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INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

History.  California State University, Sacramento was founded in 1947 to provide school teachers, community leaders, musicians, artists, and a talented workforce for the Sacramento Valley region. Originally named Sacramento State College, the University moved to its present location on the banks of the historic American River in 1953 and was renamed California State University, Sacramento in 1972. Since its origin, the campus has grown from a small teachers’ college into an expansive 300-acre metropolitan university that is the seventh-largest campus in the 23-campus CSU system.

What has not changed in the ensuing half-century is the University’s commitment to the founders’ vision of a vibrant comprehensive university committed to community involvement and excellence in teaching, learning, and research.

CSU, Sacramento seeks to fulfill its mission as a regional educational center of excellence in a myriad of ways:

Teaching.  Excellence in teaching and learning is our primary focus. To foster this commitment, we require a broad general education program for all students, and we offer a low student-to-faculty ratio to facilitate interaction and contact. The fact that teaching is the most important consideration in faculty evaluations underscores our commitment to this area of university life.

Scholarship.  In addition to teaching, the University encourages faculty engagement in research and creative activity. Regarding faculty scholarship as a stimulus for student learning, the University has supported its own internal Research and Creative Activity Award Program.

Today CSU, Sacramento faculty and students generate annually $24 million in research grants and $71 million in grants and contracts in pure and applied research.

Community.  CSU, Sacramento is working to fulfill its mission of community engagement through programs that involve both students and faculty with regional organizations and institutions.

Students are highly engaged in the Sacramento community, with 40% of CSU, Sacramento students performing volunteer work that generates 2.3 million volunteer hours every year. In addition, over 1,000 students take classes that have a community service/collaboration component.

Through its 30 affiliated research centers, institutions, and outreach programs, Sacramento State faculty help train first-time teachers and provide free assistance to small businesses in the capital region. In addition, they conduct economic, social, public policy, and educational research for clients throughout the region and the state. A recent analysis found that the University’s economic impact on the region exceeds $743.5 million annually, and that CSU, Sacramento provides 15,986 jobs to area residents. Most of the 5,000 students who graduate from CSU, Sacramento each year remain in the area.

How the Student Body Reflects Who We Are.  Today the California State University, Sacramento campus, located in the 25th largest metropolitan area in the United States, is home to a multicultural student body of nearly 29,000 students. Almost all of CSU, Sacramento’s students commute to their classes from work and home, and more than 78,000 of our 161,000 alums make their home in the metropolitan area.

In 2003 Time magazine named Sacramento the most integrated city in the country, and this diversity is reflected in the CSU, Sacramento student body. Fifty-five percent of our students identify themselves as non-white and 33% consider themselves multi-ethnic.
How Our Programs Serve the Student Body and the Region.

CSU, Sacramento students are enrolled in 60 undergraduate, 40 master’s degree, and two joint doctoral programs within eight colleges.

Recognizing that over two-thirds of its students work while taking classes, CSU, Sacramento has developed the largest cooperative education program in California, offering hundreds of students each year credit for paid work experiences related to their majors. The University is fifth among U.S. universities in using federal work-study funds to promote community service. CSU, Sacramento has utilized its location in the state capital to offer California’s only undergraduate degree in government journalism, and in cooperation with UC Santa Barbara we offer one of only 10 public history doctorate programs in the nation. CSU, Sacramento was the first public university in the state to offer a master’s degree in software engineering and also the state’s first internet-based public relations undergraduate program. We are one of two universities in Northern California to offer a program in audio logy, and in Summer 2005 we will begin a joint doctorate program in educational leadership in conjunction with Sonoma State and UC, Davis.

The Current Context

In the eight years since the last WASC re-accreditation review, this regional comprehensive university has grown approximately 22%, from 18,060 full-time equivalent students in fall 1996 to 22,001 in fall 2004. Within the past year CSU, Sacramento has experienced major changes in its administrative leadership. Dr. Donald Gerth retired after 19 years as President, and Dr. Alexander Gonzalez became CSU, Sacramento’s 11th President. Shortly thereafter, President Gonzales named new Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Advancement and Student Affairs. We also have two newly appointed deans and two interim deans. This is truly a time of transition.

These sweeping changes in administrative leadership come at a time when CSU, Sacramento, like all California public universities, is facing major budget cuts, a shift in enrollment focus from recruiting new students to limiting new admissions, and an influx of new full-time faculty to replace retiring faculty.

Together, the challenges posed by these major changes and the WASC re-accreditation review make this an appropriate time for CSU, Sacramento to undertake a re-examination of its mission and its strategic planning structures and processes. Accordingly, we would like to adopt a strategic planning approach to this WASC re-accreditation review, and within this over-arching approach we propose to focus on three areas centrally related to our mission and the current challenges CSU, Sacramento faces in fulfilling it: (1) academic programs, (2) campus life, and (3) community engagement and impact.

We believe that by adopting this approach we will be able to address the core commitments of institutional capacity and educational effectiveness while continuing to develop and refine the strategic planning process as it relates to evaluating student learning and teaching effectiveness, the culture of evidence which we began during the last WASC Review, and the opportunities and challenges offered by the major changes in leadership, enrollment, and budget.

Responses to the 1996-97 WASC Report.

In its 1996-97 reaccreditation review report, the WASC report observed that conversations on the CSU, Sacramento campus had begun to focus on substantive educational issues, including assessment of student learning. WASC’s Accrediting Commission report noted evidence that the academic administration was supporting and encouraging programs and faculty members to learn more about assessing student outcomes and about faculty roles in learning-centered institutions. Furthermore, the report also noted that faculty members were taking advantage of these opportunities.
In the years since that final report, CSU, Sacramento has actively addressed the challenge of becoming a place where learning outcomes are an integral part of university life. Both the conversations and faculty participation in assessing student learning have not only continued, but have become part of the campus culture at CSU, Sacramento.

In its 1997 final Report, WASC posed four questions.

1. “How appropriate are current assessment instruments and what new assessment instruments need to be designed by faculty to assess student learning outcomes?”

In regard to this question, the WASC Report made three suggestions: (1) continue efforts to clarify the language of the emerging culture shift, (2) increase efforts to provide a broad base of expertise about assessment and how it can be useful in departments and among faculty and staff, and (3) focus both assessment and improvement activities in a way that permits ongoing work and sustained effort by concentrating on questions within themes rather than on broad themes, and assessing the benefit/effort ratios of assessment/improvement strategies in order to determine which should be continued and become part of the university’s fabric and which should not.

In response to the issue of faculty-designed tools to assess student learning, the CSU, Sacramento campus community has been deeply involved in developing outcomes assessment strategies for department majors and the General Education program. A General Education assessment cycle has been established and implemented and departments submit annual assessment reports for majors in their programs. These assessment processes have recently become embedded in the program review process.

To move the assessment process beyond the department level, in spring 2004 the Faculty Senate approved a proposal to incorporate student learning assessment, as well as assessment of departments’ General Education course offerings, into each academic department’s Program Review, thereby establishing a mechanism for seamless ongoing review and reflection on student learning within academic program centers and in Academic Affairs.

2. What infrastructure is needed to assure the institution’s commitment to teaching and learning?

The 1996-97 WASC Report noted that the university had begun to develop “a more robust infrastructure to ensure the continuation of these assessment efforts.” The report acknowledged that along with the University Faculty Senate and other university bodies, the Council for University Planning (CUP), a campus-wide advisory body, played an important role in linking budget, planning, and assessment. While CUP was still developing during the last WASC review, the question from the report prompted reflection on how effectively CUP currently responds to issues of teaching and learning.

In the years since our last review, WASC has extended its emphasis from a focus on data and assessment to include a focus on student learning. Operating under the assumption that all universities are now active participants in “Cultures of Evidence,” this shift is the next logical step in changing the paradigm of academe primarily based on knowledge and content to a paradigm that emphasizes student learning. In order for CSU, Sacramento to further develop in this direction, certain changes and innovations are needed in our current strategic planning infrastructure. Developing and beginning to implement these strategic planning changes will enable us to use the WASC review both to accomplish our goals regarding three issues central to CSU, Sacramento—academic programs, campus life, and community engagement and impact—and to significantly address the core commitments of institutional capacity and educational effectiveness as they relate to these themes.

The WASC re-accrediting review process provides the opportunity to reexamine the CUP strategic planning process and to reflect on data trends in student learning that move from program centers
to CUP. The preliminary work of the WASC Steering Group indicates that the most efficient vehicle for this alignment is an annual analysis of the program review reports in Academic Affairs. Because all self-studies are now required to report on GE and major outcomes, all program reviews should include the assessment of student learning. Patterns and trends that are revealed from this annual analysis can be moved into the strategic planning process by the Vice President of Academic Affairs when he makes his annual report to CUP. The details of this planning process will be worked out by the Program Review subcommittee of the Academic Programs Emphasis in the Educational Effectiveness review (See page 10).

3. How can the university – or various schools and departments – define effective teaching more comprehensively so that it includes responsibility for curricular design as well as professional practice with student learning as the goal?

While we cannot point to specific initiatives undertaken to address the definition of effective teaching, CSU, Sacramento has responded to the issue through revisions in the process and standards used in the Program Review process as well as the process used for General Education Course Review.

After several years of discussions among faculty who attended a variety of state, regional, and national conferences and training sessions on Student Learning and Assessment, a revised Self-Study and Program Review Process and Standard was developed, and the final version was approved in 2004 by the Faculty Senate. The revised Program Review involves a three-part assessment process: (1) demonstrated linkage between department mission, program-level goals and learning outcomes, with specific courses designed to facilitate student achievement of those outcomes; (2) the use of data from two indirect and one direct assessment measure to assess student learning of these outcomes; and (3) an assessment-driven faculty reflection process that opens considered discussion and encourages change.

A similar process was implemented for the General Education program: faculty teaching general education courses must submit (to a faculty General Education/Graduation Requirements Course Review Subcommittee) their course syllabi and an assessment plan. The plan must specify the linkage of General Education goals and learning outcomes to course-specific versions of those learning outcomes, and the assessment methods and criteria used to evaluate and reflect on student achievement of these learning outcomes.

