WASC CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW
CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

CLU’s History

California Lutheran University (CLU) is a diverse, scholarly community situated among the rolling hills of Ventura County in Thousand Oaks, California. Halfway between Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, Thousand Oaks is one of the nation’s safest cities, and it provides ready access to many of Southern California’s occupational, cultural, and recreational resources. In addition to its Thousand Oaks resident campus, CLU maintains graduate centers in Woodland Hills, Ventura, and Glendale.

CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs reflect the University’s three-fold commitment to liberal learning, professional preparation, and character & leadership development. CLU offers excellent programs in both the liberal arts and professional studies, all of which embrace the “values goals” expressed in its mission statement—“to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.”

Initially incorporated in 1959 as California Lutheran College (CLC), our institution opened its doors in the fall of 1961 to 330 freshmen and sophomores, many of whom were transfers from other Lutheran colleges. The 30 faculty members included young scholars as well as experienced faculty who were willing to leave secure positions with other institutions to participate in the new adventure.

Even though CLC narrowly avoided bankruptcy during its first decade, the College expanded its program offerings in the 70s, generating an increased enrollment that helped establish financial stability. It was not until the mid-1980s, however, that CLC completed its first permanent facilities: the library, the chapel, and the science building. In 1986, CLC became California Lutheran University and created the University’s current organizational structure: a College of Arts and Sciences, a School of Business, a School of Education, and the Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP). Today, with over 3,000 students, CLU offers 36 majors and 28 minors for undergraduates, and 12 programs for graduate students.

In the mid-1990s, CLU experienced an eroding enrollment which resulted in a retrenchment of faculty and staff positions and in operating funds. While the University was engaged in serious master planning and refocusing its development efforts, fundraising was essentially flat and no major new facilities had been built for several years. The administration then created an innovative and comprehensive enrollment planning process, and hired consultants to deal with marketing efforts and undergraduate financial aid packaging. As a result, enrollment has steadily increased; 2004 marked the largest enrollment in CLU’s history.

Recent Progress

Our University’s significant growth in the last 10 years is evident in areas other than increasing enrollment—areas that include planning and organization, facilities, finance, faculty, students, and external recognition.

Planning and Organization Efforts  A strong planning culture led by a talented leadership team coordinated master, strategic, academic, technology, business, and development plans and created a new Mission and Vision for the University. In addition, this team

- Strengthened relationships with the parent church body and ecumenical community
- Forged new public and corporate networks that focus on the University’s initiatives in health care, biotechnology, and multi-media
- Enhanced governing boards and volunteer leadership—the Convocation, Board of Regents, CLU Foundation, Alumni Board, Community Leaders Association, and the President’s Advisory Council (chaired by J.D. Power).
Facilities  The visionary hand of the leadership team is perhaps nowhere more evident than in the extraordinary facilities upgrade of the CLU campus, an upgrade which includes the following:

- Installation of a fiber optic and wireless communications infrastructure (CLUnet) that won the 1996 national CAUSE Award for Excellence in Campus Networking
- Completion of six new buildings--Spies-Bornemann Education and Technology Center, Soiland Humanities Center, Overton Hall, Zimmerman Music Studios, Alumni Pavilion, and a 120-student residence hall
- Complete renovations of 14 campus facilities
- The purchase of eleven adjacent properties
- A $30 million Athletics Complex and another 180-student residence hall designed, funded, and under construction
- A new Master Plan for CLU’s Thousand Oaks campus, which includes a 550-resident, $170 million “University Village” retirement community

Finances  The University’s successful completion of an $80 million, 5-year capital campaign reflects its increasingly stable financial status. Other facts tell the same story:

- The annual operating budget has increased from $29 million in 1993 to $61 million (FASB adjusted), with operating surpluses in all years
- CLU has experienced a 247% increase in institutional assets since 1993
- Our endowment has increased by 522% since 1993
- The number of planned and deferred gifts have increased three-fold since 1996
- Record revenue from fundraising includes gifts and major grants from Keck, Kresge, Hearst, Ahmanson, Irvine, Weingart, Hilton, Parsons, Fletcher Jones, Verizon, CAPHE, Peterson, Darling, Teagle, Stauffer, Culpeper and other foundations and trusts.

Programs  CLU has significantly expanded its curriculum, international programs, exchanges, and lectureships by

- Adding an undergraduate honors program and majors in Multi-Media, Exercise Science and Sports Medicine, Environmental Science, Bioengineering, and International Studies,
- Launching new graduate academic programs that include an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, an International MBA, an MBA in Financial Planning, and an M.S. in Computer Science,
- Initiating off-campus semesters in Washington, D.C., Hong Kong, Sweden, Austria, Thailand, India, Tanzania, and
- Creating and funding a Diplomat-in-Residence program.

Faculty  The greater visibility of CLU faculty in publications, conferences, grants, and awards is indicative of the University’s effort to secure faculty of the highest quality. Other indicators of this effort include the following:

- The hiring of 30 new faculty in the last three years
- A significant upgrade in faculty recruitment, review, and promotion standards
- The establishing of new endowed chairs and professorships in Developmental Biology, Reformation Studies, Analytical Chemistry, Kinesiology, and Political Science & International Studies

Students  CLU’s student residential population has increased by 291 students in the past eight years. The 72% increase in the freshman class during this period also reflects more than a doubling of our out-of-state students. During the same period, there has been a 63 point gain in SAT scores and major increases in retention levels.

External Recognition  One indicator of CLU’s enhanced status in academic and other communities-at-large is that 44% of its graduates immediately enter graduate and professional schools. Additional indicators include the following:
The School of Education achieved NCATE accreditation in 2004

Membership in Independent Colleges of Southern California—the first new member inducted in a decade

Winner of two national sports championships (NCAA III) and over 50 conference titles in women’s and men’s sports

For the past ten years, CLU has been ranked among the “Best” (first tier) comprehensive universities in the Western United States by *U.S. News & World Report*

CLU was recognized in the Templeton Foundation *Honor Roll for Character-Building Colleges*, and featured in *Models for Christian Higher Education: Strategies for Success in the 21st Century* (Eerdmans, 1997)—a Lilly Foundation project

*The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education* named CLU as an especially welcoming institution for Hispanic students

Stronger *town and gown* relations enhanced by CLU’s award-winning National Public Radio Station KCLU-FM (AP California/Nevada Station of the Year 2002); the University’s summer Kingsmen Shakespeare Festival; and expanded community service programs, including Special Olympics soccer.

Continuing Challenges

While we have made considerable progress in the past decade, CLU continues to face significant challenges:

We have transformed the physical plant over the past 20 years, but still lack key facilities—including an arts center, a student center, and a social science building.

Additionally, recruitment of transfer students, adult evening students, and graduate students has been greatly affected by *competition* in our immediate area. We are now not only directly competing for students and faculty with older, larger, and more richly endowed institutions, but also with the newly opened Cal State Channel Islands located 15 miles to the North.

CLU is exceptionally tuition dependent and continues to have a high undergraduate discount rate. These realities limit the needed investment in academic programs and faculty development. In fact, low salaries coupled with the excessively high housing costs in Ventura County make recruitment and retention of faculty and senior staff one of our greatest problems. Although an effort was made to boost salaries with a 5% salary pool increase over five consecutive years, this effort did not change our salary standings among CLU’s comparison institutions.

CLU continues to struggle with the challenge of defining its academic strengths and identity (to both internal and external constituencies) within the context of its Lutheran heritage.

RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

CLU’s last WASC comprehensive review (1995) was followed by a Fourth Year Report in 1999. The document prepared for the 1999 Report (*Fourth Year Report*) addressed the recommendations from the 1995 review. The WASC letter responding to our 1999 Fourth Year Report requested that we address the following:

1. Illustrate the impact of the implemented program review process: In the past five years, the program review process at CLU has been analyzed and revised. We are now in the second year of a seven-year schedule, during which all programs are to be reviewed. CLU’s student learning outcomes are addressed within program reviews and as a result, the review process is helping to align curricula with our educational objectives throughout the academic programs. Further information on program reviews can be found in Essay Two.
2. Demonstrate progress in addressing faculty development and compensation: Faculty development funding is available through the Hewlett Grant, and more recently from a Culpeper Grant and an Irvine Grant. In addition to these grants, the institutional budget for faculty development has increased by 92% in the past five years (from $24,000 to $46,000). In 1999, the Board of Regents committed to a 5% salary pool increase for the next 5 years. Salary increases since 1999 show positive results, but increasing salaries continues to be one of our greatest challenges.

3. Provide evidence of impact of enrollment management strategies: At the time of the last WASC on-site visit, sustaining undergraduate enrollment was a pressing issue. The institution’s traditional undergraduate enrollment had dropped for three consecutive years, falling from a high in 1992/93 of 1443 to 1374 by 1994/95. Enrollment further eroded during the next two years, bottoming out in the fall of 1996/97 with a headcount of 1237. By this time, it was clear that the strategies in place were not working and a new enrollment management team created and implemented new strategies that made an immediate impact. The fall 1997 enrollment rebounded from the previous low of 1237. Freshmen yield increased from the previous year’s low of 231 to 340. These new strategies and management have increased our traditional undergraduate headcount to 1713, which is really full-capacity, at least until we can add new facilities and hire additional faculty. (See summary graph)

4. Amplify the institution’s commitment to diversity: In 2003, the University established the President’s Diversity Council which consists of seven members representing a variety of areas within the University community. The Council was charged with creating and monitoring a comprehensive model for sustained improvement in the area of diversity at CLU. An Irvine Diversity grant has helped to establish and fund the initiatives of this Council (see Diversity Plan). Further information on CLU’s intentional and comprehensive commitment to diversity can be found in Essay One.

