Marty Wilson, College of Business/EMBA

Academic Programs and Special Session Students
   Jane Constance
   Janna Graham
   Linda Miquelon
   Ken Sun

Clients, Employers, Community Service Partners
   Sharon Frederick, CalTrans
   Dr. Viridiana Diaz, CSU CAMP Program
   Karen Johnson, California Department of Health Care Services
   Jodi Traversaro, Cal HR

Non-Credit Students
   Keith Arboi
   Shang Lo Lin
   CiCi Slater
   Joan Sprenger
   Jordyn Wood

Non-Credit Program Instructors
   Tery Ayres, IHSS instructor
Leanne Cameron, ELI instructor  
Jeff Cook, CCE Pre-Hospital Programs Instructor  
Jeannine Litchfield, CCE Certificate Program  
Andrea Zeboski, ELI Instructor  

Dr. Jeet Joshed, External Consultant, Dean, College of Continuing Education, CSU Long Beach

Documents Consulted

- College of Continuing Education Self Study, February 2013
- The College of Continuing Education website http://www.csus.edu/CCE
- Dr. Jeet Joshee, External Consultant Report for the College of Continuing Education, (report received January 2014)
- Program Review at Sacramento State http://www.csus.edu/acaf/progReview/
- Office of Academic Program Assessment at Sacramento State http://www.csus.edu/programassessment/index.html
- California State University system website information on continuing education http://www.calstate.edu/extention
- The International Association for Continuing Education and Training website http://www.iacet.org
- The Association for Continuing Higher Education website
SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations:

Commendation 1: The College of Continuing Education prepared a thoughtful, honest and detailed self-study;

Commendation 2: The College of Continuing Education is committed to efficient functioning, focusing on sustainable enrollments to ensure its services and programs are affordable;

Commendation 3: The College is creative, strategic and collaborative in developing new degree and non-degree programs;

Commendation 4: The College of Continuing Education has developed and nurtured effective connections with a variety of community stakeholders;

Commendation 5: The College of Continuing Education has a long-standing and fruitful practice of partnering with campus colleagues on initiatives and activities of importance to Sac State students and the regional community;

Commendation 6: The College of Continuing Education has consistently demonstrated its willingness to engage units on the main campus in cooperative and mission-driven efforts that support its activities and align with its responsibilities to its students, the University and the region;

Commendation 7: Many of the programs offered by the College of Continuing Education are signature examples of how the University meets an important element of its mission--- access to higher education for the greater community and region.
Commendation 8: As evidenced by comments from students and faculty, the College of Continuing Education demonstrates its commitment to its students’ needs in the variety of modalities in which it offers its programs and courses;

Commendation 9: The College faculty are committed to offering excellent programs and courses, and facilitating high quality student learning;

Commendation 10: The College staff, at every level, is committed to providing high quality services to their clients;

Commendation 11: The College contributes extensively and meaningfully to the University’s curriculum through its support of the General Education program. CCE also supports departmental degree programs in its intersessions and summer sessions as well as offering department-based programs;

Commendation 12: The College of Continuing Education is a careful steward of its financial resources and has provided the University with a steady stream of income even during periods of economic and budgetary hardship

Recommendations to the College and the Dean:
Recommendation 1: That the College revisit its current mission statement and consider developing a new statement that clarifies exactly what CCE does. A new mission statement should be developed with a clear and defined sense of the College’s place in the University’s Academic Plan. Such an understanding may best be reached in consultation with the Provost;

Recommendation 2: That CCE implement a regularized schedule of review and revision for the College website as new University initiatives and policies are developed;

Recommendation 3: That the College of Continuing Education consider some fundamental questions before undertaking a data collection plan or consultation with the Office of Institutional Research. Meaningful data collection will depend on defining what data is relevant to the College’s mission and activities; considering the purposes to which the data to be collected will be put; and identifying the stakeholders who will be interested in the data;

Recommendation 4: That the College develop processes to collect and analyze retention and completion information for all programs, whether system-directed, University-directed, or CCE-directed;
Recommendation 5: That CCE revisit the issue of faculty and institutional engagement and develop a strategic vision of, and implementation plan for, meaning engagement with campus constituencies;

Recommendation 6: That the College identify the “progress barriers” that it feels are of most concern (and why) and work with the appropriate administrators and Faculty Senate committees to address impediments to its efforts;

Recommendation 7: That the College of Continuing Education develop a regular process for collecting and reviewing information about ELI students that includes age, gender, country of origin, home institution, retention, graduation and matriculation information;

Recommendation 8: That, insofar as it is able, the College of Continuing Education continue to collect meaningful and helpful data about participants in Extension courses in order to assess the program’s educational effectiveness and service to students and the region;

Recommendation 9: That the College of Continuing Education, in collaboration with the Academic Advising Center, other University services, and appropriate academic departments, prepare and distribute orientation and advising materials to students in its programs;

Recommendation 10: That the College of Continuing Education, in collaboration with academic departments and the Center for Teaching and Learning develop a strategy and method for evaluating the educational effectiveness of all academic program offerings;

Recommendation 11: That, in addition to specifically evaluating academic program offerings for educational effectiveness, CCE consult the Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA) to determine the most appropriate and meaningful assessment activities for each of the College’s Program Areas (System-directed activities, University-directed activities, and CCE-directed activities);

Recommendation 12: That the College of Continuing Education work with departments and colleges to ensure that all its courses have student learning outcomes which are evaluated according to consistent baccalaureate-level student learning outcomes. The Program Review Team further recommends that students taking classes in self-support be evaluated and reported separately from students in state-support programs. This will allow the College to compare both the learning outcomes and the results separately for each group;
Recommendation 13: That based on an initial consultation with the Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA), CCE investigate the value of creating a CCE-based office of program assessment;

Recommendation 14: That the Dean, in collaboration with Student Affairs, ASI and the Faculty Senate develop specific structures and activities to ensure that the College of Continuing Education and its faculty, staff and students are able to participate in the life of the University in engaged and meaningful ways;

Recommendation 15: That the Dean of the College of Continuing Education consult with the Provost and other appropriate administrators to arrange access to a broad range of University support services and activities for CCE students, staff, and faculty so that they will feel a stronger connection to the University.

Recommendation 16: That the College of Continuing Education include some public statement about its core “commitments” on its website and operationalize them to provide a foundation for planning and implementing improvement and assessment activities;

Recommendation 17: That the College of Continuing Education pursues its own self-study recommendations on assessment, by setting its own standards of performance, choosing its own assessment methods, contextualizing its efforts in its own interpretations of the results, and making plans to act on its findings in ways that support both its unique mission and the student learning outcomes delineated in the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals;

Recommendation 18: That the College of Continuing Education convene a Strategic Planning Working Group, with a membership of interested stakeholders from the College, University and community to develop an implementable plan for future goals, directions, and resource development and allocation.

Recommendations to the Provost:
Recommendation 19: That the Provost consult with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education about the College’s academic role in the University curriculum;

Recommendation 20: That the Provost consult with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and the Director of the Office of Global education to resolve any issues creating barriers to international students attempting to transition onto campus as matriculated students from the ELI programs, and if possible, streamline the processes required for international students to transfer to the main campus;
**Recommendation 21**: That, within the system structures required for state- and self-support units, the Provost ensure that CCE programming is treated fairly in the University room allocation process.

**Recommendations to the Faculty Senate:**

**Recommendation 22**: That the Senate consider how the academic activities of the College of Continuing Education might best be represented in the Senate, on Senate Committees and in Senate policies.