In the years since the last WASC review, CSU, Sacramento has been deeply committed to developing and strengthening faculty expertise, involvement, and responsibility for assessing student learning. Developing ways of defining effective teaching remains an ongoing issue, and the Center for Teaching and Learning has been active in developing faculty mentors to work with new faculty in a formative assessment and reflection process. We believe it is important for CSU, Sacramento to continue its efforts to define effective teaching. We propose to use this WASC Re-accreditation Review to identify new ways in which we can address these important ongoing issues.

4. The final issue raised by the 1996-97 WASC Report asked CSU, Sacramento to consider “What is the University’s definition of the baccalaureate degree, including general education, the major, writing and other skills?”

In response to this question, a faculty task force worked for two years to develop a set of Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the Faculty Senate Curriculum Policies Committee last year recommended that we assess the outcomes. This recommendation was sent to CUP and recommended to the President as a Planning Objective. As a consequence, this objective will become a major focus of the Academic Programs emphasis for the EE Review.
CONSULTATION AND CAMPUS INVOLVEMENT

To begin preparations for the WASC Review and to guide the overall process, a WASC Steering Group was formed. This Phase I Committee included representatives from a broad campus constituency, including the faculty, the Office of Institutional Research, the Faculty Senate, CUP, general education and program assessment, Student Affairs, the student body, and the College deans (See Appendix A).

To begin, the WASC Steering (Phase I) Committee started planning for the WASC Review with the assumption that in order to look carefully at “who we are and what we strive to be” we need to clarify our identity as a university. Because it had been some time since this discussion had received serious attention on campus, and because there had been much growth and change since the last mission statement was developed, the WASC Steering Committee developed a plan to focus university attention on our mission. Our plan for this process was as follows:

• Members of the Steering Committee were assigned to contact various campus constituencies (e.g., the Faculty Senate, CUP, Associated Students Incorporated Board, the academic Colleges, Student Affairs and Student Support Programs and Units, the University Staff Assembly, the Alumni Association) and to ask them to discuss the issue of our identity as a university, to provide reflection and feedback on our mission.
• To prepare for this discussion, the Steering Committee prepared a handout (see Appendix A: October 2003 Campus Constituency Mission Consultation Plan) which asked campus constituents to review CSU, Sacramento’s mission from an historical perspective (we attached the “University Mission and Goals” from the CSU, Sacramento 2002/04 Catalog, pp. 26-27), and to respond to three questions defining what they believed should be (1) the most important current values and beliefs that define CSU, Sacramento; (2) the University’s most important aspirations; and (3) the University’s most vital obligations.
• Once we received feedback, the WASC Steering Committee summarized the feedback, seeking points of overlap and intersection.
• Next, the Steering Committee composed a draft mission statement and sent it out to the campus constituency groups for review and feedback.
• The Steering Committee reviewed this feedback, incorporated it into a new draft mission statement and solicited further feedback. This process was repeated several times until the current, final mission statement emerged. While we expected to find divergent values and visions from the various constituencies, we were surprised to see enormous consensus across the campus, receiving almost unanimous agreement on the central values of the University. This consensus made the task of writing the statement easier, and it reaffirmed our sense of the campus as a community (see Appendix B: University Mission and Goals).

Through the process of revising the mission statement, the Steering Group chair regularly updated the Council for University Planning and the Faculty Senate as well as the Office of the President.

The breadth of the University constituencies who participated in the process of revising the mission statement provides an illustration of the broad, ongoing involvement of institutional representatives in the review process. As with the development of the Mission Statement and the Institutional Proposal, in the next phases of the review we will include involvement from the campus community, including the following constituencies:

Senior Administration
Faculty Senate Leadership
Faculty
Staff
Students
Alumni

A variety of communication methods will be used to provide information to the campus community
and to solicit their input, including:
1) WASC website ([www.oir.csus.edu/wasc](http://www.oir.csus.edu/wasc))
2) hyperlinks to other important campus sites (e.g. the Institutional Portfolio, the Council for University Planning)
3) presentations and discussions with all College Academic Councils
4) presentations and discussions with Student Affairs managers and directors
5) discussions with the Council on University Planning (CUP)
6) discussion with the Faculty Senate
7) discussions with Associated Students, Inc.
8) faculty focus groups
9) University Town Hall meetings.

**STAGING AND TIMELINE**

We expect to complete the self-study for the Preparatory Review by November 2006, anticipating a site visit in Spring 2007. We expect to complete the self-study for the Educational Effectiveness Review by November 2007 with the site visit scheduled for Spring 2008. See Appendix G for a more detailed schedule of timelines and milestones.

The WASC Steering Group was charged with developing the Institutional Proposal and has met weekly during the academic year since Fall 2003 to conceptualize the self-study process, to revise the Council for University Planning strategic planning process, and to draft the institutional proposal. This group will continue to guide the overall WASC re-accreditation process as we move more deeply into the next two phases.

In Spring 2004 the WASC Capacity/Preparatory Working Group was identified and began analysis of Stipulated Polices identified in the WASC 2001 Handbook. Members of this working group will be charged with the development of the four major sections of the Educational Effectiveness Review: Planning, Academic Programs, Student Life, and Community Engagement. In addition, these subgroups will be organized around the hypotheses for each theme and each will be paired with their Capacity/Preparatory Review counterparts to ensure continuity and coherence across these phases of the self-study.

The work of the Preparatory Review group and the Educational Effectiveness Review group is expected to be overlapping, iterative, and dialectical. As Appendix E implies, the three phases of this self-study are convergent rather than sequential. For example, the revision of CUP is actually a part of the EE Review though it began during the proposal stage. The following sections explain more fully the rationale for this decision. To summarize for the moment, proposing a sequential work plan seems to us overly mechanistic and would prevent the dynamic responsiveness to institutional needs that we are hoping to create and engender with this review.

**INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW (PHASE II)**

One of the primary objectives we hope to accomplish through the re-accreditation process is a more comprehensive, unified understanding of the data currently being gathered across the university and an enhanced ability to use this data in the strategic planning process. The Institutional Capacity and Preparatory Review will provide the opportunity for examining both the data we have as mentioned on page 8, and its adequacy for self-review under the Standards of Accreditation.

In structuring our Preparatory Review, we will include a matrix of the Criteria for Review that we believe are clearly fulfilled by long-established policy and which are not directly related to the study that we plan to undertake as a part of the EE Review (see Appendix F for a listing of those CFRs and a preliminary listing of hyperlinks to their evidence).

We will also include a reflective essay that
demonstrates how the EE Review will be based upon the current context of CSUS with regard to the planning policies and practices that underpin each of the three themes (see Appendix F). The overarching purpose of this essay will be to provide the rationale for issues to be addressed in the EE Review. In addition, the Preparatory Review will be evaluative in the sense that we will analyze the extent to which we fulfill the standards, areas where we find weaknesses in evidence, and where we intend to go from here.

The outline for the structure of the second essay follows:

1. Planning at CSUS:
   This section of the essay will address standards that concern strategic thinking and planning and also those related to the commitment to learning and improvement in the planning process (i.e., 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6). In addition to describing the previous strategic planning process and mission statement, we will analyze weaknesses and explain the need for changes in these areas for the EE Review. The Planning Subgroup of the Capacity/Preparatory Review will work with the Planning Subgroup of the EE Review to initiate implementation of changes in the planning process. (See Appendix G for organization.)

2. Academic Programs
   This section will address the criteria for review in Standard Two that concern the current policy guidelines for academic programs and academic program review, assessment in academic programs, support for scholarship, and support for student learning (i.e., 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7). This section will also take up a number of the criteria for review in Standard Four on the commitment to learning and improvement with regard to planning (i.e., 4.3, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8). Further, the discussion will center on the analysis of what evidence and processes need to be added or improved to create a more learning centered campus and on-going formative assessment. The Campus Life subgroup for the Capacity/Preparatory Review will work with the Campus Life subgroup of the Educational Effectiveness subgroup to begin developing and implementing changes.

3. Campus Life
   This section will address the criteria for review in Standard Two that are related to Scholarship and Learning. The issues of experiential learning (e.g. service learning, cooperative education, and internships) and co-curricular learning (e.g. students’ involvement in clubs, organizations, campus employment) are of particular interest here. The criteria for review with regard to experiential education and co-curricular programs are also critical (i.e., 2.9, 2.11). In addition, the criteria for review in Standard Four that concern the commitment of learning and improvement are also of interest (i.e., 4.4, 4.6, 4.8). However, this section will focus on the role of Student Affairs in student learning, how Student Affairs is integrated with Academic Affairs to achieve student learning, and how those efforts are assessed. Like the preceding section, the discussion will center on the analysis of what evidence and processes need to be added or improved to create a more learning centered campus and on-going formative assessment. The Campus Life subgroup for the Capacity/Preparatory Review will work with the Campus Life subgroup of the Educational Effectiveness subgroup to begin developing and implementing changes.

4. Community Engagement
   This section will establish the rationale for the integration of efforts in Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to respond to the goals of the University’s mission and the strategic goals of community engagement. This section will emphasize the evolving role of student leadership, civic engagement, and career development in the union of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. While the document will describe how the University’s community engagement responds to the standards of scholarship and creative activity
described in Standard Two, the real intent of this segment of the document will be to demonstrate the relationship between the three themes that have been chosen for the EE Review. The Community Engagement and Impact Subgroup for the Preparatory Review will work with the Community Engagement and Impact Subgroup for the EE Review to begin developing and implementing change.

A number of primary web-based sources of evidence will be used to support the Capacity and Preparatory Review. These sources include the following.

CSUS Strategic Planning:
* Council for University Planning (Accountability, Institutional Planning At CSUS, Budget, Enrollment Management Plans, and Capital Outlay Plans, etc.)
* Office of Institutional Research (student information, faculty workload, supporting information for institutional assessment and academic program assessment, etc.)

CSUS Assessment:
* Assessment and Accountability for Learning (e.g., Program Review Guidelines and Reports, Academic Program Assessment Plans, summary of annual department assessment reports etc.)
* General Education Assessment (e.g. GE Learning Goals, GE Outcomes, etc.)
* University Electronic Portfolio (Institutional Portfolio, Program Portfolios)
* WASC Accreditation (e.g., CSUS Accreditation Process, Preparation Timeline, etc.)