5. Document improvement in increasing the institution’s endowment and in reducing its tuition dependency: Endowment growth since the 1994/95 WASC visit has been significant in absolute dollars. As of May 31, 1995, the closest year end to our last WASC visit, the endowment totaled $12,047,000. By May 31, 2004, it had grown to $40,171,000, still fairly small when compared to institutions for which CLU competes for students. But this growth, when measured by endowment per traditional undergraduate student, is significant and produced a per student increase from approximately $8,075 to $23,450. Nevertheless, at the time of the last review the percent of endowment revenue was 7% and remains approximately the same today. In 1994/95, tuition as a percent of total revenues was 53%, and dropped to 46% in 2003/04; however, that year was quite unusual, and when looking at other years, the amount of tuition dependency remains close to what it was 10 years ago. (See supporting data Statement of Activities)

6. Analyze the utility of the assessment measures (outlined on pages 30-33 in the 1999 Fourth Year Report): The University began working on its assessment plans in 1999. The faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences and Schools of Business and Education have received training in developing student outcomes and assessment of student work. In the ensuing years, the general plan developed on two tracks. The first one used broad commercial or external measures such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Noel-Levitz Survey. These instruments were chosen by the Provost and Assistant Provost for Assessment for their validity, reliability, and utility and content match with important CLU goals. Data were shared with faculty and the administration and used to evaluate CLU programmatic directions.

The second track focused on departmental and programmatic student outcomes tied to the CLU and disciplinary student learning outcomes. The Assistant Provost for Assessment has assisted the undergraduate departments in developing their assessment plans. Some departments have collected data and are in the process of aggregating it for programmatic feedback. Graduate programs are at different stages of assessment implementation. The School of Education created an assessment plan that matched CLU, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and NCATE outcomes. In the fall of 2003, assessment data were used as part of their successful NCATE accreditation. The
graduate School of Business faculty are currently developing their assessment plans under the direction of the Dean of Business and a faculty member with extensive training in assessment. A schedule has been developed to implement all academic assessment plans by 2007.

7. Further define and clarify the role of the graduate program: Since the last WASC visit, the Role of Graduate Programs has been articulated, graduate program facilities have been improved, three formal committees have been established to address the needs of graduate programs, and a new administrative position has been developed to provide leadership for graduate programs. Further information on these improvements can be found in Essay Two.

2002 Substantive Change Review In 2002, the School of Education received approval from the WASC Commission to begin offering the Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership, which is the first doctoral program at CLU. The Commission letter approving the initiation of the Ed.D. program requested that we address the following issues in this comprehensive review:

1. Student learning: The Ed.D. program prepares reflective, principled leaders, who provide vision and proactive direction for informed practice in a variety of organizational contexts and settings. Graduates of the program will possess knowledge and tools to enable them to serve as effective leaders. Student learning objectives for the program are articulated and course objectives are derived from these learning objectives.

The Ed.D. program is designed for practitioners working in a variety of educational settings, and all courses are offered at times convenient for working professionals (evening/weekends). Coursework is arranged in thematic units, and students are required to follow the prescribed sequence in cohort groups. Because students take courses in a prescribed sequence, the curriculum builds upon prior learning as students progress through the program. Students engage in action research throughout the program and conduct these research activities in their own work settings. Technology is an integral element of the instructional process and every student is expected to purchase a laptop computer.

2. Library and technology resources: The library book budget has grown from $63,000 in 1999-2000 to $137,000 in 2004-2005. Funding for electronic access to periodicals and on-line databases has grown from $90,000 in 1999-2000 to over $127,000 in 2004-2005. The University has budgeted $11,400 for the on-going support of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership.

3. Faculty scholarship and workload as applied to the doctoral program: Prior to the Ed.D. program, all faculty in the School of Education had a 12-unit per semester teaching load (four classes each semester). During the first two years of the Ed.D. program, the teaching load was evaluated and a new policy was developed. Faculty now have a 9-unit per semester teaching load (three courses per semester) plus a 3-unit load per semester for dissertation and/or thesis supervision.

THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS
CLU’s WASC Steering Committee, developed collaboratively by the Provost and the Faculty Executive Committee in 2002, is composed of individuals who represent the major constituencies within CLU. This committee was originally co-chaired by the Provost and the Chair of the Faculty. With the Provost’s departure from CLU in 2004, the Faculty Chair assumed the position of Associate Provost and Accreditation Liaison Officer, and is now the sole chair of the WASC Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee met on a regular basis to shape the goals and objectives of the CLU WASC Proposal. To help identify Expected Outcomes and Educational Effectiveness Themes for the proposal, an Accreditation Self-Study Proposal Issues Survey was developed and distributed in April 2002 to all CLU faculty, staff, administrators, members of the Board of Regents, Alumni Board members, and members of the student government. This survey listed a wide range of issues that have been identified as important to CLU. Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each issue for CLU over the next five years. In May
2002, the WASC Steering Committee hosted a working retreat for all CLU faculty to review the survey results and to discuss their goals for the review. Based on the survey results and faculty retreat, the Steering Committee articulated a comprehensive goal, the expected outcomes for the review process, and the themes for the Educational Effectiveness Review. We arrived at the following two themes for the Educational Effectiveness Review:

1. Raising the level of expectations, challenge, and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs (including the effectiveness of the first year experience).

2. Enhancing engagement with diversity in the campus community and in the classroom.

The WASC proposal and accreditation process was the central focus of the fall 2002 Faculty Retreat. The faculty focused on how the WASC accreditation expected outcomes and Educational Effectiveness Themes might be expressed in the work of their faculty committees and academic departments. At the 2003 Faculty Retreat, we worked on defining and assessing CLU’s Student Learning Outcomes. Over the past two years, a number of faculty workshops have dealt with our themes of challenge, engagement, and diversity.

Seven Task Force Groups have been developed to address our goals for the WASC review. Each of these groups has at least one member from the WASC Steering Committee and approximately 5-7 members from the faculty or staff with expertise or interest in the particular task. The Task Force Groups are:

1. Capacity & Preparatory Review
2. First Year Experience
3. Diversity
4. Assessment
5. Co-Curriculum
6. Challenge & Engagement
7. Faculty Development

The Capacity and Preparatory Task Force Group has been responsible for compiling the data for the electronic portfolio, writing the essays, and preparing for the Capacity and Preparatory team visit. Four individuals were designated to each draft one of the essays. More than a half dozen other individuals contributed to writing sections of the essays. Throughout the writing, drafts of the essays were distributed for review to the President’s Cabinet, Deans, faculty, and a member of the Board of Regents. A final draft of the essays was made available to the entire campus community one month prior to submission.

The four essays that follow each address one of the WASC Standards and speak to CLU’s capacity to provide an effective educational experience. At the conclusion of this document, we address our preparations and our readiness to proceed to the Educational Effectiveness Review.

**REFLECTIVE ESSAY ON STANDARD 1**
**DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ENSURING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

**MISSION OF CLU** *(CFR 1.1)*

The mission of CLU defines the nature of the institution, the significance of its heritage, and its central purposes:

*California Lutheran University is a diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason.*
The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation and committed to service and justice.

This statement was approved by the faculty and Board of Regents in February 1995, following campus-wide discussions involving students and alumni, faculty, administrators, Regents and Convocators.

DIVERSITY (CFR 1.5)

CLU’s intentional, comprehensive, and integrative approach to diversity and international education has resulted in significant progress toward creating the “diverse scholarly community” identified in its mission statement. The University’s goal of educating “leaders for a global society” fits comfortably within a Lutheran tradition that celebrates diversity as a core value. Both the foundational commitment to diversity and the progress in achieving a more diverse community continue to be manifested in many areas, including the following:

Student Body CLU’s student body has become increasingly diverse, as has the overall CLU community (see list of diversity initiatives). Currently, our students come from thirty different countries, represent over thirty different denominations and faith backgrounds, and have a wide variety of educational backgrounds.

- Undergraduates The percentage of underrepresented undergraduate students at CLU has grown from 15% in 1990 to 28% in 2004. In fall of 2004, the University attracted 32% of its first-time freshmen and 31% of its transfer students from underrepresented groups (see enrollment data), the third largest percentages of any school associated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA). Latinos represented the highest racial/ethnic group at 16%, and 19% of new transfers in fall 2004 were Latino (up from 12% in 1997).

- Graduate students About 25% of graduate students (see enrollment data) enrolled at CLU in 2002 reported being from an underrepresented group. Because many of our graduate programs have a professional emphasis, the demographic composition of our graduate student population closely mirrors the demographic composition of the region. A steady increase in the percentage of Latinos enrolled in graduate programs at CLU reflects the increase in the region’s Latino population.

In an effort to continue to increase the percentage of students from underrepresented groups, the Deans will hold annual retreats, funded by the Irvine Grant, for the purpose of articulating specific recruitment and retention strategies. The next retreat is scheduled for January 2005.

Administration, Staff, Faculty Efforts have been made to advertise in appropriate venues and deliberately recruit administrative, staff, and faculty personnel from diverse backgrounds. As a result, the number of faculty from diverse backgrounds has increased from 13 of 98 faculty in 1998 to 16 of 122 faculty in 2003, though the percentage remains proportionally stable at 13%. The President’s Diversity Council (PDC) recommends that the institution set a goal to increase the number of staff and administrators from underrepresented groups to 20% by 2007 and the number of faculty from underrepresented groups to 20% by 2008. Workshops have been provided through the Human Resources Department on interviewing strategies and techniques for hiring candidates from a diverse background.

Infrastructure A commitment to diversity must, of course, go well beyond diversifying our university population. CLU’s comprehensive approach to diversity strives to be transformative, affecting the institution’s culture, values, policies, and practices and reaching across the entire university community. To that end, attention to diversity must be reflected in our administrative and organizational practices, policies and procedures, and our educational and co-curricular programs.
Grants  An overview of some of the University’s diversity-related grants underscores the intentionality and comprehensiveness of its foundational commitment to diversity.

- **Upward Bound** (1980)
- Math-Science Upward Bound (1992)
- **Title VII Grant** (Preparation of Bilingual Cross Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Teachers) awarded in 2001
- **Irvine Diversity Initiative** awarded in 2003

Administrative and Organizational Practice  CLU seeks to enhance a comprehensive diversity in the student, administrative, staff, and faculty populations by continuing to identify, monitor, and adjust its administrative and organizational practices regarding diversity.

- The Board of Regents approved the following resolution at their February 2004 meeting: at least 10% of the Board is to be composed of persons of color or persons whose first language is not English. The Board now includes 5 persons of color, which represents 16% of the voting members of the Board of Regents.