**Recommendation 23**: Based on this review and the self-study report prepared by the College of Continuing Education, the Program Review Team recommends that all of the College’s programs and academic activities be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.

**I/INTRODUCTION/HISTORICAL INFORMATION**

**Background:**

In American higher education, continuing education is generally understood to be to adult education, commonly for adult learners, especially those beyond traditional undergraduate college or university age. In the past, it did not include basic instruction such as literacy, English language skills, or programs such as vocational training or GED preparation. Instead, as the term suggests, continuing education assumed that the student already had a college education and was simply continuing it.

Frequently, in the United States, continuing education involves enrollment in college/university credit-granting courses, often by students enrolled part-time, and often offered through a division or school of continuing education of a college/university known sometimes as the university extension or extension school.

Within continuing education, professional continuing education is a specific learning activity generally characterized by the issuance of a certificate or continuing education units (CEU) for the purpose of documenting attendance at a designated seminar or course of instruction. Licensing bodies in a number of fields (such as teaching) impose continuing education requirements on members who hold licenses to practice within a particular profession. These requirements are intended to encourage professionals to expand their foundations of knowledge and stay up-to-date on new developments. Depending on the field, these requirements may be satisfied through college or university coursework, extension courses or conferences and seminars attendance.
The California State University system website includes the following characterization of the system’s continuing education opportunities:

Extended and Continuing Education brings education and training opportunities to people in local communities throughout the state—and around the world. We offer students opportunities in:

- Online and off-campus credit degree programs,
- professional development certificate programs and courses,
- courses for personal enrichment, and
- access to university courses without university admission

There are programs for working professionals, displaced workers, career changers, military and veterans, international students and a host of others. By collaborating with business and industry, Extended and Continuing Education offers a variety of activities aimed at increasing the competitive edge for individuals to succeed in today’s global work environment. On average, our 23 campuses process 300,000 Extended Education enrollments each year. (http://calstate.edu/extension)

The Sacramento State College of Continuing Education demonstrates the ways in which the definition and uses of continuing education have evolved since the early 20th century, changing to meet both the needs of different groups of students and the universities which offer these programs. The activities and programs of Sac State’s College of Continuing Education also reveal the sometimes conflicting demands and expectations under which the College must function.

The College’s Self-Study and accompanying Appendix clearly indicated the College’s future goals and its intention to develop new programs, serve its students, address quality improvement, and support the mission of the University. As the external consultant, Dr. Jeet Joshee, noted, the self-study “also addressed various issues concerning resources, campus climate, institutional support and placement, national trends, academic quality assessment and the CCE program structure. It included extensive data regarding enrollment, program development and revenue generated by the College.”

**Commendation 1:** The College of Continuing Education prepared a thoughtful, honest and detailed self-study.

The external consultant’s general finding was that the College of Continuing Education’s self-study and appended materials reveal that “CCE is a healthy and robust college, financially viable, and serving an important role in providing enhanced access to educational resources at CSUS.” Dr. Joshee also found that College’s reporting structure and institutional organization
aligned with generally accepted practices. The College is led by a Dean who reports directly to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. This is a standard reporting structure for similar units within the CSU system and at higher education institutions around the country.

In keeping with its role in the University, CCE revised its mission statement in 2010 to align with the campus Destination 2010 initiative and the accompanying change in the University’s Strategic Plan. The College’s updated mission statement is incorporated into the general description of the College on its website:

CCE strengthens the academic mission of Sacramento State by connecting the resources of the campus community with the needs of individuals, employers and the capital region. (www.cce.csus.edu)

However, the mission statement on the College website remains, in many ways a vague, open-ended statement, that does not helpfully, or in any meaningful detail, describe the services and programs the College provides in support of the University’s mission. This weakness is particularly striking on the College’s webpage. Additionally, in the near future, the College will need to revisit its mission to align itself with the new University Strategic plan currently under development.

Review Team Recommendation 1: That the College revisit its current mission statement and consider developing a new statement that clarifies exactly what CCE does. A new mission statement should be developed with a clear and defined sense of the College’s place in the University’s Academic Plan. Such an understanding may best be reached in consultation with the Provost.

Review Team Recommendation 2: That CCE implement a regularized schedule of review and revision for the College website as new University initiatives and policies are developed.

The self-study offers a more detailed view of the College’s mission:

At the direction of the CSU system or the University, CCE undertakes activities that extend the mission of Sacramento State. CCE has consistently focused on providing programs to non-traditional students. CCE defines non-traditional students as working-age adults, international ESL students and individuals seeking professional development without the expectation of a degree.

CCE has also developed competencies in providing services to government and industry organizations in need of customized training programs, conferences, events, organizational development and government program review. (3)

To support this mission, CCE is organized into four programmatic units and a support department. The four program centers are:
- Academic Programs, which deals with degree and academic certificate programs in partnership with Sacramento State colleges and academic departments;
- Extension Programs, which is responsible for non-degree programs and certificates that do not offer academic credit. This unit also competes for large-scale contracts from state agencies for customized training;
- Conference Training and Services, which supports professional development and educational training for agency and association clients;
- International Programs, which supports the English Language Institute (ELI) and custom programming for international universities. This unit also coordinates programming for professional groups who come to Sacramento State for short and intensive immersion programs.

The Operations unit provides a wide range of support to the College in its efforts, including enrollment services for both credit and non-credit courses, administrative services, creative services and on-line services.

To operationalize its mission, the College adopted a strategic plan, GO CREW, to align with the University’s Destination 2010 strategic plan. This acronym frames the College’s strategic decision-making:
- Global Relationship Development
- Organizational Development
- Community Development
- Regional Development
- Economic Development
- Workforce Development

*(Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010-2011, p. 5)*

The College of Continuing Education Self-Study provides two other important pieces of contextual information which were both very helpful and of significant interest to the Program Review Team. One important aspect of CCE’s mission is that all its activities must be self-supporting. Funding for the College depends on a combination of fees, contracts and grants. Consistent with the State Administrative Manual, CCE’s programs and services are based on a cost recovery model which requires that all costs for any program must be set so that the program’s direct and indirect costs are met by the fees paid by participants. College of Continuing Education programs and services are not eligible for monies from the state’s General Fund and as a result, the fees charged to students are generally higher than the University’s fees for instruction. Nonetheless, CCE fees are lower than the fees charged by independent institutions, whether non-profit or for-profit.
Commendation 2: The College of Continuing Education is committed to efficient functioning, focusing on sustainable enrollments to ensure its services and programs are affordable.

Part II of the Self-Study provides an informative overview of the College’s programmatic framework and activities.

The College has divided its programmatic activities into three main categories, to distinguish their different goals, student populations and modalities. The College provided an extensive list of list of its offerings in these categories over the review cycle in Exhibit 3 of the Self-Study. (8-9) The College of Continuing Education offers:

- **System-directed activities**: Through courses scheduled in summer and winter intersessions, the College offers classes outside the regular academic year. The College also administers Open University which consists of seats available to non-matriculated students and community members. These offerings tend to be discrete courses, rather than entire sequential programs. CCE’s role in this programming is centered on scheduling, promotion, registration and fiscal administration. Courses offered in summer and winter sessions are determined by department chairs, program directors and College deans;

- **University-directed activities**: Under oversight from the Faculty Senate, departments and Colleges can offer degree programs and certificates through the College of Continuing Education. Some examples are of this sort of programming are academic certificates, second bachelor’s degrees and degree completion programs. University-directed programs follow the regular campus curriculum approval process as well as being reviewed, as appropriate by the Chancellor’s Office, professional accrediting groups and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior Commission. While CCE is tasked with implementation of these programs, in its cost recovery model, the originating unit is responsible for program design, curriculum, assessment and program review. During the period under review, the College offered twenty-seven degree and certificate programs in collaboration with University Colleges and departments. These programs were usually offered in satellite locations, at non-traditional times (evening and weekends) or in hybrid or on-line formats.