Others:
Academic Affairs Website
Business Affairs Website
Center for Teaching and Learning Website
Faculty Senate Website
Human Resources Website
Community Collaboration Website
University Affairs Website
Research and Sponsored Projects Website
Student Affairs Website
University Catalog
University Library
University Policy Manual

THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
(PHASE III)

We propose to use the strategic planning-based model for the Educational Effectiveness Report. Under this model, we propose to address in depth three strategic planning themes: Academic Programs, Campus Life, and Community Engagement and Impact.

Strategic Planning Model
The Council for University Planning (CUP) is at the center of the CSU, Sacramento strategic planning process. In its current configuration, CUP membership includes every constituency associated with the university, including students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community representatives. CUP actively addresses present priorities and recommends future directions for the university. In responding to priorities, CUP serves as a vehicle for overseeing and coordinating the University planning processes.

Each year, CUP analyzes and evaluates assessment data and key performance indicators to determine how well the University is accomplishing its goals, a process that leads to recommendations of the strategic planning objectives. It was intended that the Council play a central role in thorough and careful planning and effective utilization of resources. In the early years of CUP, there was a deliberate and innovative emphasis on the inclusion of institutional assessment in the University’s planning.

In choosing the strategic planning approach, we determined to examine educational effectiveness as defined by the WASC standards through the lens of planning. However, in order to focus our planning and resources on student learning and to answer the questions posed by the 1997 WASC final report, we realized that the strategic planning process needed to be restructured to include communication and collaboration among CUP and the Vice Presidents, the colleges, and the program centers that report to the Vice Presidents. Moreover, we also realized that the WASC Steering Group would need to move forward in
revising this process in order to have something to show for our work by the time of the EE site visit. For these reasons, the Steering Group undertook this revision process. Although this revision is a part of the Educational Effectiveness Phase of the self-study, we determined that a meaningful self-study could not proceed without these structural changes in place. In conjunction with the Vice Presidents and the CUP Planning Committee, the WASC Steering Group revised the CUP charge to reduce the number of strategic planning objectives recommended to the President each year, created a mechanism for assigning the objectives to Vice Presidents, created a process for developing initiatives that would respond to the planning objectives, and developed an accountability process for reporting on the results of initiatives. These changes to the CSUS strategic planning process were initiated in the Fall 2004 semester. From this point onward, each fall CUP will engage in an in-depth review of two of the eight strategic planning themes. These in-depth reviews are expected to produce a limited number of planning objectives that will result in initiatives which respond to institutional needs.

In addition to these structural changes, we chose Academic Programs, Community Engagement, and Campus Life as the three themes that would be studied in-depth for the WASC review. The CUP reviews of these three themes are expected to serve as the linchpin for the WASC in-depth reviews. Each theme will be reviewed and reexamined with a focus on student learning. Based on institutional data and departmental assessment data from the Vice Presidents, CUP will make recommendations for planning objectives for each theme. In addition, the WASC EE subcommittees for each theme will provide rationales and recommendations for those planning objectives. They will also study the additional sources of planning data that underpin each theme, much of which will be analyzed by the Capacity/Preparatory Review Working Groups.

**Expected Strategic Planning Outcomes**

The intended outcomes to the planning process we expect to result from this approach to the Educational Effectiveness Review are the following:

1. Reexamination and revision of the language of the University mission statement and all strategic planning themes, particularly the goals of the themes, to reflect our intended focus on student learning. At this point, the mission statement has been revised and approved and two of the planning themes have been rewritten to focus on student learning. After the WASC review has been completed, the CUP process will continue to undertake an in-depth study of each theme as an on-going, formative practice.

2. Reexamination and adjustment of the structure and function of the Council for University Planning (CUP) to clarify and facilitate communication and collaboration between CUP, the Vice Presidents, and the academic councils and program centers that report to them. This revision was included in the revised charge to CUP and implemented in Fall 2004. The EE Review will begin to build a framework for analyzing the impact of the changes in strategic planning on student learning.

**Academic Programs Emphasis**

**Program Review**

Prior to the initiation of departmental outcomes assessment in 1999 and General Education assessment in 2002, CSU, Sacramento embraced the characteristics of a teaching-centered university where the spotlight focused on faculty-teachers rather than on learning and learners, on “content” rather than on learning processes. In this milieu faculty were highly involved in their own classes and course content rather than on the collective learning that occurs across an integrated curriculum. The intention of the campus-wide assessment efforts over the last six years has been
to begin to shift this focus from a faculty-centered culture to a student-learning-centered culture. This shift has had an impact not only in the classroom but in other aspects of student life and has mandated a more integrative relationship between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. Implicit in these efforts is the need to engage an even broader campus constituency in discussion and reflection on issues that cut across content areas as well as on the development of learning-centered practices within disciplines.

In the years since the last WASC review, a General Education assessment cycle has been developed and implemented. At the time this proposal is being submitted, three of the five areas in General Education have developed and begun implementing plans for assessing and reflecting on student learning of core general education learning outcomes in each General Education class. In addition, in spring 2004 the CSU, Sacramento Faculty Senate approved a proposal to require assessment and reflection on student learning outcomes in each academic department’s self-study for program review. As a result of our recent work on assessment, we are beginning to get more broad-based indications of patterns in student learning. For example, during the last academic year results from program review and the annual department assessment reports indicate that students improve in their writing across their college career, but they still lack the skill level that their professors expect.

The ability to locate similar general patterns in learning across departments and units is the sort of outcome that we would like to see move from the department and unit level to the institutional level. Although departments are beginning to make this shift, program review continues to emphasize governance, curricula, and enrollment. We would like to recast the focus of program review so that the self-study reports (in addition to the annual assessment reports) become a rich source of data on learning trends. Moreover, since the VP of Academic Affairs now has an opportunity to introduce planning objectives to CUP, it is the program review process in Academic Affairs that will provide the vehicle for linking department and unit level assessment with strategic planning. To ensure that this shift in program review focus occurs, we propose to engage a broad campus constituency in examining the following hypothesis for the WASC review:

**Hypothesis 1:**
The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

**Methodology:**
To test this hypothesis, this committee will examine student work in the department electronic portfolios, annual assessment reports to Academic Affairs, and focus groups with program review teams and departments that have undertaken self-study in the last five years. In addition, they will interview the Faculty Senate Curriculum Policies Committee, and other related University and Senate standing committees. The EE subcommittee will need to develop its own criteria for an effective program review process before it begins contact with the various university groups. This work directly responds to the WASC Criteria for Review on Institutional Purposes (1.2), Teaching and Learning (2.4, 2.6, 2.7), and Commitment to Learning and Improvement (4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8). See Appendix F.

Rather than establishing a separate committee for this hypothesis, the current Faculty Senate Program Review Oversight Committee will function as the EE Review Academic Programs subcommittee. The Oversight Committee will coordinate with its counter-part committee in the Capacity and Preparatory Review in its assessment of the current program review process. The Oversight Committee will also accept recommendations from the Capacity/Preparatory Working Groups’ review of data with regard to strengths and weaknesses in the program review process as they relate to student learning outcomes, and it will begin to implement those recommendations (See Appendix G, Organization Grid).
The Baccalaureate Learning Goals

The 1996-1997 WASC Report asked the University to consider the definition of the baccalaureate degree. Specifically, they asked, “What is the University’s definition of the baccalaureate degree, including General Education, the major, writing and other skills? Structurally, the answer to this question is dictated by the requirements of Title V, which mandates the areas and units for General Education and the unit requirements for majors. However, Title V only sets the lower limit for the baccalaureate degree. CSU, Sacramento has essentially raised those minimum requirements by adding a foreign language requirement and a second semester writing requirement.

The University further tightened its learning expectations by adding program review self-study guidelines that address writing in the major and information competence. To support those efforts, Academic Affairs has hired a Writing-Across-the-Curriculum specialist who holds workshops and consults with departments on discipline-specific writing issues. In addition, CSU, Sacramento has integrated information competence assessment into Area A of the GE program, and over the past year, the campus has served as a Beta site for the forthcoming ETS information competence assessment tool. Administration of this assessment tool will be expanded within the next year.

To address WASC’s question of a definition for the degree more directly, a team of faculty three years ago developed a set of Baccalaureate Learning Goals, which were endorsed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President. The definition of the learning expectations for the baccalaureate degree at CSUS is most coherently outlined in these outcomes (www.csus.edu/aca/Portfolios/GE/lnrgls.htm). Over the past year, the Faculty Senate Curriculum Policies (CPC) committee has recommended that the University develop a method for assessing the extent to which these goals are embedded into courses and programs. Knowing the complexity of this task, the CPC recommended to the Academic Programs working group of CUP that this recommendation should become a strategic planning objective for 2005-2006. Through the revised strategic planning process of CUP, the assessment of the Baccalaureate Learning Goals became a strategic priority and was sent to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for action. This planning objective will serve as our second hypothesis for the Academic Programs emphasis of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Hypothesis 2:
Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.

Methodology:
The Baccalaureate Learning Goals working group will be created to specifically develop this area of the EE Review. A chair has been identified, and one faculty member from each of the academic colleges will be selected to serve on the committee as well as a dean and a representative from Student Affairs. The working group will evaluate existing indicators of the learning outcomes such as the number of GE course outcomes that align with the Baccalaureate Learning Goals, and the departments’ reports on the extent to which their programs respond to the Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

It will also develop an assessment plan for the Learning Outcomes that can be implemented on an on-going basis. Based on the results of an initial assessment of two General Education areas, the EE subcommittee will evaluate the extent to which students achieve those learning outcomes set forth in the GE Program. It will also evaluate the feasibility of assessing the outcomes at the point of graduation. This section of work responds to the University’s Core Commitment to Institutional Purposes (i.e., 1.2 and 1.7), Teaching and Learning (i.e., 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7), and the Commitment to Learning and Improvement (4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8).
Campus Life Emphasis
The collaboration of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs

CSU, Sacramento has long been dedicated to providing a holistic undergraduate experience that promotes the development of all of our students. This commitment involves offering programs and services that help students translate their in-class learning to real-life situations, enhancing students’ sense of self and well-being, fostering their interpersonal skills, increasing their comfort in working with people different from themselves, enabling them to practice their civic responsibilities, and helping them explore professional and career options. In the past most of these efforts have been housed in the Division of Student Affairs.