- In the Office of Undergraduate Admission one-half of one staff person's time is dedicated to increasing outreach to underrepresented populations and to diversity initiatives. One of those initiatives, a multi-cultural student overnight program, allows students from underrepresented ethnic backgrounds to visit campus at no cost, spending two nights on campus in the residence halls with current CLU students of color. The time they spend on campus is filled with programming including attending classes, meeting our Multicultural Student Programs staff, and sitting in on a Student Support Services workshop. Off campus excursions are included so the students can get to know the surrounding area. For fall 2004, these efforts helped push the percentage of underrepresented students to 32% of the incoming freshman class, up from 23% in fall 2003. CLU also offers a multicultural grant that gives additional financial aid to students from non-Caucasian backgrounds.

Policies and Procedures  The policies within the institution reflect concern with diversity in student recruitment, hiring and curricular monitoring and change. Many units within CLU have worked independently on various diversity initiatives with some success. However, in order to more systematically create and monitor policies that support diversity in our populations and programs, the University established the President’s Diversity Council in 2003. The council consists of seven members from several organizations in the university community—including Church Relations, Residential Life, Multicultural Programs, Admissions, Human Resources, and Academic Affairs. The Council was charged with creating and monitoring a comprehensive model for sustained improvement of diversity at CLU. Their Diversity Plan was based on an assessment of diversity within the University.

Academic and Co-curricular Programs  A commitment to diversity requires an infrastructure that supports teaching and learning for a diverse learner population. Many students from underrepresented populations need assistance to improve their study skills. And instructors need assistance in incorporating instruction methods that will help everyone in the diverse learner classroom work successfully. In the area of curriculum, a number of initiatives have been created in recent years.

**Academic Initiatives**
- CORE-21: The undergraduate Core curriculum has been revised to include expanded Global Perspectives and U.S Diversity requirements
- Gender & Women’s Studies: This minor has been revised and expanded with a more academic and programmatic agenda
- School of Education: Valuing diversity is a core part of the School of Education vision statement and is infused throughout the curriculum to meet NCATE standards and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing requirements (see STRIVE statement)
- Academic support services:
The Office of Student Support Services (founded in 1990) provides academic counseling, tutoring and other support for first generation college students and/or students from low income families, including a highly successful Summer Orientation to Academic Resources (SOAR) program.

The Center for Academic and Accessibility Resources, located in the library provides similar services for students with other special needs, including those with disabilities.

The Writing Center is also located in the Library. A director and 10 student assistants make Writing Center services available 50 hours each week for all University students.

**Co-curricular initiatives**

- CLU’s nine multicultural student clubs include those for Latino, African American, Native American, and other international students.
- The University’s Office of Student Life assists and supports students from diverse backgrounds. CLU has 15 student Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World who are trained diversity workshop facilitators. They work primarily in the residence halls, but also facilitate workshops for freshmen seminar classes.
- Students learn about the larger world through informal conversations and interactions that complement the more formal on-campus activities and events including celebrations, speakers, and intramural sports.
- The CLU Community Service Center provides an environment that promotes leadership, responsibility, understanding, and an appreciation of differences through service opportunities that enhance student education and foster a positive living/learning environment.

The success of these academic and co-curricular efforts was evident in the results of the 2001 NSSE survey data. Eighty-one percent (81%) of CLU’s undergraduate students reported “much” or “very much” exposure to diverse perspectives. However, a few students have expressed some dissatisfaction with the lack of racial and ethnic diversity in the classroom and throughout the campus community and also want an increased emphasis on social class diversity.

**RELATIONSHIP TO THE LUTHERAN TRADITION (CFR 1.1, 1.6)**

In 2000, the president appointed a task force of six faculty and six administrators to draft a document that would help clarify CLU’s relationship with the Lutheran tradition. During 2000-2003, after considerable reflection and discussion with various committees and groups within faculty, administration and other constituencies, the task force produced three different statements directed at three different audiences:

- The first statement was written specifically for convocationists, pastors, and church members. It emphasizes CLU’s founding motto, “Love of Christ, Truth, and Freedom” as the expression of the university’s highest aspiration: to be a place where Christian faith, intellectual integrity, and academic freedom are fostered and integrated;
- The second statement was written specifically for new faculty who may come from diverse backgrounds and who may not be familiar with or comfortable with theological language;
- The third statement was geared specifically toward prospective students and their parents.

The committee understands the statements as complementary declarations directed at these three distinct audiences. All three documents are available in the Church Relations Office, the Pastors’ offices, and the President’s Office. The first statement is distributed to congregations, the second has been provided to all faculty, and the third statement is on the CLU website and is distributed to students when they are admitted.
The Lutheran heritage is valued at CLU, while at the same time, we are clear that the primary purpose of the institution is education. The faculty has full authority over the curriculum, and the academic program operates with autonomy. Our mission statement asserts that we are “rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith,” and that “the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason.” Our primary mission is to help students expand and deepen their minds in the pursuit of truth, and we believe that this mission is best undertaken within a diverse community and in ways that nurture all dimensions of a student’s life—intellectual, physical, emotional and spiritual.

EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES (CFR 1.2)

The core commitments to the educational objectives of Liberal Learning, Professional Preparation, and Character and Leadership Development are essential to an institution whose mission statement assures that “CLU is … dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies” and that “the mission of the University is to educate leaders… who are strong in character and judgment.” CLU’s educational objectives are recognized throughout the institution and are consistent with this mission statement.

Four years ago, the CLU faculty began an institution-wide process of revisiting, redefining, and expanding its educational objectives. The resulting Educational Objectives & Student Outcomes document includes 14 Student Learning Outcomes. Efforts to weave these outcomes throughout the various curricular and co-curricular programs at CLU began by having the following groups study and consider the implications of this document:

- The Board of Regents’ Academic Affairs Committee and the Alumni Board have both reviewed these documents;
- Undergraduate student leaders have been exposed to the CLU educational objectives and student outcomes through meetings with the Student Senate, Program Board, and Resident Assistants;
- Full-time faculty were responsible for developing the educational objectives and student outcomes and have engaged in multiple discussions on these documents at faculty retreats and workshops;
- Part-time faculty received a copy of the educational objectives and definitions of student outcomes with their contracts this year;
- The Assistant Provost for Assessment is working with the Student Affairs staff to integrate the student learning outcomes into the university’s co-curricular activities;
- An Assessment Committee, comprised of key administrative, staff, and faculty personnel, is developing a plan that will enable the university to provide evidence that it is achieving its educational objectives—objectives that include the curricular and co-curricular student outcomes outlined in the Objectives and Student Outcomes document. The work of the Assessment Committee will be emphasized and demonstrated in our Educational Effectiveness review.

INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP (CFR 1.3)

CLU prides itself on maintaining a shared institutional leadership that includes the following groups and persons:

- The Board of Regents has the authority and responsibility to manage the institution in a legal and fiduciary manner;
- The President, who is the Chief Executive Officer, and the President’s Cabinet, made up of the five Vice Presidents, oversee all aspects of the institution;
- The Provost, two Associate Provosts, an Assistant Provost, and three Deans provide academic leadership. The Provost has an advisory group, the Academic Council, made up of the chairs of the major faculty committees and other academic leaders;
- The faculty governance at CLU is very strong, with an elected Faculty Chair who serves as a voting member of the Board of Regents;
A network of faculty committees is charged with the work of the faculty, and is overseen by the Faculty Executive Committee; CLU’s “LINK” organization is made up of administrative leaders across the campus.

Further information on institutional leadership can be found in Essay Four.

INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY (CFR 1.4, 1.7, 1.8)

Integrity in Representing Our Academic Goals (CFR 1.7) CLU accurately communicates its academic goals, programs, and services to students and to the larger public through admissions brochures, undergraduate and graduate catalogs, and the institution’s website. The CLU catalogs explain all academic policies and procedures, including admissions processes, financial planning, registration, grading policies, transfer credits, and graduation requirements. Traditional undergraduates and ADEP students must complete a minimum of 31 credits per year in order to complete their degree in a timely fashion. Advisors help both graduate and undergraduate students complete their degrees on time. Program directors advise graduates who want to use this service. Advising is required for undergraduates prior to registration. Departments prepare two year course plans, and all classes required to complete a major or degree program are offered over that two year period.

Integrity in Operations (CFR 1.7, 1.8) The University and its community members believe that all decisions, except those decisions regarding confidential personnel decisions, should be open to public scrutiny. The Board of Regents’ membership includes the elected faculty chair and the president of the associated students, who are privy to all decisions made by the Board of Regents. They are allowed to discuss Board issues with their constituents, except for those personnel matters that must remain confidential.

Academic Freedom (CFR 1.4) In addition to shared leadership, CLU shares a commitment to academic freedom and mutual respect. These ideals are articulated in a wide variety of university documents, including the following:

- The Faculty Handbook includes a “Statement on Academic Freedom” (Section II, III. A. 2, p. 10-14) and on “Academic Freedom for Librarians” (Section II, III. A. 2, p. 11). In these sections, the handbook states that “the faculty, administration, and the student body bear mutual responsibility to exercise professional competence and to extend to one another the trust and respect that foster an environment for the exercise of academic freedom.” The Faculty Handbook also includes sections from the 1940 Statement of Principles of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), endorsing full freedom in research and publication, freedom in classroom discussions, and freedom to speak or write as citizens without institutional censorship.
- The CLU Lecturer’s Handbook--distributed to all part-time faculty.
- The CLU Student Handbook
- The undergraduate and graduate catalogs (widely distributed and also available on-line) include academic freedom statements.

Integrity in Research (CFR 1.7) The Institutional Review Board (IRB) is a university committee whose purpose is to carry out the University’s protection policies regarding human and animal subjects used in research. The IRB reviews all research proposals generated by faculty, staff, students, and outside agencies for adherence to standards of ethical research practices. The committee and its five members can be characterized as follows:

- The committee is expected to be diverse. Members of the IRB must have varying backgrounds, including consideration of race, gender, and cultural backgrounds. They must be sensitive to such issues as community attitudes, and promote respect for advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects.
• IRB members must be sufficiently qualified through experience and expertise to review research activities commonly conducted by the institution.
• The IRB chair is responsible for ensuring that every research proposal follows the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45, Public Welfare; PART 46, Protection of Human Subjects. The code can be found at the following URL: http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm.