- **CCE-directed activities**: The College of Continuing Education designs programs and activities to meet “external market needs and expectations” in order to align
with the College’s mission to connect “the resources of the campus community with the needs of individuals, employers and the capital region.” (6) To determine its offerings, the College consults with CCE unit leaders, industry leaders and employers, subject matter experts and faculty in a “stakeholder governance model,” which draws on the specific requests of clients, addresses specific workforce development needs or advances the University’s mission. In the period under review, CCE offered an expansive group of 112 CEU-based certificate and customized training programs.

CCE analyzed program exemplars in each of these three categories and developed recommendations for improvement based on its review and analysis of the data the College was able to collect. Its recommendations are included in the appropriate sections of this report.

One important finding for the College was the discovery, as the self-study team began to collect data, that data related to system-directed and university-directed programs were in one database, the information relevant to CCE-directed programs was housed in another, different database. Additionally, the self-study team found that data collection was inconsistent and that much of the data was retained at the program unit level, and therefore difficult to meaningfully aggregate to the College-level.

As a result of this experience, the College offered three preliminary recommendations related to data-collection:

- **CCE Recommendation I.1.1:** Consider centralizing data collection and the adoption of a standard set of data collected for all programs (FERPA guidelines and client restrictions permitting);
- **CCE Recommendation I.1.2:** Investigate development of a single database for all CCE activities, or should that not be possible, consider developing a data warehouse that allows easy access to all relevant data;
- **CCE Recommendation I.1.3:** Investigate with the Office of Institutional Research whether a college fact book can be developed for CCE.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 3:** That the College of Continuing Education consider some fundamental questions before undertaking a data collection plan or consultation with the Office of Institutional Research. Meaningful data collection will depend on defining what data is relevant to the College’s mission and activities; considering the purposes to which the data to be collected will be put; and the stakeholders who will be interested in the data.
In its self-study, the College presented very limited data related to retention and graduation/completion rates, with the exception of the Child Development program. For that program the retention and completion rates across cohorts was quite strong but the graduation rates were very low for some of the cohorts (p. 49) and no potential explanations for these variations were offered. The issue of completion, across demographic groups and College of Continuing Education programming is a vital element of determining the College’s effectiveness in meeting its mission goal of “connecting the resources of the campus with the needs of individuals, employers and the capital region.” (p. 4)

**Program Review Team Recommendation 4:** That the College develops processes to collect and analyze retention and completion information for all programs, whether system-directed, University-directed, or CCE-directed.

**II/RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS PROGRAM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS:**
The 2004 Program Review Report offered ten recommendations to the College. The Self-Study documents the College’s efforts to respond to each recommendation:

- **New Opportunities:**
  - Recommendation 1: That the campus and the college explore the strategic selection of additional degrees to be offered as self-support programs through CCE, permitting excess revenues to be shared with campus programs;
  - Recommendation 2: That the campus and the college explore the designation of the CCE as an incubator for new program initiatives.

**CCE response:** The College reasserted its significant focus on program development opportunities. On campus, the College collaborated with the College of Business Administration to launch a very successful Executive Master’s in Business Administration (EMBA) program. CCE also filled the vacuum created by the closure of the State of California Department of Personnel Administration State Training Center (STC.) Working with the STC staff, CCE organized its Portfolio Programs series which offers professional training to public sector leaders.

**Commendation 3:** The College is creative, strategic and collaborative in developing new degree and non-degree programs.

- **Academic Connections:**
  - Recommendation 3: That the University determine the academic role that CCE should assume on behalf of the University and provide the direction and support necessary to carry out that role.
- Recommendation 4: That the college explores additional opportunities to create even greater levels of engagement with the faculty and institution.

**CCE response:** In the context of new special session or professional projects, CCE worked with academic departments and Colleges to create opportunities for faculty to interact with the community and strengthen the campus’ outreach efforts. Additionally, in the period since the previous program review, CCE added academic offerings from seven programs and in collaboration with departments and colleges, developed reimbursement and residual revenue sharing agreements. CCE also placed staff representatives on campus committees and subcommittees, including the Graduate Coordinators Committee, the University General Education Policies and Graduation Requirements Committee, the USA Staff Appreciation Committee and the CSU Commission for the Extended University.

**Program Review Team comment:** Despite these efforts, CCE continues to have something of a “campus relations” problem, particularly with faculty, some of whom view the College (and the ramifications of its self-support requirement) with some suspicion. CCE’s physical location, separated from the main campus, is an apt metaphor for the disconnection that seems to plague CCE’s efforts to be seen as an integral member of the campus academic community. In part, this may be due to the seeming lack of interest on the part of the University administration and the Academic Senate to take action in support of the previous Program Review Team’s recommendation 3.

One component of the problem with CCE’s academic role, is that because CCE draws on University departments and faculty for many of its academic offerings, it has not specifically evaluated the quality of the student learning that takes place in those courses, leaving that responsibility to the departments which provide instruction. The issue of academic assessment is dealt with in more detail later in this report.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 5:** That CCE revisit the issue of faculty and institutional engagement and develop a strategic vision of, and implementation plan for, meaning engagement with campus constituencies.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 19:** That the Provost consult with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education about the College’s academic role in the University curriculum.
Program Review Team Recommendation 22: That the Faculty Senate consider how the academic activities of the College of Continuing Education might best be represented in the Senate, on Senate Committees, and in Senate policies.

- Community Connections:
  - Recommendation 5: That the college continue to explore additional efforts that would provide effective linkages with the community and that continue to build on the strength of the program specific advisory boards that have been created. It is further recommended that the dean consider creating a CCE Dean’s Council composed of prominent community members.

  CCE response: Based on consultation with the University President’s Office, no Dean’s Council was formed. CCE has secured significant community involvement in its program-specific advisory boards, which include community representatives, field experts, campus faculty, and associate representatives (including representatives of the Board of Vocational Examiners, the Council for the Preparation of School Personnel, and the Career Pathways Subcommittee of the Health Workforce Development Council, among others.)

  Commendation 4: The College of Continuing Education has developed and nurtured effective connections with a variety of community stakeholders.

- University Reach:
  - Recommendation 6: That the campus strengthen its support for the many outreach efforts initiated by the college and engage in discussions about the future use and further development of these efforts.

  CCE response: During the period under review, CCE was involved in a number of campus initiatives, including a 2009 green industry workforce development grant funded by the American Reinvestment and Redevelopment Act; a 2011 project with the Colleges of Engineering and Computer Science, Health and Human Services and Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies to evaluate opportunities for homeland security projects; and support for a National Emergency Grant to the College of Education for teacher retraining and credentialing. The College found multiple benefits to these activities, including improved understanding of CCE from members of the campus community and the opportunity to determine the College’s capacity for different sorts of project. Additionally, during the review cycle, the College offered five undergraduate, six graduate and three credential special session degree completion programs to meet
workforce investment requests and community needs that could not be met on campus. These programs were developed in partnership with several campus Colleges.

**Commendation 5:** The College of Continuing Education has a long-standing and fruitful practice of partnering with campus colleagues on initiatives and activities of importance to Sac State students and the regional community.