Despite well-established programs to fulfill this commitment, there is a perceived disconnect among many faculty and staff with regard to the role of Student Affairs in student learning. Given the importance at CSUS of providing a well-educated workforce to the community and the joint role of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs in providing real-world, experiential learning, the inclusion of this theme in the WASC review seems particularly germane to this self-study. That is to say, excellence in academic programs for this campus necessarily involves experiential and co-curricular learning, and Student Affairs plays a major role in facilitating the linkage between the classroom and the community.

During the development of this proposal, the Vice President of Student Affairs met with the Vice President of Academic Affairs to discuss the critical points of convergence between these divisions in the interest of student learning. The Vice President of Student Affairs continued this discussion with the division directors and their staff, and out of these discussions the following WASC hypothesis emerged:

Hypothesis 1:
The University has in place the processes and institutional incentives to promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning.

At the present time, the infrastructure suggested by this hypothesis has just started to emerge. Some cross-division committees and processes exist, but there has never been a coherent understanding of how Academic Affairs and Student Affairs should be integrated, and how they should support one another in common interests. The calling together of these two divisions to co-create an expanded vision of student learning represents a new direction for this university. It seems particularly appropriate to begin this endeavor in the context of a self-study that is framed by a strategic planning approach.

Methodology:
To accomplish the goal embedded in this hypothesis an EE Campus Life working group will be established. The group will include an Associate Vice President of Student Affairs, an Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Director of Residence Life, the Director of Student Activities, the Director of the Office of Community Collaboration, the faculty coordinator of Freshman Seminars, the faculty coordinator of Learning Communities, representatives from the Enrollment Management Committee, the Director of General Education, a representative from the Faculty Senate, and student representatives from Associated Students, Inc.

This group will work with its counter-part committee from the Capacity and Preparatory Review to identify existing structures and to propose additional infrastructures. In addition, it will evaluate the efficacy of those structures that already exist. It is expected that this work will lead to greater clarity in understanding the collaboration needed between the two divisions in order to educate the whole student. Further, it is assumed that the EE working group on Campus Life will begin to put these structures in place through the CUP planning process.

The Assessment of Student Affairs Programs and Units
As with most universities, the outcomes assessment paradigm at CSUS has focused almost exclusively on academic programs in the Division of Academic Affairs. While some units within
Student Affairs have chosen to evaluate their programs, there has been no coherent assessment structure for this division, and there has not been institutional support for such a structure. Moreover, a regular cycle of program review has never been developed. While this situation is not unusual across institutions of higher education, it is a characteristic of this university that the Division of Student Affairs would like to change. The addition of this process would not only provide valuable feedback for the staff and faculty who administer Student Affairs programs, it would also help the division focus more deliberately on student learning, and it would provide more credibility for the division in demonstrating their role in student growth and learning.

Over the past year, the Vice President of Student Affairs met with Student Affairs directors and managers to begin discussion of the division’s assessment process. These discussions led to the second hypothesis for the Campus Life EE Review:

**Hypothesis 2:**

Student Affairs has assessment plans that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in co-curricular and experiential learning programs.

**Methodology:**

To accomplish the intended outcome of a well-articulated Student Affairs assessment process, an EE Campus Life working group will be formed for this hypothesis and will be composed of representatives from each unit of Student Affairs and also the Academic Affairs Assessment Coordinator. This group will work with its parallel group from the Capacity and Preparatory Campus Life Review to identify the existing assessment processes in Student Affairs and evaluate their current work. It is expected that this work will codify an assessment process for the Division of Student Affairs. This process will also provide the Vice President of Student Affairs with a mechanism for reporting department level assessment trends to the appropriate CUP working group as suggestions for planning objectives.

---

**Community Engagement and Impact Emphasis The Capital and the Community**

“Community engagement and impact” denotes not only the collective programs and events that bring the campus and the community together, but also the image and significance of the University to the region.

CSU, Sacramento has an extensive array of community engagement activities. Art, music, theatre and athletic events enhance the social and cultural offerings of the community. Conferences, lectures, symposia and library services enrich the area’s intellectual life, and on-campus clinics and programs provide specialized services to the community and the campus. In addition, over 30 CSUS Centers conduct research in the public interest and bring faculty and student expertise to community agencies and industry.

Despite these extensive efforts, the University’s associations with the community are not generally understood in the aggregate, and their assessment in terms of their impact on student learning remains unexamined. In Fall 2004, CUP undertook an in-depth review of the Community Engagement and Impact theme. Consistent with the revised CUP charge, the CUP working group for this theme revised the theme language with a focus on student learning and examined key performance indicators that are associated with this theme. The working group and the Council-at-large recommended planning objectives to the President, which will become the hypotheses for the Community Engagement Emphasis of the EE Review. The first of these hypotheses attempts to raise awareness of the interconnection between the campus and the surrounding community and to promote those linkages.

**Hypothesis 1:**

The University fosters strong linkages between Sac State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community at-large.

California State University, Sacramento is unique in the CSU system because of its location in
the state capital. The state legislature and the governor’s office provide opportunities for the university to embed a variety of programs within a “living laboratory.” In addition, the governmental offices and agencies that are associated with the Capital provide research opportunities for a large variety of social science and education departments on campus. CSU, Sacramento also serves as the CSU representative to the legislature for issues that arise with regard to legislation affecting the system. Faculty are often called on to testify on legislative panels that have implications for their fields and for higher education. Because of the obvious value that the Capital adds to our intellectual life and the value that our faculty add to the Capital, it is extremely important to tap and foster this relationship. In a similar fashion, the business community offers the same opportunities for reciprocal growth and exchange. We plan to use the WASC EE Review to organize and make visible our linkages to the Capital and the wider community where most of our graduates will continue to reside.

**Methodology:**

To accomplish the intent of this part of the EE Review, the Office of University Advancement will form a committee to be composed of an Associate Vice for University Advancement, the President’s assistant on Legislative Affairs, several of the college development directors, the Director of the Office of Community Collaboration, a Faculty Senate representative, the Director of the Career center, and a student representative. This group will work in collaboration with its counterpart committee for the Capacity/Preparatory Review to evaluate the current structures, to make visible our linkages to the Capital and the wider community where most of our graduates will.

**Student Leadership and Civic Engagement**

One of the hallmarks of this institution’s importance to Northern California is its role in providing a well-prepared workforce for the entire region. To this end every college and most departments have community engagement components, including service learning, volunteer work, cooperative education, community collaboration programs, and community outreach programs.

Students who participate in these types of experiential learning are guided by faculty and staff who help the students understand the linkage between classroom learning outcomes and real-world experience. However, beyond those expected outcomes, we have found that experience in the real world often produces unintended consequences that have a lasting impact on the student’s world view, their tolerance for ambiguity, and their ability to integrate knowledge.

In our discussions with both faculty and staff as we revised the mission statement and developed the proposal, the issue of the role of experiential learning in the overall education of students was mentioned repeatedly. Moreover, the CUP working group on Community Engagement recognized this concern from its sources of institutional data and from its discussions with the campus community. As a result, the following hypothesis was developed for the WASC EE Review:

**Hypothesis 2:**

The University offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.

**Methodology:**

To accomplish the goal of further developing leadership and civic engagement, the EE Review will take advantage of a committee that is already in place. Over the past year, a CSUS faculty member in the Department of Public Policy has been working on a Carnegie sponsored project called the American Democracy Project. As a part of this work, this professor has already conducted an audit of the types of civic engagement opportunities that are currently available to students. She has gathered a committee of faculty
and staff from Academic Affairs and Students Affairs to analyze her findings and to consider next steps. This committee’s charge will be broadened to include not only a consideration of civic engagement, but also leadership in experiential learning opportunities. This committee will work in collaboration with its sister committee in the Capacity and Preparatory Review to evaluate our current offerings and to locate future opportunities. Recommendations for change and initiatives will be made to the CUP working group on Community Engagement.

**Proposed Goals and Outcomes**

As a result of the re-accreditation process, we propose to accomplish the following goals and outcomes:

1. **Revise the strategic planning process**
   
   This revision reduces the number of planning objectives sent to the President each year. In addition, it calls for the President to assign each objective to a Vice President for action, thus focusing greater attention on fewer strategic issues, and ensuring accountability for change by assigning the objective to a specific division.

2. **Implement meaningful linkages between data trends in student learning and CUP resource planning priorities**
   
   The revised CUP process will continue the use of institutional data from key performance indicators. In addition, it will involve developing more direct paths for data trends in student learning to move from academic programs to CUP via an annual review of program review reports in Academic Affairs.

   The specific intended outcomes we expect from our research questions are:
   * Revision of the program review process that encourages greater reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.
   * An understanding of the degree to which students achieve the baccalaureate goals.

3. **Communicate and implement a learning-centered approach to campus life and student services**
   
   This will involve looking at campus life and student service issues through a broadly focused student learning lens—one that views learning not only as a classroom activity, but as a life-long process that includes out-of-classroom transferable skills and experiences.

   The specific intended outcomes we expect from our research questions are:
   * Processes for collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty.
   * Assessment plans that effectively identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in Campus Life and Student Service programs.

4. **Develop and communicate a plan for enhanced community engagement and impact involving the entire university**

   This will involve developing a plan to ensure that the extensive array of community engagement activities collectively contribute to student learning. In addition, we will continue to develop partnerships with the Capital and community civic and business leaders in the interests of both the Sacramento region and the University.

   The specific outcomes we expect from our research questions are:
   * Stronger linkages between Sac State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community.
   * Enhanced curricular and co-curricular programs that help students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.
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October 2003 Campus Constituency Mission Consultation Plan
CSUS Planning for WASC

Who we are and what we strive to be

One of the issues that must be addressed in the upcoming CSUS WASC review is our sense of identity as a university. It has been some time since this kind of discussion has received serious attention on this campus, so we are asking that you and others engage in focused consideration of our mission as a university.

Our plan for this process will be as follows:

- Various campus constituencies (e.g., Faculty Senate, CUP, ASI Board, Academic Colleges, Student Affairs and other Student Support Programs and Units, University Staff Assembly, Alumni, etc.) will discuss the issues and provide reflection and feedback.
- The WASC team will summarize and evaluate the feedback, seeking points of overlap and intersection. The team will then compose a draft Mission Statement.
- The campus constituency groups will review the draft and provide feedback to the team.

We hope that this inclusive process will promote a sense of common purpose among the university community and also provide us with a vision of where we want to go from here.

To prepare for this discussion, we ask you to review our mission from a historical perspective. For background information, please see the attached “University Mission and Goals” (CSUS 2002/04 Catalog, pp. 26-27).