Procedures Supporting Institutional Integrity  The institution has several procedures for monitoring institutional integrity which include:

Grievance procedures for faculty, staff, and students are published in official University documents. During the past 10 years, these procedures have provided a venue for individuals who feel they have been wronged—so that they can air their grievances and seek redress. For student discipline cases, the Student Life staff frequently exercise disciplinary actions, but all decisions are open to appeal to the University Hearing Board, a body comprised of students, faculty and university administrators. Faculty grievances are handled through the Grievance Committee.

Audits The institution engages external auditors to review and audit financial data each year. The institution also has embraced most of the tenets, except those directly relating to public companies, of the Sarbanes Oxley act in order to operate in a fashion that highly values full disclosure and supports an active role for an audit committee of outside directors. The Board of Regents audit committee now directly engages and receives reports directly from the outside auditors. Routinely, the Audit Committee meets with the external auditor without management present.

Campus crime statistics (arrests, crime, hate offenses) The University takes its Cleary Act reporting requirements seriously, reports all incidents promptly to the community, and maintains campus crime statistics in a manner that is free from public relations influence.

REFLECTIVE ESSAY ON STANDARD 2
ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES THROUGH CORE FUNCTIONS

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)

ENROLLMENT

CLU’s fall 2004 enrollment of 3,021 students is the largest in its history (see enrollment history). The 2004 enrollment includes:

1. 1,713 “traditional” undergraduates, with approximately 1100 residential;
2. 260 ADEP students, enrolled in CLU’s undergraduate evening degree completion program for working adults. Students take general education courses and major in business or computer science;
3. 1,048 graduate and post-baccalaureate credential students—the 5 credential programs in the School of Education, all approved by the California Commission of Teacher Credentialing, include 1) Multiple Subject Teaching 2) Single Subject Teaching 3) Special Education 4) Education Administration 5) Pupil Personnel.

PROGRAMS

The Academic Programs at California Lutheran University are positioned within the College of Arts and Sciences, the Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP), the School of Business, and the School of Education. CLU also has a Continuing and Professional Education Office which is situated within the School of
Education and offers approximately 25 courses each semester. The content, length, and standards of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral degree programs at California Lutheran University are consistent with the established standards for the various disciplines.

Requirements and policies for academic degrees as well as general education, major, and program specific requirements are all published in the University catalogs (undergraduate, ADEP and graduate). Each course has a syllabus (undergraduate, ADEP, MBA, MPPA, MSCS, education) which explains the expectations for student learning for the course. Students complete course evaluations at the end of the semester for every course offered. The institution-wide student outcomes are woven throughout the curriculum, and we are in the process of making these explicit on all course syllabi.

**Library use (CFR 2.3)** The library supports all of the University’s programs. A study was conducted to determine how CLU patrons make use of library resources compared to how students in similar schools use their libraries. Using data from the FY 2000 and 2002 National Center for Education Statistics Academic Library Peer Comparison Tool, we compared five peer institutions to CLU: Chapman University, University of Redlands, Pacific Lutheran University, Whitworth College, and Seattle Pacific University. The comparison also provided data on state and national averages for Masters I comprehensive private universities.

- **Interlibrary loan system** Given CLU’s small number of print holdings and the fact that we do not offer access to as many databases as our peer institutions, we would expect to see a higher volume of materials received via our interlibrary loan system (ILL). We expected to see CLU receive 3,250 ILL’s based on our peer group’s borrowing rate, but we did not—even though Pearson Library has done much to improve interlibrary loan processing. In fact, students and faculty are frequently amazed by the prompt delivery of journal articles to individual e-mail boxes. Many materials are received within 24 hours after they have been requested.

- **On-line Resources** In creating the Library Strategic Plan, we found that students have made tremendous use of on-line resources provided through the library—with the highest use observed in the fields of Education and Business. We have graduate programs in these two areas, and so expected to see high use because of the research requirements at that level. The Arts and Sciences use on-line resources less frequently, partly perhaps because Business and Education faculty have embraced information literacy at a much higher rate and invite librarians into classes more often than do Arts and Sciences faculty. Efforts are currently underway to implement a comprehensive information literacy program in the undergraduate program. (See pages 7 – 21 for further library benchmarks reported in the fall 2004 Library Strategic Plan.)

**Undergraduate Programs**

CLU’s undergraduate programs require completion of 124 units, including a broad general education program (CORE-21) consisting of a minimum of 51 units that are integrated throughout the curriculum. In addition, students are required to concentrate in a field of special interest by choosing a major which requires completion of between 32 and 54 units. CLU offers 36 majors within the traditional undergraduate program.

The CORE-21 requirements integrate the learning competencies described in the CLU Educational Objectives and Student Outcomes. To complete the degree, an undergraduates is required to take: 1) courses focused on particular competencies (a writing intensive course, a speaking intensive course, foreign language, mathematical reasoning); 2) courses focused on various perspectives (history, literature, philosophy, religion, social sciences, natural sciences, visual and performing arts); 3) courses focused on cultures and civilization (Global Studies, U.S. Diversity); and, 4) an integrated studies capstone course within the major. (See page 50 of the undergraduate catalog for specific course descriptions.)

**Graduate Programs**
CLU offers the Doctor of Education degree in Educational Leadership, and eleven masters degree programs in: Education (Masters of Education, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Administration, Special Education, Counseling and Guidance); Business (MBA, Masters in Financial Planning); Computer Science; Psychology (Clinical, Counseling MFT); and Public Policy & Administration.

Admission to all masters programs requires a baccalaureate degree. The unit requirement for completion of CLU’s credential and masters programs varies between 24 units and 50 units, and the Ed.D. program requires completion of 60 units. Each graduate program has clearly defined and articulated expectations for achievement that include course requirements, research competencies, comprehensive exams, portfolios or thesis/dissertation projects. Some programs require professional experience or fieldwork prior to graduation requirements.

Our 1999 fourth-year WASC review suggested that CLU needed to further define and clarify the role of its graduate programs. This section will specifically focus on the significant progress that we have made to improve our graduate programs in the following areas: program quality; structural changes; facility improvements; and new programs.

**Program Quality**  In an effort to support the quality and development of graduate programs, a reinvestment plan was initiated in 2001. Each year, programs which exceed enrollment projections are allocated 50% of the additional income the following year. This has made it possible to fund faculty positions and provide start-up costs for the International MBA (IMBA) program, the Certificate in Financial Planning (CFP) program, and the upcoming on-line MBA/CFP program.

In 2004, CLU achieved NCATE accreditation, indicating that the School of Education's programs have met national standards of quality and excellence. In addition, the NCATE approval gives our programs some added status as well as portability, making it easier for our graduates to move from state-to-state because the programs are nationally accredited. At the time CLU received NCATE, only four private IHE's in California were NCATE-accredited.

Quality issues in the graduate programs are addressed in three formal committees, which have all been developed since our last Comprehensive Review:

- The Graduate and Professional Education Committee (GPEC) is responsible for reviewing and making recommendations concerned with graduate courses and program curricula, as well as for overseeing faculty affairs, student affairs, and academic standards of the graduate programs as a whole.
- A newly created Graduate and Adult Student Services Council, chaired by the Associate Provost, addresses issues related to graduate student services. It includes representatives from graduate admissions, marketing, the registrar’s office, financial aid, Information Systems and Services (ISS), career services, alumni relations, and the business office.
- Graduate Council is chaired by the Associate Provost and consists of all graduate program directors. Its primary function is defined broadly as providing coordination and leadership of the graduate and professional programs, and more narrowly as developing, monitoring, and implementing strategic planning for those programs. In 1995, Graduate Council began discussions on the Role of Graduate Studies at CLU. Two documents emerged from these discussions: Statement of the Positioning of Graduate Level Courses and Marks of Quality of Graduate and Professional Programs. The next year, Graduate Council broke into subgroups for further discussions, which resulted in the articulation of The Role of Graduate Programs at CLU. In the fall of 2004, Graduate Council reviewed this document and is in the process of making revisions.

**Structural Changes**  In response to one of the recommendations in the 1995 WASC Comprehensive Review, CLU created an Assistant Provost position for Graduate and Professional Studies (1998). The Assistant Provost, a senior level faculty member, assisted the Provost in coordinating, planning, and
implementing CLU’s graduate programs. Despite the progress that was made, it became apparent that this release time arrangement did not provide sufficient time, resources, or authority to make the position fully effective. When it was discontinued in 2001, the Director of the Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP) was given the temporary job of overseeing the graduate programs.

As a result of consulting with several institutions about how they administered their graduate programs, we created a new position in 2004: Associate Provost for Graduate and Adult Programs and Accreditation. This full-time administrative position is responsible for oversight of graduate admissions and marketing, graduate program review, off-campus graduate facilities, new program development, and coordination of policies and procedures for graduate administration.

Another major structural change, undertaken in 2002, resulted in a decentralized approach to graduate admissions and marketing. The former Graduate Enrollment Office was split into three areas: 1) admissions staff for the 15-week graduate programs (Education and Psychology); 2) admissions staff for the ADEP program and the 11-week graduate programs (Business, Computer Science, MPPA); and, 3) marketing staff for all graduate and adult programs, with much greater emphasis on strategic outreach to identify new opportunities. This structure has resulted in a smoother, more effective and efficient management of the applicant process. For example, processing of applications in the School of Education has improved from a three-month turnaround to a one-week turnaround.

**Facility Improvements** With the completion of the $6.5 million Spies-Bornemann Center for Education and Technology in 2002, the School of Education now resides in a state-of-the-art facility. The new building includes faculty offices, a long-distance classroom equipped with 20 student computer stations, a smart classroom, a MAC lab, a TV studio, a multimedia lab, and a Center for Teaching and Learning.