- **Develop New Markets + Market Research**
  - Recommendation 7: That the dean considers what additional opportunities could be cultivated by the broader and more strategic use of an extensive market research initiative to help achieve even greater breadth and depth in continuing education programming.
  - Recommendation 8: The at college continue its development of techniques to promote and strengthen customer relationship management and support the further development of prototype modular strategies to create customer designed education as being tested in selected business programs.

  **CCE response:** The College determined that broad market research was not an efficient use of its resources due to the economic downturn that occurred during the review cycle. As an alternative, the College undertook a more strategic approach, drawing on its network of contacts to foster new areas of development and to deepen existing areas of educational programming. A new MPP position, Senior Director for Strategic Communication and Emerging Markets was created to support CCE’s plans for future growth.

- **Plan for the Implications of Growth**
  - Recommendation 9: In thinking about CC’s capacity to take on new academic programs, some consideration should be given to faculty and staff readiness.

  **CCE response:** The College expanded its contract-based training and education services to client organizations during the economic downturn. The results were successful professional development programs that met the specific needs of CCE’s public and private sector clients. The College also considered various options for physical space that would best serve the College and University’s goals to serve more international students and employers. CCE had determined that utilizing classrooms on the main campus would best serve the campus goal of global awareness for students in all Sac State programs.
Program Review Team Recommendation 21: That, within the system structures required for state- and self-support units, the Provost ensure that CCE programming is treated fairly in the University room allocation process.

Program Review Team comment: This element of the College’s response to the previous program review focused on issues of space and programming, rather than the sense from the Program Review Team’s recommendation that there were some issues of skill or training that needed to be addressed. This report discusses these issues in the sections below on Faculty and Operations.

- Improving Campus Processes
  - Recommendation 10: That the campus and the college determine how to mitigate or remove these process barriers on behalf of the CCE.

CCE response: The College has worked with Academic Affairs, academic departments and College deans to ensure that all its approval, policy and Chancellor’s Office obligations were met. This recommendation from the previous Program Review Team does not identify which specific progress barriers were of concern.

Commendation 6: The College of Continuing Education has consistently demonstrated its willingness to engage units on the main campus in cooperative and mission-driven efforts that support its activities and align with its responsibilities to its students, the University and the region.

Program Review Team Recommendation 6: That the College identify the “progress barriers” that it feels are of most concern (and why) and work with the appropriate administrators and the Faculty Senate committee to address impediments to its efforts.

III/STUDENTS
The mission of the College of Continuing Education focuses on providing access to students who are not customarily served by the Sacramento State campus.

- Characteristics: The College of Continuing Education serves a broad population of students who are enrolled in graduate and undergraduate degree programs; certificate programs; credit and noncredit courses; management training for State Government employees and the private sector; and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. As a result of this wide variety of programs, CCE serves a diverse mix of students: through
its Summer and Winter session offerings, the College supports matriculated University students; adults and working professional students are enrolled in degree programs offered through CCE; non-matriculated students take classes through the Open University program; and the College also serves students who enroll without a degree objective, usually for professional advancement or personal enrichment.

Commendation 8: As evidenced by comments from students and faculty, the College of Continuing Education demonstrates its commitment to its students’ needs in the variety of modalities in which it offers its programs and courses.

In many ways, the characteristics of CCE students depend on the program unit which supports their educational goals. The College collected information on enrollments and demographic data based on the three main divisions of its activities as described in the self-study. For system-directed activities, traditional, matriculated Sac State students tended to be served by the course offerings in winter or summer sessions. Non-traditional students were served by Open University. University-directed activities tended to target non-traditional students seeking academic degrees or certificates. CCE-directed activities and programs served the broadest constituency---from overseas university partners and students seeking English Language instruction to businesses, working professionals and government organizations.

Students in System-Directed Activities:
Exhibit 4 of the Self-Study organizes the target audiences for each activity and Exhibits 5-9 provide more detailed information about each activity’s target audience. Exhibit 5 provides demographic information about students in system-directed summer (2010) and winter intersession (2006-2011) courses. The majority of students enrolled in these sessions were over the age of 25. 58% of summer session students and 85% of winter session students were over 25 compared to traditional campus students, of whom, 25.5% were over age 25, as reported in the 2012 University Factbook. 73% of the students taking summer session classes and 75% of students taking winter session classes lived or received mail within the University’s six-county service region. The ethnicity of students enrolling in summer and winter sessions is generally aligned with the general University population, although the number of Latino students seems to be lower than the general student population at Sacramento State and the “other/unreported” student population is higher. Whether this is a statistically significant matter is something the College may wish to explore as it organizes its future data collection strategies. Enrollment by College during summer and winter intersessions seems parallel to the enrollment patterns during the traditional academic
year, with the exception of College of Business Administration students, who make up a higher percentage of CCE summer and winter session enrollments, while College of Engineering and Computer Science students enroll at lower percentages in CCE winter and summer sessions.

**Students in University-Directed Activities:**
CCE has identified working adults as the focus of its university-directed activities. These are students interested in degree completion, certification or second bachelor’s degrees. Those students pursuing a degree are admitted to the University as matriculated students, but their program fee structure reflects the self-support mandate of the College of Continuing Education. Non-matriculated students are also included in University-directed activities. Exhibit 6 in the Self-Study charts the demographic information available for students in University-directed activities in comparison to the demographic data for the campus in spring 2011. The CCE data demonstrates that the College is achieving its goal of serving working adults. 99% of the matriculated students in CCE University-directed programs are at least 25 years of age, while 79% on non-matriculated students are age 25 or over. While much of the other demographic data is comparable for the two populations, there is a larger group of males in the non-matriculated group. The ethnicity data for non-matriculated students has a significant proportion of “other/non reported” responses, probably attributable to the fact that these students do not apply to the University through the CSU Mentor program.

**Students in CCE-Directed Activities:**
The largest number of students and participants in CCE-directed activities are enrolled in International Programs, particularly the English Language Institute (ELI), which saw consistent and significant growth during the period under review (Exhibit 7.) CCE-directed activities also include the Extension Program, which serves working adults who are seeking additional training and skills. While ELI students have academic schedules that resemble traditional University students, Extension students may only attend classes for a few hours or days. Conferences are included in CCE-directed activities and those participants usually only participate in a single event, although it may last anywhere from a few hours to a few days. Because of the diversity of activities and modalities in CCE-directed activities, data collection for programmatic purposes is problematic. The College was able to collect data for ELI and for a program known as The Portfolio. Data for ELI was presented in Exhibit 8. A surprising piece of data was that the majority of ELI students were 25 years of age or older. During the period under review, female students began to outnumber men in the program, paralleling a similar
development on the campus. Unhappily, the data collected on ELI students is not comprehensive, although the data for 2010-2011 was more detailed. The College self-study team recommended the development of a standardized database and mandatory information be collected for every ELI student. Collecting data on students in Extension Programs has been an issue for the College. Some contract clients are hesitant to support data collection in their activities. The College experienced resistance to the collection of demographic data from both employee bargaining units and students. Additionally, demographic data is not required for admission. In response to those difficulties, the College conducted student surveys at different times during the administration of Extension Programs. Consistent data was collected in the Portfolio Program, a set of governmental leadership training courses, because it has an application process that facilitated the gathering of demographic information. Exhibit 9 presents the data collected on participants in the Portfolio Program. Of most interest to the Program Review Team, in terms of the College’s mission, is the information that these programs had more than a 90% completion rate and that at least 15% of the participants were not baccalaureate degree holders. As a result of analyzing the student data collected for the self-study, the College of Continuing Education Self-Study team made the following two recommendations:

**CCE recommendation I.2.1:** For non-matriculated students in Special Session Programs, consider collecting demographic data consistent with the data for matriculated students in other colleges;

**CCE recommendation I.2.2:** For students enrolled in Extension Programs, the English Language Institute and Conferences, determine what demographic data can be collected consistently across programs and develop data collection strategies to approximate the data collected for matriculated students.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 7:** That the College of Continuing Education develop a regular process for collecting and reviewing information about ELI students that includes age, gender, country of origin, home institution, retention, graduation and matriculation information.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 8:** That, insofar as it is able, the College of Continuing Education continue to collect meaningful and helpful data about participants in Extension courses in order to assess the program’s educational effectiveness and service to students and the region.
Participants in Conferences and Employer-Based Training:
The College of Continuing Education supports a wide variety of organizations through its event and conference activities. While the conference convener has command of the information that can be collected about attendee, in Exhibit 10 of the self-study, the College presented information about conference enrollments. During the period under review, the Conferences and Training Services Program served an average of 15,019 participants each year. These numbers suggest that the Conferences and Training Services Program is effectively supporting the College’s goal of “connecting the resources of the campus community with the needs of individuals, employers and the capital region. “ (www.cce.csus.edu)

Program Review Team comment: Overall, CCE data regarding student characteristics is limited, and dependent upon the level of data collection on the part of the departments offering the academic programs. The issues surrounding the collection of data on CCE student characteristics are exacerbated by the challenges of collecting data for self-support programs in alignment with state-support campus data collection processes. While fact books are developed for programs on campus, based on data collected from CMS on the census date for each semester, at this point it appears that no special session course or CCE program data is being collected since, for many CCE programs, the “census date” varies. The College recognizes this issue as a major one, and its own findings led its self-study team to make recommendations I.1.1-I.1.3 which are referenced in the introductory section of this Program Review Report.

Despite its difficulties in collecting and analyzing data about its students, the CCE self-study documents the College’s commitment to supporting the University’s mission of outreach to the region.

Commendation 7: Many of the programs offered by the College of Continuing Education are signature examples of how the University meets an important element of its mission--- access to higher education for the greater community and region.

- Academic Support
This subject was not given specific consideration in the College’s self-study and does deserve some focused attention from CCE. Because of the range of programs offered by the College, the issue of academic support is complex. The College’s mission of offering access to higher education to non-traditional students carries with it at least the implication of both quality instruction and effective educational support. Based on the interviews conducted by the Program Review Team, the College needs to do more in
this arena. In particular, both the College’s processes and data collection need to include consideration of the most effective ways to ensure its students receive appropriate academic and career advising as well as academic support.

While College staff members have been designated to serve as student advisors for all programs, and are trained by the Advising Center on campus, the College has no mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness or consistency of its academic advising efforts. In conversations with the Program Review Team, CCE students, faculty and some staff indicated confusion about resources of available information for participants in CCE programs and activities. While one might assume that CCE program coordinators or program faculty on the main campus are responsible for advising and supporting students, the College needs to develop a clear advising routine, with processes and public materials which will help students, staff and CCE faculty navigate the University’s academic policies and procedures.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 9:** That the College of Continuing Education, in collaboration with the Academic Advising Center, other University services, and appropriate academic departments, prepare and distribute orientation and advising materials to students in its programs.

These concerns may be especially pungent for English Language Institute (ELI) students, many of whom plan to become matriculated Sacramento State students. In the past, confusion about the different roles and goals of CCE and the Office of Global Education seem to have created impediments to ELI matriculations, which were counterproductive to the University’s desire to provide students on the main campus with a globally sensitive education. With the recent reorganization of the Office of Global Education, the Program Review Team supports Dr. Joshee’s recommendation that, “The university administration and both units collectively should work towards creating synergies between CCE and OGE. If organizational structures need to be realigned the university administration should consider what is good for the institution as a whole so the university will be able to realize its globalization agenda.” *(External Consultant’s Report, 6)*

**Review Team Recommendation 20:** That the Provost consult with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and the Director of the Office of Global Education to resolve any issues creating barriers to international students attempting to transition onto campus as matriculated students from the ELI
programs, and if possible, streamline the processes required for international students to transfer to the main campus.

In terms of academic support, the College’s ELI program offers a positive model of student support, involving students in campus and community activities and events. Many of these efforts are in support of the students’ desire to matriculate to, and succeed in an American institution of higher education. All ELI students in levels 6-8 participate in community service projects, and the faculty and staff of ELI are active and effective advocates and advisors for students in this program. Similarly, for several years students in the Pre-hospital Education Program (EMT Basic and EMT Paramedic training) have joined in state and local Emergency Response training, strengthening their skill sets.

**IV/FACULTY**

- **Characteristics:** The College of Continuing Education is proud of its use of faculty members from across the Sacramento State campus. Its use of campus faculty has grown more than 100% during the period under review. Additionally, CCE brings subject experts and credentialed practitioners to act as instructors for non-academic credit classes and events. CCE does not have a full time College faculty or specific instructor pool. In the College’s self-study, Exhibit 11 provides an overview of the fluctuation of teaching assignments for on-campus and off-campus instructors during the period under review.

In both system-and University-directed activities, the academic College and department determine teaching assignments in CCE. The College of Continuing Education depends on University College hiring processes and oversight to ensure that qualified instructors are assigned to special session courses. Additionally, some Sacramento State faculty members serve as program coordinators and special session instructors for special session certificate and degree programs in addition to their CCE teaching assignments. Full-time Sacramento State faculty who teach in the College of Continuing Education are largely compensated through overload agreements based on the Special Session salary scale.

The College of Continuing Education’s dependence on departments and Colleges to provide suitable and effective instructors is something of a double-edged sword. Certainly, the campus has an investment in ensuring that CCE provides quality instruction to its students, but in ceding hiring decision-making to campus departments and Colleges, CCE has little opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the faculty in its courses, there are no CCE-centered criteria for making particular hires and the College
has little control over the curriculum being offered in these programs. Additionally, the College has not developed a consistent process to collect data about faculty preparation or currency, and can find itself at the mercy of self-serving departmental or individual faculty agendas rather than developing a student-centered schedule of offerings or programs.

Where the College does have significantly more control over instruction, in CCE-directed activities, it asserts that instructor preparation is aligned with the type and level of the offering. For example, ELI instructors must have a Master’s degree in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL), English or a related field. Similarly, CEU-based certificate programs screen potential instructors for subject matter expertise and experience, both with adult learners and as practitioners.