We look forward to receiving your responses to the following questions:

1. In order of importance, please list three to five current values and beliefs that define this University.

2. In order of importance, what should be the university’s three to five most important aspirations?

3. In order of importance, what should be the three to five most vital obligations of this University?
Appendix B

University Mission and Goals

(Source: CSUS 2002/04 Catalog, pp. 26-27)

The mission of California State University, Sacramento - a regional comprehensive public university - is to preserve, communicate, and advance knowledge; cultivate wisdom; encourage creativity; promote the value of humankind; and improve the quality of life for its graduates and the people of the region. The education of students is the central mission of the University. Therefore, the University faculty’s primary responsibilities are teaching and the creation of an active learning environment for students.

The University is committed to the principle that responsible and knowledgeable persons freely exercising reason in the pursuit of individual and community interests play a significant and beneficial role in addressing society’s problems and enriching life. Education liberates individuals from ignorance, intolerance and dogmatism, freeing them for critical and reflective thought, and for wise and effective action. CSUS is committed to helping students develop a sense of self-confidence and self-worth, respect for diverse cultures, awareness of important social and moral issues, and concern for others. The University strives to provide students with opportunities for active participation in academic and extracurricular activities that will contribute to their ability to function productively in a rapidly changing society.

We reaffirm the value of, and the need for, education of the whole person in the tradition of a liberal undergraduate education. Building on the fundamental knowledge and skills acquired through a general education program, the University offers traditional liberal arts disciplines and professional studies which emphasize three critical curricular values: acquisition of knowledge, the development of critical thought processes, and the synthesis of knowledge - hallmarks of an educated person.

The University further enhances the intellectual life of the campus through its graduate and post-baccalaureate program offerings and research centers. Master’s, post-baccalaureate certificates and joint doctoral programs advance students’ educational achievements and prepare them for professional and leadership positions throughout the region and in society.

As a regional resource, the University is committed to providing educational opportunities that contribute to the cultural and economic development of the region. The University strives to advance the public good through collaboration with government, social and cultural agencies, and businesses and industries within the region.

The University’s mission is guided by fundamental values that reflect its identity as a public, regional, comprehensive, metropolitan university. Thus, California State University, Sacramento seeks to offer individuals the opportunity to realize their highest aspirations and become active and involved citizens for the good of the individual and society.
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Basic Descriptive Data

Required Data Elements to Support The Preparatory Review
California State University, Sacramento

Content
1. Admissions and Student Preparation
   1.1 Admissions Activities by Level
   1.2 Preparation/Selectivity Levels of Entering Students
   1.3 Admissions by Gender
   1.4 Admissions by Race/Ethnicity

2. Student Enrollments
   2.1 Headcount Enrollments by Degree Objective
   2.2 Headcount Enrollments by Gender
   2.3 Headcount Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity
   2.4 Students Receiving Financial Aid

3. Degrees Awarded
   3.1 Degrees Granted by Degree-Level Program
   3.2 Cohort Graduation, Retention and Transfer Rates

4. Faculty and Staff Composition
   4.1 Faculty Composition
   4.2 Faculty Headcount by Department/Program
   4.3 Staff by Gender and Race/Ethnicity
   4.4 Full-Time Faculty/Staff Turnover Over the Last 5 Years

5. Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources
   5.1 Information and Computing Resources
   5.2 Physical Resources—Current Year
   5.3 Sources of Revenue
   5.4 Operating Expenditures
   5.5 Assets and Liabilities
   5.6 Capital Investments
   5.7 Endowment Values and Performance

6. Institutional and Operating Efficiency
   6.1 Key Undergraduate Educational Operations Ratios
   6.2 Key Asset and Maintenance Ratios
   6.3 Key Financial Ratios

7. Assessment Activities
   7.1 Assessment Activities
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Off-Site Degree Programs

M.S. Business Administration, Taxation Option
Approved by WASC 11/03
(Distance Education)

MSW
Redding, CA
Approved by WASC 4/95

Bachelor’s of Vocational Education
Hayward, CA (current)
Merced, CA (proposed)
Approved by WASC 6/99

Master’s in Education
Alameda County
Approved by WASC 1/99
### Appendix E
#### Work Plan and Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Proposal</th>
<th>Phase II Capacity</th>
<th>Phase III Ed Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2002</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form WASC Steering Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review 97-98 WASC self study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and discuss the new WASC standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to study new WASC standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in WASC workshop (Carson, Ca.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose approach for Phase III EE review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up WASC website <a href="http://www.oir.csus.edu/wasc">www.oir.csus.edu/wasc</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2003</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Phase I Proposal Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin revisions of CUP strategic planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin communication with ten campus constituency groups to revise the CSUS Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather feedback from constituency groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a revised statement and circulate it again to the various constituency groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update WASC website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Institutional Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Proposal</td>
<td>Phase II Capacity</td>
<td>Phase III Ed Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004 Circulate draft of revised Mission Statement for campus feedback</td>
<td>Identify Phase II Preparatory Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue revisions of strategic planning process</td>
<td>Phase II Working Group studies new WASC standards and defines organization for Phase II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with CUP Planning Committee for feedback on the revised CUP strategic planning process</td>
<td>Phase II group begins analysis of stipulated policies and other data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present changes of planning process to the full CUP Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President approves revised Mission Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post revised Mission Statement to the CSUS website and WASC website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update WASC website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Institutional Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004 Present Institutional Proposal draft to all academic councils, the Faculty Senate, all Student Affairs managers, and Associated Students and receive feedback for in-depth reviews</td>
<td>Phase II Working Group continues analysis of existing data</td>
<td>Initiate revised CUP planning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Institutional Proposal to WASC</td>
<td>Update WASC website</td>
<td>In-depth review of Academic Programs Theme and Community Engagement Theme by CUP working groups. Data used for review is drawn from units, colleges, and institutional sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Proposal</td>
<td>Phase II Capacity</td>
<td>Phase III Ed Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Institutional Portfolio</td>
<td>Develop and recommend Planning Objectives from the in-depth reviews to the President</td>
<td>President's Town Hall Meeting to Integrate Destination 2010 Vision with the Academic Programs Theme of WASC review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring 2005**

Make revisions and changes to the WASC Institutional Proposal vis-a-vis the WASC review committee  
Update Institutional Portfolio  
Coordinate with Phase III committees to provide date regarding planning and themes  
Update WASC website  
Meet with Academic Councils, Faculty Senate, Student Affairs, and Associated Students to get feedback on issues related to the in-depth theme reviews  
Update WASC website  
CUP in-depth review of Campus Life and one other strategic planning theme to be determined by CUP. Data for in-depth review is drawn from unit, college, and institutional sources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase I Proposal</th>
<th>Phase II Capacity</th>
<th>Phase III Ed Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Institutional Portfolio</td>
<td>CUP develops and recommends Planning Objectives from in-depth reviews to the President for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III working group determines organizational structure for EE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>Phase II working group begins drafting the Preparatory Review document with hyperlinks</td>
<td>Vice Presidents create and implement initiatives that respond to the Fall 2005 Planning Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update WASC website</td>
<td>Vice Presidents report on the progress of initiatives implemented in Spring 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III working group collected data on results from completed CUP initiatives and organized data for inclusion in EE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Circulate Preparatory Review document to Academic Councils, Faculty Senate, Student Affairs Managers, and Associated Students for feedback (Standard 1 and 2)</td>
<td>Established revised CUP process continues to complete two in-depth reviews of strategic planning themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II Working Group submits Preparatory Review Report to WASC</td>
<td>CUP continues to recommend Planning Objectives to the President based on in-depth reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II Working Group prepares for WASC site visit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>WASC Preparatory Review Site Visit</td>
<td>Phase III Working Group begins draft of EE report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Proposal</td>
<td>Phase II Capacity</td>
<td>Phase III Ed Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin to prepare campus department for EE Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>Update WASC website</td>
<td>Phase III Working Group circulating draft of EE report to Academic Councils, Faculty Senate, Academic Departments, Student Affairs Managers, and Associated Students for feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update Institutional Portfolio</td>
<td>Submit the EE report to WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare for EE Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC EE Site Visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix F
Embedding of WASC Standards into the Preparatory/Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard 1 Defining Institutional Purpose and Ensuring Educational Objectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A. Institutional Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. The institution’s formally approved statements of purpose and operational practices are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Mission</td>
<td>University Manual—Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Plan—Mission</td>
<td>CSUS Catalog—Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Planning Process Objectives</td>
<td>GE Portfolio—Outcomes Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. The institution’s leadership creates and sustains leadership system at all levels that is marked by high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Periodic Review of Administrative Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B. Integrity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and in their writing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Academic Freedom Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Consistent with its purposes and character, the institute demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalog-Nondiscrimination Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Web Page—Year of Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS Baccalaureate Learning Goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unity Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Pluralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Hiring Policy—UARTP Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Research Faculty/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Even when supported by or affiliated with political, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion; and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Human Subjects Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS Catalog Complaint Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Research—Graduation Analysis Retention Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8. The institution exhibits integrity in its operations as demonstrated by the implementation of appropriate policies sound business practices timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Policies Business Affairs Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9. The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission to undertake the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures including all substantive change policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 2 Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions.**

**2.A. Teaching and Learning**

2.1. The institution’s educational programs are appropriate in content, standards, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery, and are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. | X | | | | CSUS Catalog—Accredited programs Program Portfolios Program Review documents Institutional Research Faculty/staff page |

2.2 All degrees — undergraduate and graduate — awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and in terms of levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. | X | | | | GE Portfolio—Outcomes CSUS Baccalaureate Learning Goals. Program Portfolios University Manual—Graduation Requirements CSUS Catalog |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are clearly reflected in its academic programs and policies. These include the organization and content of the institution’s curricula; admissions and graduation policies; the organization and delivery of advisement; the use of its library and information resources; and (where applicable) experience in the wider learning environment provided by the campus and/or co-curriculum.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS Catalog: GE and Program structure</td>
<td>OCC Web Page: Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education Web Page</td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Education access to Library Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS Baccalaureate Learning Goals.</td>
<td>GE Portfolio—Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
<td>GE Portfolio—Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Grading Policy</td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GE Portfolio—Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.B. Scholarship and Creative Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARTP Policy Research and Sponsored Projects Web page Center for Teaching and Learning web page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, curricular and instructional innovation, and creative activity, as well as their dissemination at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Scholarship Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9. The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.C. Support for Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP Assessment Web Page—Survey Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10. Regardless of mode of program delivery, the institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students and assesses their needs experiences, and levels of satisfaction. This information is used to help shape learning-centered environment and to actively promote student success.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11. Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Activities web page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12. The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and regular information and advising about relevant academic requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS catalog—Academic Programs, Program Portfolios, Department and college web pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13. Student support services—including financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, computer labs, and library and information services—are designed to meet the needs of the specific types of students the institution serves and the curricula it offers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Services Web page, UCCS—Web Page, University Portfolio—Campus Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14. Institutions that serve transfer students assume an obligation to provide clear and accurate information about transfer requirements, ensure equitable treatment for such students with respect to academic policies, and ensure that such students are not unduly disadvantaged by transfer requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUS Catalog—Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations, Transfer Centers, Admissions and Records web page—Transfer Admission Requirements, Evaluations, Inst. Research—Factbook, Cup Accountability Web page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.A. Faculty and Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives.