The Soiland Humanities Building, completed in 1998, provides 16 classrooms which are used in the evenings by graduate programs. Six computer labs are available on campus for use by graduate students, as are the computer labs at the Woodland Hills and Ventura sites. The new Centrum Café provides food services until midnight. Prior to 2003, no food service was available on campus for students in evening classes. This fall, we opened a Welcome Center. The Center is particularly helpful for evening students who have questions or need directions. It stays open 24 hours and houses our Campus Safety Department.

**New Programs** Three new graduate programs (Ed.D in Educational Leadership, MS in Computer Science, and MS in Financial Planning) have been developed in the past 5 years. In the fall of 2002, the School of Education began offering the Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership, which is the first doctoral program at CLU.

We have just completed a WASC Substantive Change Review for our first fully on-line program at CLU, which will be in Financial Planning and will begin in January 2005. There are two options for the program: an MBA in Financial Planning (48 units); or a Certificate in Financial Planning (24 units). Both of these options have been accredited by the CFP Board of Standards.

**EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, STUDENT OUTCOMES, AND PROGRAM REVIEW (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)**

**Educational Objectives, Student Outcomes** Four years ago, the CLU faculty began an extensive process of revisiting, expanding and redefining CLU’s institution-wide Educational Objectives & Student Outcomes. We began this process with a rough draft of the Educational Objectives, which was entitled “CLU’s Roadmap for Enhancing Academic Quality.” The draft was reviewed and critiqued in multiple break-out sessions by the faculty at the August 2001 Faculty Retreat. From this first step, we began our discussions on the list of institution-wide student learning outcomes that fit within our three Core Commitments at CLU: Liberal Learning, Professional Preparation, and Character & Leadership Development.
In August of 2003, we invited Dr. Mary Allen (Faculty Director of the Institute for Teaching and Learning in the Office of the Chancellor for the California State University system) to present at our two-day faculty retreat. During these two days, Dr. Allen gave presentations on “Developing Learning Objectives,” “Aligning the Cohesive Curriculum,” “Developing an Assessment Plan,” and “Developing and Applying Rubrics.” Between each of Dr. Allen’s presentations, faculty met in breakout groups, where they focused on one of the Student Outcomes from the Educational Objectives document. At the conclusion of the retreat, each group developed: 1) A definition of their assigned student outcome; 2) A list of where their assigned outcome would happen in the curriculum and co-curriculum; and, 3) An assessment plan for the outcome with a draft of a rubric. (See final document.)

The definitions of the Student Outcomes developed at the 2003 Faculty Retreat were compiled and reviewed on multiple occasions by the faculty and the WASC Steering Committee. By the conclusion of the 2003-04 academic year, faculty reached consensus on the Educational Objectives document and on definitions for each of the institution-wide Student Outcomes. The WASC Steering Committee then prepared a document entitled “Mapping Student Outcomes to Programs” which identifies the student outcomes that will be addressed through the CORE-21 Curriculum, the Program Curricula, and the Co-curriculum.

We have now begun integrating the Student Outcomes throughout the curriculum in several ways: 1) department and program assessment plans; 2) revision of individual course syllabi; 3) review and revision of CORE-21 requirements; and, 4) program reviews. Our focus on the development, implementation, and assessment of student outcomes has resulted in CLU becoming a more “learning-centered” institution.

**Department and Program Assessment Plans** By the end of the spring semester of 2004, the Assistant Provost for Assessment requested that each undergraduate department submit a Department Assessment Plan, which integrated the institution-wide Student Outcomes as well as department-specific Student Outcomes. Also included were proposed methods for assessing these outcomes. Data collection for these department assessment plans has begun, and all departments’ assessment plans must be in place by 2007. Assessment plans have been underway in the School of Education, and we are also in the process of completing plans for all other graduate programs.

**Course Syllabi Revision** At our May 2004 Faculty Development Workshop, we conducted an instructional session on integrating the Student Outcomes into each syllabus. Faculty were given an incentive for revising all of their syllabi to directly include the Student Outcomes that are addressed in each course. In the fall of 2004, all part-time faculty received a letter and a copy of the Educational Objectives and Definitions of Student Outcomes with their fall contract explaining how these outcomes relate to their courses. We plan to help part-time faculty integrate the student outcomes statements in their syllabi through department chair and program director reviews of syllabi and through part-time faculty orientation meetings.

**Review and Revision of General Education Requirements** During the 2003-04 year, the General Education Subcommittee of the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) reviewed criteria for all CORE-21 requirements, and rewrote the criteria for the courses in the form of student outcome language. Every general education course is now required to show how student outcomes will be assessed. Significant changes for four requirements resulted in discussion and faculty vote on the following: Global Perspectives; U.S. Diversity (previously titled “Gender and Ethnic Studies”); Writing Intensive; Speaking Intensive. We are now starting from scratch with the list of courses that fulfill our CORE-21 requirements. In the fall of 2004, faculty were required to submit their syllabi to the Gen Ed Subcommittee with a completed form indicating how their course meets the revised requirements and how the outcomes will be assessed. The Gen Ed Subcommittee is now in the process of reviewing syllabi for all CORE-21 courses to ensure that they meet the new criteria. This is an important step in addressing our theme of increasing challenge and expectations.

**Program Review (CFR 2.7)** Over the past two decades, efforts to conduct program reviews have been sporadic. Reviews would be completed for a couple of years followed by a period of time without reviews. We decided to revise the program review process in the late 1990s. In the 2003-04 academic year, a new process was implemented and we completed 3 undergraduate program reviews (English, Math, and Religion).
In the current academic year, program reviews are being completed in the undergraduate departments of Philosophy, Sociology, Communication, and Exercise Science & Sports Medicine (ESSM). We have established a seven-year plan for undergraduate program reviews, which will provide one cycle of review for all undergraduate majors.

Growth and development in graduate programs over the past decade has led to a number of program reviews. In the mid-1990s, all School of Education graduate programs underwent a review process. In 1999, the Marital & Family Therapy (MFT) Program and the Clinical Psychology program were reviewed, which resulted in a shift of the MFT Program from the Sociology department to the Psychology Department as well as major curriculum changes integrating many courses in both programs. Around 2000, a review was conducted of Continuing & Professional Education which resulted in a downsizing of the program and its relocation to the School of Education. Due to questions about the viability of continuing the Masters in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA), a review was conducted last year. It was determined that the program has potential for growth, and as a result we have allocated additional resources to this program and are currently searching for a full-time director for the program.

Many of the recent graduate program reviews have been conducted for the purpose of responding to a current need within a specific program. The Graduate and Professional Education Committee (GPEC) is reviewing the graduate program review process and developing a schedule for regular program reviews.

The Program Review self-study process begins with data provided to the department or program by the Dean, Provost, and Registrar. The self-study is conducted by the department or program, and is then reviewed by the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (undergraduate) or the Graduate & Professional Education Committee (graduate). The self-study includes: program goals and educational objectives; faculty credentials, staffing and performance; facilities; information resources; external resources; curriculum; teaching effectiveness; faculty and student scholarship; student outcomes; strategic significance; and, plans for the future. The program review process includes an external reviewer who spends 2 days on campus.

SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

At California Lutheran University, the primary responsibility of faculty is to provide excellent teaching and advising. Excellence in teaching is fostered by continuous study, research, and artistic performance; thus, faculty are expected to engage in research, scholarship, and/or creative activities. These activities benefit the University, particularly when they support a faculty member’s teaching and contribute to student learning. For promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews, faculty members are expected to provide evidence of scholarship in their fields. (See criteria for review in Faculty Handbook, section II, pp. 38 - 55). A compilation of faculty publications and presentations since 1995 provides evidence of the scholarly and creative activities of the faculty at CLU.

Institutional Support The University supports research and creative activities, although one of the major challenges we face at CLU related to scholarship and creative activity is that we have limited resources. Faculty are also stretched with multiple responsibilities, making it very difficult for them to dedicate the time needed for advancing their research and creative activities. Institutional support includes:

Hewlett Endowment Grants These funds are available through the Hewlett Endowment, and are administered by the Faculty Affairs and Development Committee (FADC) to support research and presentation of results at professional meetings (See projects and award amounts).

The Sabbatical Leave Program (See Faculty Handbook, section II, pages 30-32) at CLU recognizes the important role that professional development and renewal play in the career of a faculty member. The purpose of the sabbatical program is to provide funded opportunities for faculty to engage in activities that will enhance their effectiveness as teachers and scholars. Full-time faculty are eligible for a sabbatical every six years. One-semester sabbatical leaves carry full salary, and faculty may apply for a $1200 Hewlett Endowment Grant to support expenses during the sabbatical leave.
Grants from External Sources  Although the University is in need of assistance for grant writing to provide much more support for faculty research and development, we have been fortunate in receiving some important grant awards in recent years:

A Charles E. Culpeper Foundation grant of $149,000, awarded to CLU in 1998, provided for a customized approach to the integration of technology into the CLU academic curriculum. Twenty-four Culpeper projects were developed in cycles from fall 1999 through spring 2002, and many more have been (and are continuing to be) developed in the Center for Teaching and Learning with funding from the University. (See abstracts.)

The Federal PT3 (Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology) program awarded CLU the largest federal grant it had ever received in 1999. CLU’s School of Education received $1.2 million, and used the award to train CLU students to use technology and to establish an electronic portfolio system in the Teacher Education program. The grant also funded faculty training in technology and research and evaluation in the area of technology use in education.

The James Irvine Foundation awarded California Lutheran University a $400,000 grant in June 2003 as part of the foundation's Campus Diversity Initiative (CDI) to "help institutions to prepare all students for leadership in a diverse society and promote the success of underrepresented student populations." Within this grant, $45,000 was designated to promote diversity within faculty scholarship and pedagogy. Twelve faculty development grants were awarded in the first year. (See list of projects.)

In addition to pursuing their own research interests, faculty are encouraged to support student research and creative activities. The Annual Science Showcase, Annual Senior Art Exhibition, and the new CLU Undergraduate Research Symposium showcase faculty-mentored student work. Students regularly present at the Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research and the Santa Clara Undergraduate Research Conference. Faculty are also involved in mentoring graduate student research by serving on thesis and dissertation committees.