In conversation with the Dean, the Program Review Team discussed the possibility of the College hiring and evaluating its own faculty, in processes comparable to campus academic programs and Colleges. Certainly, in the context of the external consultant’s view that CCE is poised to continue to grow, and should do so, the possibility that CCE could support its own faculty deserves to be explored. However, as Dr. Joshe suggests, while “growth and new revenue streams are desirable, CCE will need to develop a strategic plan that clearly outlines how big should CCE grow so that the quality of the programs and the support services it needs are well maintained.” (External Program Review Report, p.10)

Finally, instructors who are not members of the main campus faculty mirrored a complaint of many CCE students who feel “disconnected” from the campus and excluded from the campus community. The University and the College should work together to address this issue as it is contradictory to the values which are the foundation of the University’s strategic plan goal of “a welcoming campus.” The following Program Review Team recommendation mirrors recommendation # 4 from the earlier, 2004 College of Continuing Education Program Review. While that recommendation was a general encouragement for the college to “explore additional opportunities to create even greater levels of engagement with the faculty and the institution, the current Program Review Team has the following recommendation:

**Program Team Recommendation 14:** That the Dean, in collaboration with Student Affairs, ASI and the Faculty Senate develop specific structures and activities to ensure that the College of Continuing Education and its faculty, staff and students are able to participate in the life of the University in engaged and meaningful ways.
Teaching Effectiveness

Of significant importance to the College’s interest in the alignment of innovative approaches within CCE’s Programmatic Framework to the needs of its students, employers and academic partners is the educational effectiveness of its programs and instruction. The College’s self-study did not address this issue, and yet consideration of instructional effectiveness should be a major component in the evaluation of Programmatic Framework innovation. A significant element in meeting the College’s mission of “connecting the resources of the campus community with the needs of individuals, employers and the region,” is ensuring that those resources are used to support student success in the programs offered by CCE. Effective teaching and student learning are cornerstones of that success.

While academic departments generally take responsibility for the evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness, conversations with the Dean of the College of Continuing Education and various CCE faculty revealed that while some assessment of faculty performance are administered by the academic departments, the results are not consistently shared with the College of Continuing Education, which makes the collection and analysis of data in this area problematic. The College’s self-study offers the teaching evaluations done by the College of Business as an exemplar, and it should build on that work in developing its own processes and evaluation structures.

While there is evidence that in some programs and courses, students complete teaching evaluations, there was not clear evidence of how effectively this feedback is used by faculty to improve teaching.

The fact that University Appointment, Retention and Promotion policies preclude the use of CCE course student evaluations in the ARTP process should not result in a vacuum of CCE attention to the issue of teaching evaluations. Consideration of teaching effectiveness may also be seen as a logical first step in beginning a plan for program and student learning assessment (treated below.)

Program Review Team Recommendation 10: That the College of Continuing Education, in collaboration with academic departments and the Center for Teaching and Learning develop a strategy and consistent methods for evaluating the educational effectiveness of instruction in all its programs.
V/STAFF

As is the case with so much of CCE’s enterprise, staffing in the College is complex. The College uses a flexible staffing model which depends on temporary positions, hourly intermittent and temporary contract assignments to remain flexible in the face of changing market forces and to protect the University from undue costs. CCE staff members housed in Napa Hall include extended education specialists, functional analysts, instructional designers and administrative staff, all of whom implement student support services, program administrative functions and faculty support activities. The College also reimburses Business Affairs, Information Resources and Technology and Academic Affairs for staff costs on behalf of the College. Additionally, the College funds a staff position in Financial Aid and 25% of a position in Student Affairs, although it is unclear from the self-study if those positions are dedicated to supporting only CCE students.

The College’s self-study includes a chart (Exhibit 12) which shows overall staffing levels, for both intermittent and full-time staff over the review cycle from 2006-2011. Staffing levels show consistent and significant declines over this period, and include significant unfilled vacancies in two key positions---Director of Extension Programs and Associate Dean. In the self-study appendix, section 1.3 has detailed information on staffing levels by job classification and bargaining unit. In 2010-2011, CCE had 95 full-time benefited staff and 13 hourly intermittent staff members.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that like the staff on the main campus, CCE staff, despite their status as long time members of the campus community, feel like second class citizens. CCE staff have the additional burden of feeling like step children in the campus family. In conversation with CCE staff, the Program Review Team noted their support for the College and University mission and their desire to be understood as the creators of educational opportunities for the University’s service area, and not just a profit center.

Interviews and conversations with community partners reveal the effectiveness and efficiency of the CCE staff. Several community stakeholders commented on the ease and excellent quality of their communications with staff. One community partner commented that CCE staff work was done “timely, effectively and beautifully.” Another described her CCE support team as “phenomenal” and knowledgeable about state processes and protocols, declaring, “I don’t have to think. They just deliver.” An on-campus partner discussed her positive impression of the CCE staff’s professionalism and commitment.
Commendation 29: The College staff, at every level, is committed to providing high quality services to their clients.

VI/ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS/STUDENT OUTCOMES

- Academic Program Goals
  The College of Continuing Education has developed its programs and services in response to mandates from the California State University system, requests from Sacramento State departments, Colleges, and administration, and the needs of clients in the Sacramento region. The result has been, for the most part, very positive.

Commendation 11: The College contributes extensively and meaningfully to the University’s curriculum through its support of the General Education program. CCE also supports departmental degree programs in its intersessions and summer sessions as well as offering department-based programs.

The external consultant, Dr. Jeet Joshee, summed up the College’s program goals and progress toward those goals in his report:

Although challenges remain in some key areas where CCE will need to work with various campus constituencies, the self-study report reflected, and the on campus visit and interviews confirmed, that the CCE is proceeding in many positive directions, including greater emphasis on credit and degree programming aligned with CSUS’s academic strengths and the needs of emerging, evolving, and expanding professions. There were many positive comments about CCE’s capability to expand the outstanding educational programs to community, public and private sectors. CCE is viewed as a unit that can really showcase and extend CSUS programs to the local community, statewide and globally that no other unit on campus is equipped to do (External Program Review Report, p.6.)

- Assessment
  In the 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation, the Commission succinctly framed the issue of educational quality and student success:
  Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to document that students acquire knowledge and develop higher-order intellectual skills appropriate to the level of the degree earned. This documentation is a matter of validating institutional quality and providing accountability as well as setting the conditions for improvement of learning (WASC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation, p. 28.)
Of particular value to the College of Continuing Education may be the idea that this documentation depends on the collection and evaluation of data that provides information about student success, which has been defines as both completion and learning.

The College of Continuing Education has tried to be diligent in its data collection effort, but it has not been a consistent or comprehensive process. Both the College and the Program Review Team observed that data collection varied over time for some programs, due to a number of factors, such staffing changes. This suggests that the effort to collect data was a programmatic effort and not a College-wide effort. In addition, the data collected varied from program to program. Much of the College’s assessment data collection was indirect and did not really offer the College information to allow it to evaluate student learning either within or across programs. The College’s self-study included reviews of the assessment plans and analysis of exemplars from a variety of programs, including the Bachelor of in Child Development: Early Development, Care and Education (EDCE); Masters of Business Administration for Executives (EMBA); the English Language Institute (ELI) and Leadership for Government Executives Program; the In-Home Support Services (IHSS) Training Academy; and Biennial Childhood Obesity Conference (BCOC) (Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, pp. 44-91.)

One reason for the College’s difficulties rests with the complexity of its portfolio of educational programs. For CCE-directed programs, data collection can be complicated: employers and unions representing program participant cohorts may not want some data collected; non-credit students may find data collection methods overly cumbersome as may one-day conference participants.

In University-directed programs, student learning assessment is primarily the responsibility of the academic department. Despite this, CCE is invested in gathering and evaluating assessment data related to the programs it offers. For CCE, the main issue will be to ensure that it has instruments, plans and a schedule that draw on the student learning goals of academic department partners and provide the College with a schedule of timely and meaningful assessment. In its report, the College offered a number of recommendations of its own, such as:

**College of Continuing Education Recommendation II.3.1:** Develop a comprehensive program to encourage course evaluations for every Winter and
Summer Session course, with the collaboration of college deans, department chairs and faculty, in line with current provisions for faculty evaluation (Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, p.43.)