3.2. The institution demonstrates that it employs a faculty with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution sufficient in number, professional qualifications, and diversity to achieve its educational objectives, to establish and oversee academic policies, and to ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic programs wherever and however delivered.

3.3. Faculty and staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4. The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Faculty Professional Development Plan and ARTP Policy Center for Teaching and Learning—Web Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.B. Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5. Fiscal and physical resources are effectively aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives, and are sufficiently developed to support and maintain the level and kind of educational programs offered both now and for the foreseeable future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Affairs—Web Page CUP Web Page—Accountability, Facilities Management—Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6. The institution holds, or provides access to information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. For on-campus, students and students enrolled at a distance, physical and information resources, services, and information technology facilities are sufficient in scope and kind to support and maintain the level and kind of education offered. These resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution’s purposes, and are appropriate, sufficient, and sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCCS—Web Page Library Web Page UMS Distance Education Access to Library Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7. The institution’s information technology resources are sufficiently coordinated and supported to fulfill its educational purposes and to provide key academic and administrative functions.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCCS—Web Page UMS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.C. Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8. The institution’s organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear, consistent with its purposes, and sufficient to support effective decision-making.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9. The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSU Web Page—Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10. The institution has a chief executive whose full-time responsibility is to the institution; together with a cadre of administrators qualified and able, to provide effective educational leadership and management at all levels.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Manual—Selection Processes, Periodic Review of Administrative Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11. The institution’s faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure both academic quality and the appropriate maintenance of the institution’s educational purposes and character.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Senate Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

#### 4.A. Strategic Thinking and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1. The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.</th>
<th></th>
<th>University Portfolio Planning</th>
<th>CUP Web Page—Planning</th>
<th>Program Portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2. Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.</th>
<th></th>
<th>University Portfolio Planning</th>
<th>CUP Web Page—Planning</th>
<th>Program Portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3. Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.</th>
<th></th>
<th>University Portfolio Planning</th>
<th>CUP Web Page—Planning</th>
<th>Program Portfolios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.B Commitment to Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Proficiency</th>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Theme: Academic Programs</th>
<th>Theme: Campus Life</th>
<th>Theme: Community Engagement</th>
<th>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4</strong> The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Affairs Web Page Assessment and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP Web Page—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5</strong> Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of the institutional research function is the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution’s purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inst Research Web Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Portfolio—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP Web Page—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Proficiency</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>Theme: Academic Programs</td>
<td>Theme: Campus Life</td>
<td>Theme: Community Engagement</td>
<td>Expected Evidence &amp; Existing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>University Portfolio—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CUP Web Page—Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6. Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7. The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8. Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>CUP Web Page: Survey Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Portfolios</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G
Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Organizational Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparatory/Capacity Review</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Review</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Document Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase III</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Smith - Chair</td>
<td>Jackie Donath - Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Section

- **Phase II Steering Committee**
- **Phase III Steering Committee**

### Academic Programs Section

#### Strategic Planning Support Subcommittee
- Chair: Sutee Sufitparapitaya
- Dir. of Institutional Research
- Vickii Castillon
- Institutional Research
- Elsa Favila
- Academic Affairs
- Sarah Whyte
- Admin. and Business Affairs
- Larry Glasmire
- Dir of Special Programs/
  Enrollment Analysis

- Including:
  - Electronic Portfolio and
  - Institutional Portfolio
  - Policy Manual
  - Stipulated Policies

#### Faculty Senate Program Review Oversight Committee

**Hypothesis 1:**
The program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

- Evidence from:
  - *Prep Review rec.
  - *Dept. portfolios
  - *Annual assessment reports
  - *Focus groups
  - *Program Review teams
  - *Interviews w/ Curriculum Policies Committee

- Comparison of evidence w/ criteria for effective program review.

#### Academic Programs Subcommittee
- Chair: Jeffery Brodd
- Assistant Professor of Humanity
  and Religious Studies
- Tom Krabacher
- Chair of Geography Department
- Bernadette Halbrook
- Chair of Counselor Education Dept.
- Ben Amata
- Reference Librarian
- Tom Griffith
- Director of Academic Advising Center
- Gregory Wheeler
- Director for General Education

**Hypothesis 2:**
Learning outcomes indicate that students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.

- Evidence from:
  - * Review of GE course objectives
  - * Review of GE learning outcomes
  - * Review of surveys from departments
  - * Review of student work from the electronic portfolios and self-studies

Conclusions and Recommendations
Campus Life Section

**Campus Life Subcommittee**
Chair: AVP, Campus Life
Leslie Davis
Director of University Union
Patricia Worley
Executive Director of Associated Students
Ernest Olson
Professor of Recreation and Leisure Studies
Chevelle Newsome
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

**Division Collaboration Subcommittee**
AVP Student Affairs
AVP Academic Affairs
Director of Residence Life
Director of Student Activities
Faculty Senate Member
Director of Academic Advising
Student representatives

**Hypothesis 1:**
The University has in place the organizational processes and institutional incentives to promote effective collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty.

Evidence:
* CUP Working Groups
* Faculty Senate Committee Structure
* Student Affairs Advisory Boards

Conclusions and Recommendations for change

**Student Affairs Assessment Subcommittee**
AVP Student Affairs
Director in Student Affairs
Director in Student Affairs
Director in Student Affairs
Academic Affairs Assessment Coordinator

**Hypothesis 2:**
Student Affairs has assessment plans that effectively identify and assess the learning outcomes occurring in Campus Life and Student Service programs.

Evidence:
* Current assessment plans in Student Affairs Units

Conclusions and recommendations for change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Review Phase II</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Review Phase III</th>
<th>Educational Effectiveness Document Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Community Engagement and Impact** | **Hypothesis 1:** The University has in place the organizational processes and institutional incentives to promote effective collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty.** Evidence:**  
* CUP Working Groups  
* Faculty Senate Committee  
* Student Affairs Advisory Boards  
Conclusions and Recommendations for change | **Hypothesis 2:** The University offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.** Evidence:**  
* American Democracy Project Data  
Preparatory Review Rec.  
Conclusions and Recommendations |

**Campus Life Subcommittee**  
Chair: AVP, Campus Life  
Leslie Davis  
Director of University Union  
Patricia Worley  
Executive Director of Associated Students  
Ernest Olson  
Professor of Recreation and Leisure Studies  
Chevelle Newsome  
Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

**Division Collaboration Subcommittee**  
AVP Student Affairs  
AVP Academic Affairs  
Director of Residence Life  
Director of Student Activities  
Faculty Senate Member  
Director of Academic Advising  
Student representatives

**Student Affairs Assessment Subcommittee**  
AVP Student Affairs  
Director in Student Affairs  
Director in Student Affairs  
Director in Student Affairs  
Academic Affairs Assessment Coordinator
Appendix H

WASC Phase II (Preparatory Review) Committee Charges

Strategic Planning Support Subcommittee

Chair:  Sutee Sujitparapitaya, Director of Institutional Research
        Vickii Castillon, Institutional Research
        Elsa Favila, Academic Affairs
        Sarah Whyte, Administration and Business Affairs
        Larry Glasmire, Director of Special Programs/Enrollment Analysis

Committee Charge:
1. Identify sources of data across the university pertaining to strategic planning. Collect, synthesize & summarize relevant data from the selected sources.
2. Evaluate the adequacy of that data under the WASC standards of accreditation (listed below). Suggest mechanisms whereby the university might improve its collection of data relative to those WASC standards.
3. Using the collected data evaluate the university’s current performance on those WASC standards.
4. Prepare a draft of your respective section of the Institutional Capacity and Preparatory Review (Phase II) report.

Timeline:
• May, 2005 – Form and staff committee
• August, 2005 – Phase II Committee Retreat
• September, 2005 – Begin to identify and catalog sources of information
• December 2, 2005 – Complete collection, synthesis and evaluation of data: Preliminary report of findings to Phase III Committee
• February, 2006 - Update WASC website and Institutional Portfolio
• March 31, 2006 - evaluate the university’s current performance on respective WASC standards.
• May 5, 2006 – Complete draft of subcommittee sections of the report
• November 3, 2006 – Preparatory Review delivered to WASC
• Spring 2007 – Site visit by WASC

Standards:
4.1 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies in institutional reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic position; articulate priorities; examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions and resources; and define the future direction of the institution. The institution monitors the effectiveness of the implementation of its plans and revises them as appropriate.

4.2 Planning processes at the institution define and, to the extent possible, align academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs with the strategic objectives and priorities of the institution.

4.4* The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning. Including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.
4.5 Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included among the priorities of the institutional research function are the identification of indicators and the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning consistent with the institution’s purposes and educational objectives. Periodic reviews of institutional research and data collection are conducted to develop more effective indicators of performance and to assure the suitability and usefulness of data.

4.6* Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

* Standards shared with other phase II committees.
Academic Programs Subcommittee

Chair:  Jeffery Brodd, Assistant Professor of Humanity and Religious Studies
        Tom Krabacher, Chair of Geography Department
        Bernadette Halbrook, Chair of Counselor Education Department
        Ben Amata, Reference Librarian
        Tom Griffith, Director of Academic Advising Center
        Gregory Wheeler, Director for General Education

Committee Charge:
1) Identify sources of data across the university pertaining to Academic Programs, specifically relating to the Academic Programs hypotheses listed below. Collect, synthesize & summarize relevant data from the selected sources.