CHALLENGE (CFR 2.5)

In January, 2002, George Kuh was invited to a faculty workshop at CLU to discuss CLU’s data from the 2001 administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) (See CLU NSSE data). While CLU compared favorably on each benchmark to institutions in our category (masters-level comprehensive universities), we compared less favorably with baccalaureate-liberal arts institutions (which we aspire to be more like) on Academic Challenge. Furthermore, comparisons to institutions with our characteristics (i.e., demographics, size, etc.) revealed weaknesses in Academic Challenge for both freshmen and seniors, and in Active/Collaborative learning for CLU seniors. The discussions from the workshop with George Kuh played a significant role in developing the following themes for our WASC Proposal:

3. Raising the level of expectations, challenge, and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs (including the effectiveness of the first year experience);

4. Enhancing engagement with diversity in the campus community and in the classroom.

Over the past two years, the faculty has engaged in several discussions to define what we mean by “challenge” and “engagement.” For example, at the August 2002 Faculty Retreat, breakout groups were organized by departments, addressing the following questions: “How do you define ‘challenge’ and ‘engagement’?” and “How can you raise the levels?” Other breakout groups were organized by faculty committees and asked: “How could your committee make a contribution to the WASC outcomes and themes?” The Student Affairs division, at their summer 2002 retreat, also held discussions on defining “challenge” and submitted their results to the WASC Steering Committee. In March of 2003, the WASC Steering Committee focused on the question, “What will we look like 3 years from now if we become a more challenging and engaged learning community?”
A “Challenge and Engagement Task Group” was developed to review the information from the many discussions that took place over the course of two years. This group developed a finalized definition of “challenge” and “engagement.”

Related to our WASC theme of raising the levels of challenge and engagement, the University started a new Honors Program in the fall of 2003. This program is designed to attract outstanding students to CLU, engage students’ intellectual curiosity, and prepare students for their work in the world after graduation.

In our undergraduate course evaluations, one question asks students if the course challenged them to “analyze and evaluate.” Over the past five semesters, 85% of students “agree” or “strongly agree” with this statement. We have seen a slight increase in this response each semester, from 84% to 87% agreement. Another question asks if students “experienced a high degree of intellectual and/or creative challenge.” Similarly, the positive responses to this question have increased over the past five semesters from 81% to 85% responding that they “agree” or “strongly agree.” We will be assessing challenge and expectation in more detail over the next year, since this is one of our themes for the Educational Effectiveness review.

**ENGAGEMENT (CFR 2.10-2.14)**

**Student Satisfaction (CFR 2.10)** California Lutheran University regularly assesses student needs, experiences and levels of satisfaction at two levels: within a number of academic and student support units and more broadly across the entire University. Within units, program staff regularly assess student satisfaction with events and services.

The University examines broader indicators of students in three ways. Traditional undergraduate students’ experiences and level of satisfaction is examined through the use of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. For all students, traditional undergraduate and ADEP and graduate students, satisfaction with courses and instruction are assessed through regularly administered course evaluations.

Students responding to the NSSE, administered to freshmen and seniors every four years, indicated that they find the environment at CLU highly supportive. Items with strong, positive satisfaction included: support for academic success, personal and social support, and good quality relationships with faculty, administration, and staff. Students did not feel as challenged or engaged as they expected to be as compared with the responses of students from other similar institutions (see NSSE results). As a result of discussion of these last outcomes, the faculty has been involved in a number of activities to re-examine the level of challenge and engagement in the undergraduate programs. In addition, these areas became major themes for this WASC review.

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, administered every two years, also measures student satisfaction with a wide range of college experiences. The results compare students’ satisfaction with the students’ ratings of the importance of each item. CLU students at all four years of undergraduate work were generally moderately satisfied with services and activities on the campus when examined internally and in comparison to a national norm group. Highest levels of satisfaction (> 5.25 on a 7-point scale) were found in the areas of instructional effectiveness, academic advising, student-centeredness, and concern for the individual. Lowest areas (< 4.75 on a 7-point scale) were responsiveness to diversity and safety and security. (See Noel-Levitz summary from 2002.)

Data from the course evaluations show that students perceive their instruction to be of good quality. In the School of Education, data from the period of 2000-2002 reveal that graduate students generally rated their courses quite positively, with mean ratings for all items of at least 4.00 on a 5-point scale. Particularly strong elements of courses with ratings of 4.5 or higher included: course materials clearly presented, student participation was encouraged, instructor was interested in the individual student’s progress and was actively helpful, methods of evaluation were fair and accurate, and papers were returned quickly. (See NCATE SoE
Course Evaluation Summaries. Recent data from undergraduate course evaluations indicates that over 80% of students agreed that their courses fostered active student participation.

Co-Curricular Programs (CFR 2.11) At the undergraduate level, CLU offers a number of “experience programs” to actively promote student success. The Freshmen Year Experience Program includes a four day New Student Orientation and Friday Freshmen Seminar Class in the first semester. This program is responsible for transitioning new students into the institution, preparing them for the institution's educational opportunities and initiating the integration of freshmen into the intellectual, cultural, and social climate of CLU. Freshmen are placed in groups of 20-25 students. These groups are led by a Faculty Mentor (first year advisor and professor), an Administrative Mentor (employee responsible for an administrative function at the University, e.g., Director of Residence Life or Coordinator for Intramural Program), and a Peer Advisor (returning student leader). Other components of the New Student Orientation and the Freshmen Program include a Freshmen Leadership Retreat and Freshmen Residence Halls designed to meet the programmatic needs of new students.

The Sophomore Year Experience is a one-evening workshop held in the fall. It addresses issues such as: sophomore slump, selecting a major, study abroad, and acquiring an internship. The Junior Year Experience, a one-evening workshop held in the fall, addresses issues such as: gathering job experience, moving off-campus, acquiring an internship, applying to grad school, and how to do a graduation check. The Senior Year Experience "Disorientation" is a one-evening workshop held in the early spring, and it addresses issues such as: renting an apartment, budget management, job interview skills, and building relationships in a post-college world.

Co-curricular activities at CLU are designed to support a learning-centered environment. For example, the campus Community Service Center coordinates dozens of Service Projects each academic year and works with nearly a dozen faculty members to create service programs that meet the specific needs of the course that is being taught. These faculty members incorporate service learning as a class requirement. The Community Service Center also conducts service projects specific to every academic major (e.g. Drama Majors volunteering to assist local children’s theatre groups, Sports Medicine volunteering with the Special Olympics, and Biology Majors assisting with an ocean clean up).

In addition to dozens of training workshops and retreats planned for campus co-curricular groups, each year CLU hosts a Leadership Institute. This is a one-day workshop in which campus leaders build upon their leadership abilities. Designed to mirror a conference setting, attendees hear from a keynote speaker, attend a myriad of workshops on a range of topics (e.g. Ethics in Leadership, Time Management, the Art of Delegation, Historical Leadership Models), and attend roundtable discussions on topics of interest (e.g. Christian Leadership, Involvement, Prioritization).

With a goal of educating the whole person (mind, body, and spirit), and of bringing CLU's mission statement to life, each of CLU's thirty-seven Resident Assistants is required to conduct eight programs/activities in the residence halls a semester. When programming, each Resident Assistant must address a minimum of six "Points of Focus," which include: leadership, faith and reason, social, intellectual growth, service and justice, identity and vocation, character and judgment, diversity and global awareness, and wellness. Two of these programs must also include a CLU faculty member.

The Assistant Provost for Assessment is currently working with the Student Affairs staff to align the co-curriculum with CLU’s Student Learning Outcomes and to develop a plan for Assessment. This will be included in the Educational Effectiveness report.

Advising (CFR 2.12, 2.13) California Lutheran University delineates its academic programs and policies in multiple locations, using multiple methods. All programs and policies are listed in the University catalogs and all incoming students are given a copy of the applicable catalog. The current undergraduate and graduate catalogs are also available on-line. In addition the Registrar’s Office web page also includes academic
policies and procedures for both graduate and undergraduate students. Undergraduate policies and procedures are available in the student handbook and in the student advising handbook.

Printed copies of the student advising handbook are provided for incoming freshmen and are available on-line through the Center for Academic and Accessibility Resources web site. The purpose of the handbook is to introduce students to the range of opportunities and academic resources available at CLU, describe the academic advising process, and answer some frequently asked questions about University policies and procedures. With the current University Catalog, it provides a comprehensive guide to the academic life of the University.

The primary method of advising for both undergraduate and graduate programs is delivered by the faculty. Graduate students are able to receive any necessary advising from the Program Directors. Each student in the traditional undergraduate program is assigned a faculty advisor and is required to meet with their faculty advisor prior to registration for the next semester. These regular advising times insure that students receive assistance in understanding and meeting the degree requirements and provide mentoring and guidance in career development. Students enrolled in the ADEP program are advised by professional advising staff.

Student Support Services (CFR 2.13) Registration, advisement and career counseling are intended to support the needs and expectations of all CLU students. Registration and advising information for both faculty advisors and students are available on the web through Web Advisor, which provides access to student transcript information, program evaluations and registration. It is available to both students and faculty 24 hours a day, seven days a week with the exception of necessary scheduled maintenance. Career counseling is available to students through the Career Services office. A full listing of the services provided by Career Services is available on the office’s website.

In the spring 2003 library use survey, many students suggested longer hours especially on weekends and when the traditional undergraduate program is not in session. The library had weekend hours in January, 2004 to accommodate graduate and ADEP students’ study and information needs. The library also added two hours on Saturdays (10:15 a.m. – 4:45 p.m.) and two hours on Sundays (1:15 p.m. – 11:45 p.m.) to the weekend schedule. The library is now open on average 87.5 hours per week. Further, the library added an additional hour at the end of days the week before finals.

The spring 2003 survey also had many complaints about the age of the books, small collection size, and lighting. In the fall 2004, the assistant University Librarian has completed a project to identify recently published books held by 500 academic libraries. The University will purchase all of the books that we do not currently hold. The University has also budgeted $11,400 for the on-going support of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership. The library book budget has grown from $63K in 99-00 to $137K in 04-05. Funding for electronic access to periodicals and on-line databases has grown from $90K in 99-00 to over $127K in 04-05.