**College of Continuing Education recommendation II.3.2:** Verify for the programs being administered through CCE that the department’s assessment plan is in place, being implemented and that the proposed assessment schedule is being followed and that corrective action is taken when needed (Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, p.57.)

While the College must collaborate with departments to ensure the success of its programs and the student learning goals which should be part of every University course, CCE should not focus on “policing” department assessment efforts. It should consider its educational goals (which are certainly related to those of academic department.) One way the College can meet this challenge might be to create its own consistent assessment instruments, drawing on the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 12:** That the College of Continuing Education work with departments and colleges to ensure that all its courses have student learning outcomes which are evaluated according to consistent baccalaureate-level student learning outcomes. The Program Review Team further recommends that students taking classes in self-support be evaluated and reported separately from students in state-support programs. This will allow the College to compare both the learning outcomes and the results separately for each group.

While in CCE-directed programs assessments are consistently done, they vary in format and scope and often depend on indirect measures, like student satisfaction. Assessment will run into similar constraints as mentioned before regarding data collection. Assessment for a one-day workshop will naturally be different and less detailed, than for a week-long program. As a result of its self-study, the College included a number of recommendations for CCE-directed programs its report:

**College of Continuing Education Recommendation II.3.3:** Develop a comprehensive program of assessment for CCE directed programs, to tie program objectives, learning goals and assessment outcomes in an iterative

The Program Review Team suggests building on that recommendation with the following:

**Program Review Team Recommendation 11:** That, in addition to specifically evaluating academic program offerings for educational effectiveness, CCE consult the Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA) to determine the most appropriate and meaningful assessment activities for each of the College’s Program Areas (System-directed activities, University-directed activities, and CCE-directed activities);

As the Program Review Team met with the Dean, staff and faculty supporting the College, as well as the members of the campus and regional community it serves, the issue of the scale of the fundamental work the College needs to undertake to strengthen its assessment activities loomed increasingly large. This lead the Team to consider whether CCE’s interests would be met most effectively by simply collaborating with the assessment structure on the main campus, or if a dedicated assessment support structure would enable the College to move most effectively to meet its assessment challenges.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 13:** That based on an initial consultation with the Director of the Office of Academic Program Assessment (OAPA), CCE will investigate the value of creating a CCE-based office of program assessment;

While an examination of the self-study’s exemplars revealed that there are “deliberate assessment programs” in each of them, the College of Continuing Education recognized the challenges it faces in its efforts to develop, implement, assess and improve its programs. The College took advantage of Program Review Option C’s Focused Inquiry to reflect on some solutions to the challenges it must meet.

**VII/ INSTUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE COLLEGE**
Overall, the Program Review Team was left with the impression that while the campus and CSU system requires CCE staff, instructors and students to follow all the same guidelines and processes as the rest of campus (as evidenced by this self-study process), the College is often
not seen as not having to follow the rules. Although the College has consistently and persistently worked to correct this misapprehension, its efforts have not met with significant success.

- **Physical Facilities and Equipment**: Programs and courses are scheduled in the College’s own facilities in Napa Hall, regular academic classrooms throughout campus, and at off-campus locations throughout the region. Interviews with students, staff and the dean revealed that the College has some difficulty scheduling rooms for its CCE-directed activities as they are treated as “events” rather than as classes.

- **Student Support Services**
  In interviews with staff faculty and students, a consistent complaint was that despite paying tuition at self-support levels, non-matriculated and students taking non-credit courses (especially those in the ELI) found themselves unable to access basic University services such as Saclink, SaCT, OneCards, the Library, the Well and dining services. Additionally, academic support staff reported difficulties with scheduling in CMS and problems that arise with financial aid because the CCE calendar is not strictly aligned to the main campus schedule.

  **Program Review Team Recommendation 15**: That the Dean of the College of Continuing Education consult with the Provost and other appropriate administrators to arrange access to a broad range of University support services and activities for CCE students, staff, and faculty so that they will feel a stronger connection to the University.

**VIII/OPTION C: FOCUSED INQUIRY**

For its focused inquiry, the College fixed its attention and resources on the issue of the alignment between its programs, services and audiences. The self-study allowed the College to investigate its areas of achievement, opportunity and challenge. The size and complexity of CCE’s programming makes it clear that in order to maintain its success, the College must continue to implement an iterative set of practices that improve and renew current programs, support research to fulfill new needs, and facilitate collaboration with faculty, experts and clients to predict new directions.

In the Focused Inquiry section of its self-study report, the College of Continuing Education reported on some of the lessons it has learned as it works to improve its responsiveness to the needs of its students and clients. For example, the College has realized that what it calls
“hygiene factors,” environmental influences such as comfortable classrooms, adequate teaching technologies and technical support are basic expectations of its students and clients. The self –study offers specific commitments the College has made as a result of its focused inquiry. They are:

- CCCE is committed to hire qualified on-campus faculty as much as possible under existing rules;
- CCE is committed to offer its programs in multiple modalities, since different learners thrive in different course formats;
- CCE is committed to work with employers and bargaining units to collect robust data on program participants and to assure detailed assessments of learning outcomes;
- CCE is committed to create learning environments that resemble work retreats in order to enable participants to focus on the learning exclusively;
- CCE is committed to maintain student demographic data and attendance, and to structure the learning with CEUs whenever appropriate;
- CCE is committed to work with all levels in an organization, because it supports organizational change, supports training and development, and leads to more robust programs for employers and students alike. (Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, pp. 93-94)

Program Review Team Recommendation 16: That the College of Continuing Education include some public statement about its core “commitments” on its website and operationalize them to provide a foundation for planning and implementing improvement and assessment activities.

The Focused Inquiry section also included a detailed and useful chart (Exhibit 48, p. 95) delineating and comparing the offerings, governance, development processes, delivery modalities, assessment obligations and improvement responsibilities of each of the three major categories of CCE undertakings----System-directed, University-directed, and CCE-directed. This information reconfirms the external consultant’s characterization of the College as having “a solid portfolio of programs that extends the excellent academic programs of the university beyond the walls of CSUS.” (External Program Review Report, p.10)

The College of Continuing Education made excellent use of the self-study as an opportunity to observe the alignment between its current processes, practices and goals, and to reflect on areas where improvements were desirable. The result of their careful consideration of both the College’s current and potential future activities led the College to make eleven
recommendations in four major areas: data collection and management; assessment; operations; and strategy.

Data Collection and Management: Several of the issues raised in the recommendations presented by the College have been considered by the Program Review Team in earlier sections of this report.

- **Recommendation I.1.1:** Consider centralizing data collection and the adoption of a standard set of data collected for all programs (FERPA guidelines and client restrictions permitting);
- **Recommendation I.1.3:** Investigate with the Office of Institutional Research whether a college fact book can be developed for CCE;
- **Recommendation I.2.1:** For non-matriculated students in Special Session Programs, consider collecting demographic data consistent with the data for matriculated in other colleges;
- **Recommendation I.2.2:** For students enrolled in Extension Programs, the English Language Institute, and Conferences, determine what demographic data can be collected consistently across programs and develop data collection strategies to approximate the data for matriculated students. *(Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, p. 97.)*

The College’s proposals concerning data collection and management reflect a thoughtful consideration of issues facing any effort by CCE to gather data about its students. As the Program Team advised earlier in this report, any meaningful efforts at data collection should be framed by a clear sense of the purposes of collecting data contextualized by CCE’s mission. Collecting student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic groupings and areas of study seems like a suitable starting point for developing institutionalized structures and processes. Additionally, a mature data collection process should also track student achievement, satisfaction and experiences. The recommendations the College developed for data collection and management are good first steps in creating a database that will support CCE’s mission and improvement efforts.