2) Evaluate the adequacy of that data under the WASC standards of accreditation (listed below). Suggest mechanisms whereby the university might improve its collection of data relative to those WASC standards.

3) Using the collected data evaluate the university’s current performance on those WASC standards.

4) Coordinate with your respective Educational Effectiveness (Phase III) counterpart committee, Faculty Senate Program Review Oversight Committee, to provide the phase III committee with the data necessary for the execution of that committee’s mission.

5) Prepare a draft of your respective section of the Institutional Capacity and Preparatory Review (Phase II) report.

Timeline:
• May, 2005 – Form and staff committee
• August, 2005 – Phase II Committee Retreat
• September, 2005 – Begin to identify and catalog sources of information
• December 2, 2005 – Complete collection, synthesis and evaluation of data: Preliminary report of findings to Phase III Committee
• February, 2006 - Update WASC website and Institutional Portfolio
• March 31, 2006 - evaluate the university’s current performance on respective WASC standards.
• May 5, 2006 – Complete draft of subcommittee sections of the report
• November 3, 2006 – Preparatory Review delivered to WASC
• Spring 2007 – Site visit by WASC

Hypotheses:
1. The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development.

2. Learning outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the baccalaureate learning goals.
Standards:

1.2 Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.

1.7 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public; demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion; and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds.

2.4 The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of these expectations.

2.5 The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.

2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

2.7 In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such review.

4.3 Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.

4.4* The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning. Including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

4.6* Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

4.7 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, as well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.
4.8* Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.

* standards shared with other phase II committees.

**Starter Sources of Evidence:**
- Review of GE course objectives
- Review of GE learning outcomes
- Review of surveys from departments
- Review of student work from the electronic portfolios and self-studies
Campus Life Subcommittee

Chair: AVP, Campus Life
Leslie Davis, Director of University Union
Patricia Worley, Executive Director of Associated Students
Ernest Olson, Professor of Recreation and Leisure Studies
Chevelle Newsome, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

Committee Charge:
1. Identify sources of data across the university pertaining to Student Life, specifically relating to the Student Life hypothesis listed below. Collect, synthesize & summarize relevant data from the selected sources.

2. Evaluate the adequacy of that data under the WASC standards of accreditation (listed below). Suggest mechanisms whereby the university might improve its collection of data relative to those WASC standards.

3. Using the collected data evaluate the university’s current performance on those WASC standards.

4. Coordinate with your respective Educational Effectiveness (Phase III) counterpart committee to provide the phase III committee with the data necessary for the execution of that committee’s mission.

5. Prepare a draft of your respective section of the Institutional Capacity and Preparatory Review (Phase II) report.

Timeline:
- May, 2005 – Form and staff committee
- August, 2005 – Phase II Committee Retreat
- September, 2005 – Begin to identify and catalog sources of information
- December 2, 2005 – Complete collection, synthesis and evaluation of data: Preliminary report of findings to Phase III Committee
- February, 2006 - Update WASC website and Institutional Portfolio
- March 31, 2006 - evaluate the university’s current performance on respective WASC standards.
- May 5, 2006 – Complete draft of subcommittee sections of the report
- November 3, 2006 – Preparatory Review delivered to WASC
- Spring 2007 – Site visit by WASC

Hypotheses:
1. The University has in place the processes and institutional incentives to promote collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty to affect student learning.

2. Student Affairs has assessment plans that identify and assess the learning outcomes that occur in curricular and experiential learning programs.
Standards:
2.9* The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

2.11. Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.

4.4* The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

4.6* Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

4.8* Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.

* standards shared with other phase II committees.

Starter Sources of Evidence:
• CUP Working Groups
• Faculty Senate Committee Structure
• Student Affairs Advisory Boards
• Current assessment plans in Student Affairs Units
Community Engagement Subcommittee

Chair: Frank Whitlatch, Interim AVP Public Affairs
Charlotte Cook, Professor and Director of Office of Community Collaboration
Mary Kirlin, Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Administration
Nancy Shulock, Executive Director for the Institute for Higher Education Leadership and Policy
Marilyn Albert, Director of Career Center
Monica Pope, Alum

Committee Charge:
1. Identify sources of data across the university pertaining to Community Engagement, specifically relating to the Community Engagement hypotheses listed below. Collect, synthesize & summarize relevant data from the selected sources.

2. Evaluate the adequacy of that data under the WASC standards of accreditation (listed below). Suggest mechanisms whereby the university might improve its collection of data relative to those WASC standards.

3. Using the collected data evaluate the university’s current performance on those WASC standards.

4. Coordinate with your respective Educational Effectiveness (Phase III) counterpart committee, Community Engagement EE Subcommittee, to provide the Phase III committee with the data necessary for the execution of that committee’s mission.

5. Prepare a draft of your respective section of the Institutional Capacity and Preparatory Review (Phase II) report.

Timeline:
- May, 2005 – Form and staff committee
- August, 2005 – Phase II Committee Retreat
- September, 2005 – Begin to identify and catalog sources of information
- December 2, 2005 – Complete collection, synthesis and evaluation of data: Preliminary report of findings to Phase III Committee
- February, 2006 - Update WASC website and Institutional Portfolio
- March 31, 2006 - evaluate the university’s current performance on respective WASC standards.
- May 5, 2006 – Complete draft of subcommittee sections of the report
- November 3, 2006 – Preparatory Review delivered to WASC
- Spring 2007 – Site visit by WASC

Hypotheses:
1. The University fosters strong linkages between Sac State, the Capital, and the Sacramento community at-large.

2. The University offers a wide variety of curricular and co-curricular programs in which students develop leadership skills and a commitment to civic engagement.
Standards:
2.9* The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

3.4 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning consistent with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.

4.4* The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time, and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

4.6* Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty takes responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

4.8* Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.

* standards shared with other phase II committees.

Starter Sources of Evidence:
- University faculty working with State Capital offices and agencies
- University student programs working in the Capital offices and agencies
- Data from Office of Community Collaboration
- Data from Service Learning
- American Democracy Project Data
Appendix I
WASC Phase III (Educational Effectiveness Review/Academic Programs) Committee Charges

Phase III Chair: JR Donath
Responsibilities: Coordinate EE Review Academic Programs groups and their activities
Prepare final reports for each hypothesis (no more than 10 pages of text)
Make regular reports to AAVP

Baccalaureate Learning Goals Subcommittee

Chair: JR Donath
Committee Membership:
A+L/JRD
CBA/CCSE/HHS
COE/Virginia Dixon (Assoc Dean)
Student Affairs/

Chair: JR Donath
Committee Membership:
NSM/
SSIS/
ASI/
Greg Wheeler

Individual committee members are responsible for consistent reports to college academic councils

Committee Charge:
1. Coordinate activities, as necessary, with Phase II (Preparatory Review) Academic Programs Committee and Faculty Senate Program Review Oversight Committee
2. Identify sources of data available to address Academic Program hypothesis 2
   Preliminary sources of data:
   Preparatory Review recommendations
   Review of GE Area learning goals
   Review of GE course proposal forms
   Review of GE Area assessments
   Department surveys
   Electronic department portfolios and self-studies
3. Collect, synthesize and summarize relevant data
4. Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 2
5. Suggest mechanisms/structures that might improve the University’s ability to collect data of relevance to WASC standards
   a. Develop (proposal for) on-going assessment plan of Baccalaureate Learning Goals
   b. Evaluate alignment of Learning Goals with General Education Program
   c. Pilot assessment plan in 2 GE Areas
   d. Evaluate effectiveness of pilot plan and propose revisions
   e. Consider feasibility of Learning Goals assessment at graduation
6. Evaluate the University’s current performance on the relevant WASC standards based on relevant data
7. Identify strengths and weaknesses in policies and practices related to Learning Goals contextualized by WASC standards (and University culture)

8. Prepare a draft report on Academic Program hypothesis 2

**Timeline:**
- Spring 2005: Organize committee
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group meets with Academic Councils, Faculty Senate, Student Affairs, and ASI for feedback on issues related to “in-depth theme reviews”
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group organizes structure for Baccalaureate Learning Goal report in context of program review process and WASC standards
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group reviews and organizes data collected from “completed” CUP initiatives
- Spring 2006: Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 2
- Spring 2006: Present proposal for assessment plan of Baccalaureate Learning Goals to CPC/ Faculty Senate (consider alignment issues—parallel to GE Assessment planning?)
- Fall 2006: Pilot assessment of 2 GE Areas (parallel to GE cycle?)
- Spring 2007: Evaluate effectiveness of assessment plan and suggest adjustments
- Spring 2007: Phase III Working Group begins draft of EE report
- Spring 2007: Begin to prepare departments for EE Site Visit
- Spring 2007: WASC Preparatory Review Site visit
- Fall 2007: Phase III Working Group circulates EE draft report (Academic Councils, Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs (managers?), ASI) for feedback
- Fall 2007: EE report submitted to WASC
- Spring 2008: WASC Educational Effectiveness Site Visit

**Academic Programs Hypothesis 2:**
“Learning Outcomes indicate that our students are achieving the Baccalaureate Learning Goals”

**Standards:** * = standards shared with other Phase II and Phase III committees

1.2*/Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives.

1.7*/The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, and services to students and the larger public; demonstrates that its programs can be completed in a timely fashion; and treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing students conduct, grievances, human subjects in research and refunds.

2.4*/The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering and demonstrating the demonstration of these expectations.

2.5*/The institution’s academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved.
2.6*/The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

2.7*/In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such review.

4.3*/Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.

4.4*/The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and pedagogy.

4.6/Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.

4.7*/The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning. As well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of the curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.