Transfer Students (CFR 2.14) Transfer Student Orientation occurs during both the fall and spring semesters. Transfer students are checked into the University (e.g., given an ID Card, Parking Permit, Class Schedule, and Financial Status report), are welcomed by both the University President and Student Body President, and provided sessions and workshops on Academic Life (advisement, registration support, resources), Student Life and Services (Campus Ministries, Student Programs, Career Services, Residence Life, Multicultural Programs, Involvement Opportunities), and Social Adjustment (student panel discussion, class social, campus tour). The Undergraduate Student Catalog (pp. 8-10 and 41) describes application procedures for transfer students and policies on transferring credits.

REFLECTIVE ESSAY ON STANDARD 3
DEVELOPING AND APPLYING RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES TO ENSURE SUSTAINABILITY

HUMAN RESOURCES (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)
CLU employs 370 regular employees on an annual basis and maintains a 2:1 ratio of staff and administration to faculty. This ratio is consistent with educational institutions our size. Our employee distribution by FTE, which includes adjunct faculty, is 109.6 Faculty, 76 Adjunct, 116.51 Administrators, and 113 Staff. Additional University services are provided through contracts with Sodexo for housekeeping and campus dining, and Follett for managing the bookstore. (See data on Ratios of Employees).

Staff (CFR 3.1, 3.3) Despite limited resources for additional staff to support its non-instructional program, the University has been able to maintain excellent student service and institutional support functions and to incrementally create positions to support strategic plan initiatives (e.g., Graduate Marketing and Admissions, Capital Campaign, Facilities Operations, Undergraduate Admissions and Multicultural Recruitment, Web Design and Publications, Marketing and Communications, Student Counseling and Student Affairs, Academic Advising and Student Support Services, Associate and Assistant Provost). These positions have been funded through reallocation and redesign of existing positions as well as through new revenue. Also, the technology investments made in earlier years are now paying off in that many offices are doing more work with the same or less staff support. In 2002-03, a capacity study revealed that the current staffing levels could accommodate approximately 1700 traditional undergraduate students. The institution has now reached that number and may have to invest in more staff: if the student body continues to grow; if additional requirements should be added from governmental and other agencies; or other demands be placed upon the workforce.

Even though we have increased revenue and new staffing in key strategic areas, many offices that support the institution are experiencing an increase in workload with no additional resources. However, the level of commitment remains high and productivity continues to be healthy and adequate for maintaining current programs. Our workforce deployment is consistent with and supportive of the University’s mission and strategic goals. New funding through the Irvine Grant will assist us in achieving goals focused on enhancing both student and employee populations from underrepresented groups.

Staff recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices (CFR 3.3) In June 2000 the University implemented a new compensation and classification system for non-instructional employees with the assistance of a consultant/specialist. The key objective of the new program was to provide for internal pay consistency and market competitiveness based on the scope and complexity of each position’s responsibilities and requirements. New job evaluation factors and criteria were developed for the purpose of ranking positions into eight grade levels (excluding senior executive levels) and salary ranges were established to coincide with each grade. All job descriptions were updated and put into a consistent format that clearly identified the qualifications, knowledge and abilities required for the position. The system has been maintained and is updated every two years. An appeals process has been implemented which allows individuals and supervisors to appeal current grade levels in order to adjust for changing and expanding roles.

The Human Resources Department manages our recruitment system for staff and administrative positions. Our hiring objectives are consistent with the institution’s strategic plan. The search process is published on our intranet and is available for all employees to access; each step is overseen by Human Resources. Personnel Requisitions and job descriptions are reviewed by HR to ensure compliance with the law as well as consistency with the University’s internal policies and procedures. Authorizations to recruit must be approved by the appropriate vice president, the Budget Officer, HR and the President (for new positions). Employees clearly meet the qualifications and possess the credentials necessary for positions to which they are hired or promoted. Reference checks and background checks are completed for all new hires. In addition to posting job openings on CLU’s website, we typically utilize an average of 35-40 recruiting sources during the course of a year.

Enhanced efforts are being made to recruit and hire individuals from underrepresented groups. Specific goals and strategies are outlined in the Irvine Diversity Grant proposal and plan, including increasing the number of administrative and staff employees from underrepresented groups by 20% by 2007-2008. HR has facilitated several supervisory training workshops during the past three years focusing on the interview and hiring process. This year, we added the additional component of hiring from diverse population groups.
Our performance appraisal process for staff and administration is also managed by Human Resources. The appraisal format has been updated within the past three years and the institution has made a concerted effort to ensure that appraisals are conducted in accordance with institutional policies set forth in the Administrative & Staff Handbook. Completion rates have improved dramatically and are reported by division quarterly to the President’s cabinet. Administrative employees are evaluated on common core competencies and on how well they meet their individual goals. Several supervisory training workshops have also been offered through HR focusing on the performance appraisal process and addressing performance issues.

**Faculty (CFR 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)**

CLU’s mission statement describes the University as a scholarly community committed to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. The faculty members and others who came to the University in its early years to participate in a noble (and somewhat risky) experiment in institution building developed an ethos of strong norms of egalitarianism, collegiality, and consensus as well as a serious commitment to the teaching and learning functions of the institution.

It is difficult to say whether the sense of community is as strong as it was in the first two decades of the institution’s life. The University is larger and more complex now, and there are pressures for faculty to do more scholarly work in addition to their teaching. High housing costs result in many faculty members, especially newer and younger ones, being forced to live a considerable distance from campus. All of these factors contribute to an eroding of the amount of time available for faculty to participate in dialogue or even to socialize. Nevertheless, the norms established early in the institution’s life are still very much reflected in how the faculty conducts its business and how satisfied faculty are with their working conditions.

Based on data from the faculty satisfaction survey, which is administered to faculty every two years, the CLU faculty indicate that they are generally satisfied with their working conditions, and most would choose to work at CLU again. Results from the latest survey in fall 2002 indicated that faculty were most satisfied with their autonomy and intellectual freedom, internal rewards including challenge, stimulation, enjoyment of teaching and colleagues, and clarity of criteria for promotion and tenure. Faculty were least satisfied with their role and influence in budget issues, time and resources for scholarship, progress on salaries relative to the cost of living, and salary equity within ranks.

When compared with data collected in previous surveys, the 2002 data indicates that, overall, faculty have become more satisfied with rewards for merit, resources for teaching, and clarity of promotion and tenure criteria. Data indicated declines in faculty satisfaction, however, in the areas of time and resources for scholarship, salary, relationship with the administration, and autonomy and intellectual freedom.

Faculty participation in overseeing academic policies, curriculum, and program development is strong at CLU. Faculty at the department, school and program levels are also actively involved in the review of teaching and learning assessment data. This includes programs offered all or in part in the evening and at the University’s satellite centers.

Rather than employing a senate style representational system, the entire University faculty meets monthly during the academic year as a committee of the whole to decide significant curricular issues and changes. Similarly, membership in the major faculty committees (e.g., ART, FEC, and FADC) is determined by election processes involving all faculty members. An elaborate committee structure (Faculty Handbook, Section I, pp. 6 – 39) supports this plenary decision-making forum, and strong norms (formal and informal) encourage widespread faculty participation. The annual faculty retreat also involves all faculty, and social events throughout the year encourage involvement from all areas of the faculty.

Faculty undertook the major task of writing a new edition of the Faculty Handbook (Sections I, II, and III) during the years from 1987-1990. That document, with annual amendments, remains the guiding source for understanding faculty governance at CLU. The faculty governance system requires (and receives) active participation by a substantial proportion of the full-time faculty members.
**Faculty recruitment, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices (CFR 3.3)**

**Recruitment & Staffing:** CLU is committed to an educational philosophy that includes classroom instruction by faculty members rather than teaching assistants, and the maintaining of reasonably small class sizes. Thus, our staffing needs may well require more faculty FTE’s per given program size than would be the case for institutions taking other pedagogical approaches. (See Faculty Data by Department).

The Provost maintains a Faculty Staffing Plan which includes the current “inventory” of faculty resources and delineates a target number. In general, over the years, the size and quality of the faculty have improved. In the 2003-04 academic year, CLU’s faculty consisted of 122 full-time faculty, with 93% holding terminal degrees (See Full-time Faculty Profile). This represents the largest number of full-time faculty in CLU’s history. Because of enrollment declines beginning in 1992, full-time faculty positions were cut from 110 positions in 1992 to 96 by the fall of 1997. The 25% increase in number of full-time faculty in the past 6 years (1997-2003) is a response to increased enrollment and to strategic planning focused on increasing the number of full-time faculty.

At the end of the 2003-04 academic year, 9 senior faculty members retired, taking advantage of an incentive package that included an additional year of salary. This resulted in a very tight year in 2004-05. We have relied more heavily than usual on part-time faculty (see percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty) and, for the short term, faculty resources are stretched. We are, however, funding replacement positions in the 2005-06 year. Approval has been given to hire 14 new faculty who will begin teaching in the fall of 2005.

In allocating faculty slots, the Provost consults with the academic deans and the Academic Council, a committee comprised of faculty who are elected to chair major faculty governance committees. The adequacy of available faculty allocations varies across academic units and programs. Currently, higher than desirable proportions of courses are delivered by part-time faculty, particularly in the professional schools and graduate programs.

The Provost, using the consultative system described above, has discretionary authority to recruit new members to the full-time faculty. The approval process requires documentation of need and the establishment of relevance and priority in relation to the current University strategic and academic plans and the Provost’s Staffing Plan. Recruiting policies (and the strategic and academic plan) require specific efforts be made to identify and recruit women and minority group faculty members.

**Workload & Incentive:** The University’s expectations of its faculty are fully articulated in the Faculty Handbook. The workload for full-time faculty is 24 units per year of teaching, plus student advising and mentoring, committee service, and an on-going program of scholarship (with more emphasis on scholarship and professional advancement in recent years). Some faculty also have administrative duties, serving as department chairs or program directors.