Assessment: The activities and research required to complete the self-study report, revealed to the College of Continuing Education that there were significant gaps in its assessment efforts. The College offered four recommendations:

- **Recommendation II.3.1:** Develop a comprehensive program to encourage course evaluations for every Winter Intersession and Summer Session course with the collaboration of college deans, department chairs and faculty, in line with current provisions for faculty evaluations;
- **Recommendation II.3.2**: Verify for programs administered through CCE that the department’s assessment plan is in place, is being implemented, that the proposed assessment schedule is being followed and that corrective action is taken when needed;

- **Recommendation II.3.3**: Develop a comprehensive program of assessment for CCE directed programs, to tie program objectives, learning goals and assessment outcomes in an iterative process directed to close any gaps in the assessment process;

- **Recommendation II.3.4**: Continue to refine the assessment instruments and processed for CCE directed programs, and where feasible, consider longitudinal surveys of alumni in cohort based programs to measure long term success (*Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011*, p. 98.)

The need for systematic assessment of the learning taking place in the College of Continuing Education requires that the College focus some energy and resources on issue of quality and integrity for both the instruction and the learning that takes place in its programs. Some core questions need to be addressed as the College moves forward on its assessment agenda: What is the quality of CCE students’ learning and how does it compare to other students on campus? How will CCE address the effectiveness of its instructors in achieving program learning outcomes? How is the instruction in Winter and Summer sessions assessed to ensure that CCE program goals, as well as department or course-based goals are met?

Historically, CCE has emphasized the prerogatives and responsibilities of departments and Colleges to ensure that appropriate assessments of student learning and instructional quality are being undertaken. However, this position has, in some ways, prevented CCE from being able to make a case that the learning of CCE students is of high quality and academic legitimacy. While collaboration is certainly the preferred method to ensure good working relationships between the College and the rest of the campus, CCE might consider developing, promoting and reviewing its own independent program assessment plans, drawing on the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals, which could, in some cases, subsume departmental assessments of student learning. In some ways, the College is a victim of its emphasis on collaboration, as it could take on a more active role in setting parameters for hiring; in deciding how many courses an instructor might teach during a single session or calendar year; in monitoring how many classes a student takes in a single session; and in reviewing and evaluating classroom instruction. Even within the context of current University policies and contractual obligations, by which College must abide, it can undoubtedly take more control of the educational matters it supervises, and thereby, perhaps, counteracting some of the campus perception that the College is simply a profit center for the University and a source of additional income for faculty
and departments and does not have academic legitimacy equivalent to that of the main campus.

For example, while CCE is a significant provider of General Education and discipline-based courses, through its Winter and Summer session offerings, it has not developed a set of practices to gauge the effectiveness of the teaching and learning that goes on in those offerings, nor has the College tied educational effectiveness in those classes to its mission or hiring practices. Depending on departments and teaching faculty to assess these classes does not offer the College the opportunity to examine or calibrate the performance of students and faculty in its classes.

- **Review Team Recommendation 17**: That the College of Continuing Education pursues its own self-study recommendations on assessment, by setting its own standards of performance, choosing its own assessment methods, contextualizing its efforts in its own interpretations of the results, and making plans to act on its findings in ways that support both its unique mission and the student learning outcomes delineated in the University Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

**Operations**: In its self-study, the College offered detailed and compelling evidence of its effectiveness during a difficult economic period. The College managed costs very well, decreasing both its direct and indirect costs consistently during the period under review. Overall, its 1.69% margin is a strong indicator of the College’s commitment to its cost-recovery model of operation. To continue to ensure the solid performance of its enterprise, the College made two recommendations in its self-study relating to its operations:

- **Recommendation I.6.2**: CCE should continue to strive towards operational efficiency: applying cost control measures in direct program costs and indirect costs will facilitate CCE’s ability to offer affordable programs;
- **Recommendation I.1.2**: Investigate development of a single database system for all CCE activities, or should that not be possible, consider developing a data warehouse that allows easy access to all relevant data. (*Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011*, p.99.)

The Program Review Team commended the College’s commitment to affordable programming and dealt with the issue of data collection earlier in this report.
**Strategy:** A final area of focus for the College of Continuing Education’s self-study was consideration of the strategies it should employ to ensure future success. The College describes itself as “very entrepreneurial, developing new programs and programming.” (Self-Study Report 2005-2006-2010-2011, p. 99) However, during the recent economic downturn, the College noticed declines in revenues, programming, and staffing which suggested that attention should be paid to the balance of programs in the College portfolio as well as their diversity. This awareness of the need for strategic thinking led the College to make a final self-study recommendation:

- **Recommendation I.6.1:** CCE should make deliberate attempts to diversify its portfolio of programs and to ensure that no single activity overly dominates its revenues. Particularly, CCE should seek to emphasize programming that is less susceptible to recession and determine how increased academic offerings may help in this respect. (Self-Study Report 2005/2006-2010/2011, p.99.)

In his report, the external consultant, Dr. Jeet Joshee made a specific recommendation related to strategic planning and future growth. Dr. Joshee acknowledged CCE’s expertise in non-credit program development and urged the College plan for sustained growth in that area:

> It is evident from interviews that CCE enjoys great customer satisfaction and name recognition for developing and offering quality professional development programs. This is a tremendous advantage that the University should plan to grow in multiple disciplines. This will provide CCE and CSUS a focused growth strategy and create new opportunities.

> This domestic expertise that CCE has in management training programs could also be extended to global markets as more and more emerging new economies are in need to train their mid to upper level management personnel. These new markets and new revenue streams will need to be carefully planned and the Dean and his management team will need to articulate a broader vision for CCE growth (External Program Review Report, p. 10.)

As Dr. Joshee suggests, “While growth and new revenue streams are desirable CCE will need to develop a strategic plan that clearly outlines how big should CCE grow so that the quality of the programs and the support services it needs are well maintained. Extension of professional and management training programs to international markets are exciting opportunities for CCE and
the University” (External Program Review Report, p. 10.) Building on Dr. Joshee’s comments, the Program Review Team makes the following recommendation:

**Program Review Team Recommendation 18:** That the College of Continuing Education convene a Strategic Planning Working Group, with a membership of interested stakeholders from the College, University and community to develop an implementable plan for future goals, directions, and resource development and allocation.

Dr. Joshe, who is the Dean of the College of Continuing Education at California State University, Long Beach had a positive impression of the College of Continuing Education at Sacramento State. In his report, he affirmed the College’s strong position:

The College of Continuing Education at California State University, Sacramento has a solid portfolio of programs that extends the excellent academic programs of the university beyond the walls of CSUS. The college is managed capably and is well-positioned to assume a more strategic academic role on behalf of the University. With few administrative adjustments and by employing several new strategies, the University administration can challenge the college to go to the next level of academic and professional programming that will serve the community and the University at even higher levels of effectiveness and success (External Program Review Report, p. 11.)

**IX/CONCLUSION: Recommendation to the Faculty Senate:**
After its review of the College’s self-study and in a variety of conversations with the Dean, staff, faculty and students, the Program Review Team concurs with Dr. Joshee’s findings, and has grounded its recommendations in support of the College’s goals for improvement and growth.

**Program Review Team Recommendation 23:** Based on this review and the self-study report prepared by the College of Continuing Education, the Program Review Team recommends that all of the College’s programs and academic activities be approved for six years or until the next scheduled program review.