4.8*/Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.
Faculty Senate Program Review Oversight Committee

Chair: J Brodd
Committee Membership:

Committee Charge:
1. Coordinate with Phase II (Preparatory Review) Academic Programs Committee to provide data necessary for Phase III (Educational Effectiveness Review) Academic Programs Committee to meet it’s charge
2. Identify sources of data available to address Academic Program hypothesis 1
   Preliminary sources of data:
   Preparatory Review recommendations
   Department portfolios
   Annual assessment reports
   Focus groups (programs that have been reviewed)
   Program review teams
   Curriculum Policies Committee
   Faculty Senate Program Review Policies
3. Collect, synthesize and summarize relevant data
4. Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 1
5. Suggest mechanisms/structures that might improve the University’s ability to collect data of relevance to WASC standards
6. Evaluate the University’s current performance on the relevant WASC standards based on relevant data
7. Identify strengths and weaknesses in policies and data-driven practices related to program review process, contextualized by WASC standards (and University culture)
8. Design (several) models for revised program review based on study and discussion
   a. Engage one or more departments as pilots for model(s)
   b. Based on results of pilots suggest policy revisions to CPC/Faculty Senate
9. Prepare draft report on Academic Program hypothesis 1

Timeline:
• Spring 2005: Share charge with Program Review Oversight Subcommittee. Organize for fall 2005. Recruit more faculty for Committee
• Fall 2005: Collect and review data. Preliminary conclusions
• Fall 2005: Organize and meet focus groups
• Spring 2006: Research and design new models for program review process and propose pilot to CPC/Faculty Senate
• Fall 2006: Implement pilots
• Spring 2007: Evaluate effectiveness of pilots and suggest adjustments
• Spring 2007: Prepare draft report on Academic Program hypothesis 1
• Spring 2007: Circulate draft report
• Spring 2007: Begin to prepare departments for WASC site visit
• Summer 2007: Complete draft report of EE Report
Fall 2007: Circulate completed report to all constituencies
Fall 2007: EE Report to WASC
Spring 2008: WASC Educational Review Site Visit

Academic Programs Hypothesis 1: *=standards shared with other Phase II and Phase III committees
“The current program review process encourages reflection on student learning that leads to faculty engagement in curricular and pedagogical development”

Standards:
1.2*/Educational objectives are clearly recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with stated purposes. The institution has developed indicators and evidence to ascertain the level of achievement of its purposes and educational objectives

2.4*/The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment are developed and widely shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering and demonstrating the demonstration of these expectations.

2.6*/ The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

2.7*/In order to improve program currency and effectiveness, all programs offered by the institution are subject to review, including analyses of the achievement of the program’s learning objectives and outcomes. Where appropriate, evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional societies is included in such review.

4.3*/ Planning processes are informed by appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and include consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.

4.4*/The institution employs a deliberate sent of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and pedagogy.

4.7*/The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning. As well as into the conditions and practices that promote the kinds and levels of learning intended by the institution. The outcomes of such inquiries are applied to the design of the curricula, the design and practice of pedagogy, and to the improvement of evaluation means and methodology.

4.8*/ Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.
WASC Phase III: Educational Effectiveness Review/Campus Life

Phase III Chair: L. Varlotta (or designee)
Responsibilities: Coordinate Phase III Campus Life groups and their activities
  Prepare final reports for each hypothesis (no more than 10 pages of text)
  Make regular reports to AAVP

Division Collaboration Working Group

Chair:
Members:
  AVP Student Affairs (or designee)
  AVP Academic Affairs (or designee)
  Director of Residence Life or Director of Student Activities
  Director of Academic Advising
  Faculty Senate Representative
  ASI Representative

Committee Charge:
1. Coordinate activities, as necessary, with Phase II (Preparatory Review) Campus Life Committee
2. Identify sources of data available to address Campus Life hypothesis 1
   Preliminary sources of data:
   - Preparatory Review recommendations
   - CUP Working groups
   - Faculty Senate Committee Structure
   - Student Affairs Advisory Boards and structures
   - Student Affairs organization, activities
   - Academic Affairs organization, activities
3. Collect, synthesize and summarize relevant data
4. Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 1
5. Suggest mechanisms/structures that might improve the University’s ability to collect data of relevance to WASC standards
6. Evaluate the University’s current performance on the relevant WASC standards based on data collected
7. Identify strengths and weaknesses in policies and practices related to collaboration between Student Affairs, Academic Affairs and faculty, contextualized by WASC standards (and University culture)
8. Prepare a draft report on Campus Life Hypothesis 1

Timeline:
- Spring 2005: Organize committee
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group meets with Student Affairs units, Faculty Senate and ASI for feedback on issues related to “in-depth theme reviews”
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group organizes structure for draft report in context of program review process and WASC standards
• Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group reviews and organizes data collected from “completed” CUP initiatives
• Spring 2006: Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 1
• Spring 2006: Present findings and recommendations for assessment of effective collaboration and incentives to relevant units and Faculty Senate
• Fall 2006: Pilot assessment
• Spring 2007: Evaluate effectiveness of assessment plan and suggest adjustments to assessment and recommendations for changes in organization and institutional incentives
• Spring 2007: Phase III Working Group begins draft of EE report that includes conclusions and recommendations for change
• Spring 2007: WASC Preparatory Review Site visit
• Fall 2007: Phase III Working Group circulates EE draft report (Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, ASI) for feedback
• Fall 2007: Phase III EE report submitted to WASC
• Spring 2008: WASC Educational Effectiveness Site Visit

Campus Life Hypothesis 1:
“The University has in place the organizational processes and institutional incentives to promote effective collaboration between Student Affairs staff and Academic Affairs staff and faculty.”

Standards:
*=standards shared with other Phase III committees

2.9/The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

2.11/Consistent with its purpose, the institution develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs and supports student professional and personal development.

4.6*/ Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.
Student Affairs Assessment Working Group

Chair:
Committee Membership:
AVP Student Affairs (or designee)
Director in Student Affairs
Director in Student Affairs
Director in Student Affairs
Academic Affairs Assessment Coordinator
Faculty Senate Representative

Committee Charge:
1. Coordinate with activities, as necessary, with Phase II (Preparatory Review) Campus Life Committee
2. Identify sources of data available to address Campus Life hypothesis 2
   Preliminary sources of data:
   Preparatory Review recommendations
   Assessment Plans in Student Affairs units
3. Collect, synthesize and summarize relevant data
4. Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the
   University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 2
5. Suggest mechanisms/structures that might improve the University’s ability to collect data of rele-
   vance to WASC standards
6. Evaluate the University’s current performance on the relevant WASC standards based on data col-
   lected
7. Identify strengths and weaknesses in policies and data-driven practices related to assessment process,
   contextualized by WASC standards (and University culture)
8. Design (potentially several) models for revised assessment based on study and discussion
9. Prepare draft report on Campus Life hypothesis 2 that includes conclusions and recommendations for
   change

Timeline:
• Spring 2005: Organize for fall 2005.
• Fall 2005: Collect and review data. Preliminary conclusions
• Spring 2006: Research and design new models for program review process and propose pilot to
  CPC/Faculty Senate
• Fall 2006: Implement pilots
• Spring 2007: Evaluate effectiveness of pilots and suggest adjustments
• Spring 2007: Prepare draft report on Campus Life hypothesis 2
• Spring 2007: Circulate draft report
• Summer 2007: Complete draft report of EE Report
• Fall 2007: Circulate completed report to all constituencies
• Fall 2007: EE Report to WASC
• Spring 2008: WASC Educational Effectiveness Review Site Visit
Campus Life Hypothesis 2
* = standards shared with other Phase III committees

“Student Affairs has assessment plans that effectively identify and assess the learning outcomes occurring in Campus Life and Student Service Programs”

**Standards:**

4.4*/The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and pedagogy.

4.8*/Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, and others defined by the institution, are involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs.
WASC Phase III: Educational Effectiveness Review/Community Engagement and Impact

Phase III Chair:
Responsibilities: Coordinate Phase III groups and their activities
  Prepare final reports for each hypothesis (no more than 10 pages of text)
  Make regular reports to AAVP

Community Engagement EE Working Group

Chair:
Committee Membership:
  AVP for University Advancement
  President’s Assistant on Legislative Affairs
  College Development Directors Representative
  Director, Office of Community Collaboration
  Faculty Senate Representative
  ASI Representative
  Alumni Association Representative

Committee Charge:
1. Coordinate activities, as necessary, with Phase II Community Engagement Subcommittee
2. Identify sources of data available to address Community Engagement and Impact hypothesis 1
   Preliminary sources of data:
     Preparatory Review recommendations
     Information about faculty working with State Capital offices and agencies
     Information about University programs for student placements in Capital offices and agencies
     Data from Office of Community Collaboration
     Service Learning Program data
3. Collect, synthesize and summarize relevant data
4. Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms
   of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 1--- NB: concept of “strong” linkages needs to be
   operationalized
5. Suggest mechanisms/structures that might improve the University’s ability to collect data of rel-
   evance to WASC standards
6. Evaluate the University’s current performance on the relevant WASC standards based on relevant
   data
7. Identify strengths and weaknesses in policies and practices related to hypothesis 1  contextualized
   by WASC standards (and University culture)
8. Prepare a draft report on Hypothesis 1 that includes conclusions and recommendations

Timeline:
- Spring 2005: Organize committee
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group meets on issues related to “in-depth theme reviews”
- Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group organizes structure for draft report in context of program
  review process and WASC standards
• Fall 2005: Phase III Working Group reviews and organizes data collected from “completed” CUP initiatives
• Spring 2006: Evaluate data in the context of relevant WASC accreditation standards (see below) and in terms of the University’s ability to “test” hypothesis 1
• Spring 2006: Present proposal for assessment plan to relevant groups
• Fall 2006: Pilot assessment
• Spring 2007: Evaluate effectiveness of assessment plan and suggest adjustments
• Spring 2007: Phase III Community Engagement EE Working Group completes draft report
• Spring 2007: WASC Preparatory Review Site visit
• Fall 2007: Phase III Working Group circulates EE draft report for feedback
• Fall 2007: EE report submitted to WASC
• Spring 2008: WASC Educational Effectiveness Site Visit

Community Engagement and Impact Hypothesis 1:
“The University fosters strong linkages between Sac State, the Capital and the Sacramento community at-large”

Standards:
* = standards shared with other Phase III committees
*2.9/The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning and service.

3.4/The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty development activities designed to improve teaching and learning with its educational objectives and institutional purposes.

*4.4/The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum, and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation and data collection. These processes involve assessments of effectiveness, track results over time and use the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures and processes, curricula and pedagogy.

*4.6/ Leadership at all levels is committed to improvement based on the results of the processes of inquiry, evaluation and assessment used throughout the institution. The faculty take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process and use the results for improvement. Assessments of the campus environment in support of academic and co-curricular objectives are also undertaken and used, and are incorporated into institutional planning.