Consistent with the stated mission of the University, existing incentives and evaluation processes emphasize excellence in teaching, though there are also expectations related to service and, increasingly, scholarship. The incentives related to promotion and tenure (retention, increases in rank and, to a small degree, salary) are tied directly to the mission of the institution and are administered using criteria detailed in the Faculty Handbook. Other incentives (e.g., money for professional development activities) are limited in amount and, historically, have also reflected the University’s emphasis on teaching. There is broad consensus on the campus that more resources are needed to support teaching but, even more, to support growing expectations related to scholarship, research, and other professional development.

Other than promotion and tenure, faculty are offered no significant financial incentives for professional excellence. There is no merit system for faculty--although merit may enter into the annual discussions of the Provost and academic dean regarding faculty salary increases. In recent years, the funds available for increasing the faculty salary pool have been expended to help resolve severe internal equity problems in the
salaries of continuing faculty, to improve the poor salary situation of all CLU faculty (relative to the market), and to meet the competitive salary needs for new hires. As faculty members continue to face cost-of-living challenges and as promotion and tenure expectations increasingly include criteria related to scholarship and professional development, we will have to offer stronger merit-based incentives and increase the level of funding to support faculty salaries overall.

**Evaluation Practices:** CLU has a well-developed, fully documented, system for evaluating the quality of faculty work. New hires receive thorough evaluations and detailed feedback at their 2nd, 4th and 6th year of service. Tenured and long-term contract (non-tenure track) faculty members receive similarly detailed and thoughtful evaluations on a rolling 5-year cycle. Faculty peers, chairpersons, deans, the faculty-elected Appointment, Rank and Tenure (ART) committee, the Provost, and, in cases of tenure, the President and the Board of Regents, all participate in the formal faculty review processes. **Criteria for promotion and performance** at each rank are clearly spelled out in the Faculty Handbook (Section II p. 43-55). The evaluation processes (time lines, steps, needed documentation) are also explained in detailed procedural packets distributed by the Provost’s office. The process involves submission to the ART committee and the Provost of performance evidence by the faculty members being evaluated (syllabi, student evaluation results, sample student work, evidence of scholarship and service) and also reflective writing about their own individual performance and goals. Peer assessments based on classroom visitation, shared committee work, and other criteria included in the evaluation dossier, are solicited from alumni, current advisees, department chairs and deans.

Every semester, summaries of each faculty member’s teaching evaluations are reviewed by department chairs, and department chairs’ evaluations are reviewed by the dean of the school or college. In 2003, an annual review process was initiated. The process, revised in 2004 requires documentation of teaching, advising, scholarship, and service. In fall 2004, the Provost initiated a “Colleague Class Visit”; each faculty member invites someone outside of his or her department to visit a class and then spend time reflecting about the experience. A form is submitted to the Provost’s Office to simply document the visit--without any written evaluation or comments.

Annually, department chairs or deans are expected to have at least one evaluation interview with each non-tenured member of their department. The interview includes a discussion of teaching evaluations, course syllabi, scholarly development, and service to the department, the University and the community. The results of these interviews are transmitted to the dean of the school or college and then to the Provost for placement in the faculty member’s file. Faculty who are not on tenure track are reviewed on the same schedule and with the same process as tenure-track faculty, and scholarship expectations are the same for both tenure track and non tenure track faculty. Upon satisfactory review, those not on tenure track are eligible for a rolling three-year contract.

Part-time (adjunct) faculty members are also evaluated, using established criteria and procedures which involve peer assessment and reviews by department chairs and deans.

**Faculty Development (CFR 3.4)**

CLU believes strongly in on-going professional development. The University’s campus-based development programs (faculty workshops; the Center for Teaching and Learning activities; the Culpeper projects) are primarily related to the development of skills in active learning, assessment, and the effective use of technology-based instruction. Grant monies have supplemented University operating funds to provide these programs and an active continuing program of grant application development and submission is in place.

Eligible faculty members may use CLU’s active sabbatical leave program for professional development in teaching or in scholarship. Sabbatical proposals are peer reviewed and also reviewed for approval by deans and the Provost. Limited amounts of funds are available for faculty development purposes through the Hewlett endowment (peer administered) and through operating funds in department budgets—though the latter
amounts are very small. It is generally agreed that the University needs to provide additional funding to support its faculty’s professional development.

The CLU Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) promotes curricular and instructional innovation. The goal of the CTL is to provide extraordinary teaching and learning opportunities for the campus community, characterized by: currency and quality, active learning, one-on-one student/teacher interaction, and collaboration. The Center provides resources for and consultation about effective teaching practices and learning techniques, helps faculty prepare instructional projects for publication, assists them in developing multimedia presentations for classroom use, and sponsors a series on teaching and learning strategies. The CTL staff collaborates with faculty to redesign courses, update knowledge of learning strategies, and integrate technology into teaching.

FISCAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES (CFR 3.5)

Fiscal Resources The financial profile of the institution has improved significantly since 1995-96. Beginning in 1996-97, enrollment in the undergraduate program steadily improved--after an almost catastrophically low freshmen enrollment of 231 in the prior year. Since CLU was and remains a highly tuition-dependent institution, the increases in enrollment have played a significant and fundamental role in the improving health of the institution. Even during that troubling period of low enrollment, the University had enough discipline to present and live within a balanced operational budget. During each of the past 10 years, CLU has ended the year “in the black” on an operational basis. Only once have total expenses exceeded revenues, and this was caused by investment losses during 2001-02.

To ensure that fiscal resources are aligned with institutional purposes, CLU maintains a disciplined budgetary system. Budgetary priorities are determined by the priorities of the then-current strategic plan. The President’s Annual Budget Memo (00-01, 01-02, 02-3, 03-4, 04-05) provides guidance to the Cabinet, which is the institution’s primary budget committee. In addition, a joint faculty and staff Budget Advisory Committee analyzes the work of the Cabinet and responds directly to the President regarding the accuracy of revenue projections, adherence to Budget Memo priorities, to the mission, and to the University’s strategic plans.

Budget planning has also included projections for the future to demonstrate that the actions being taken are sustainable. These projections coincide with the length of the strategic plan (the last strategic plan encompassed a three year period). Since the institution is in the midst of a major capital expansion, a capital budget has been carefully developed and debt service integrated into the operational budget projections.

The institution has a consistent history of discipline when it comes to operations, as is demonstrated by the key ratios. It also, however, has a relatively weak balance sheet compared to many of its peer institutions. The campus consensus is that CLU is still building the “school house,” and has insufficient resources to expand reserves. This past year a decision, long pondered by senior management and the Board of Regents, was made to place the proceeds of the $10 million sale of the Reseda property on the balance sheet rather than to expend the funds for plant investment. This action has significantly added to CLU’s quasi endowment and strengthened the institutional balance sheet and many key ratios. (See also: Budget Summary 99-05, RevenueCapital Investments 99-04, Construction in Progress 99-04, Endowment 99-04, Expenditures 99-04, Financial Ratios 99-04, Revenue 99-04)

While the University’s financial position has improved significantly over the past 10 years, much remains to be accomplished. Perhaps the most pressing concern is the salary levels of faculty and staff--especially in the context of comparison groups and of current Ventura County housing prices. We have been benchmarking ourselves with AICCU IIB schools, and our goal five years ago was to reach the mean. Despite an intensive effort to provide salary increases in the five per cent range each year, we have not reached the mean, primarily because the comparison institutions made similar salary increases. A related and equally pressing factor has been the unprecedented increase in housing prices in the immediate area of the University. Housing prices are now out of reach for most individuals; only two income families can hope to purchase homes. A Board Task force is studying this issue. Their report, with recommendations, is due in February, 2005.
Other financial issues that continue to be a concern of the institution include the following:

- relatively high tuition discount rate for traditional undergraduates (approximately 39%)
- relatively low total expenditures per student (approximately $16,300)
- relatively low endowment per student (approximately $14,170)
- relatively low alumni giving rate (approximately 21% according to 2002 data)

**Facilities** When compared to other key institutions, our square footage per student is low. Two years ago, a capacity study indicated that approximately 1700 traditional undergraduate students was our capacity given our current buildings, so the institution is now at its maximum utilization of its current facilities.

The institution’s primary goal during the past 10 years has been to increase the number of new, permanent buildings. As a result, the Soiland Humanities Building, the Spies-Bornemann Center for Education and Technology, the 120-bed Mogen Hall, and numerous campus improvements have been completed. In fall 2004, a ground breaking ceremony was held for the new, 97,000 square foot Sports and Fitness Center, which is scheduled for completion in the summer of 2006.

In spite of these great advances, key facilities are still lacking. Many faculty offices and some classrooms remain in temporary buildings that were constructed almost 40 years ago. The facilities for the arts and social sciences are clearly substandard, as are student service areas such as the current Student Union building. With the growth of the student body, the current library and science buildings are becoming inadequate. The next strategic plan will clearly have to include more campus facilities development.

The physical plant is in substantially better condition now than it was five years ago, but much remains undone. Beginning in 1996-97, the institution realized that insufficient resources existed to maintain its buildings and began a program to build deferred maintenance budgets in order to better address the deferred maintenance backlog. Currently, $790,000 is budgeted annually for deferred maintenance projects, and supplemental funds have increased expenditures in this area to approximately $1,000,000 annually. By our calculations, “equilibrium” (the point at which we are addressing the amount of additional deferred maintenance expenses) is about $900,000 annually. The latest deferred maintenance report demonstrates that a process exists to identify, prioritize, and complete deferred maintenance tasks. In the next four years, significant expenditures will have to be made to the “new west” residence halls in order to bring them to the level of our other institutional housing. The estimated cost of these projects, $3.2M, would consume the institution’s entire deferred maintenance budget for this period, unless other funds could be identified to supplement the existing budgets. Addressing this issue will be one of the institution’s major tasks during the next four to five years.

**Information Resources (CFR 3.6)**

During the summer of 2004, CLU participated in the Council for Independent College’s “Future of the Library College Workshop.” We used that opportunity to begin working on three specific areas: collection development, information literacy, and library facility. Each of these had been addressed in a draft library plan completed in the fall of 2004.

**Collection** CLU has one of the smaller collections in the group of Western, regionally ranked, liberal arts universities. In terms of collection development, over eight years ago, CLU began promoting access to information over acquisition of resources. A recent assessment of the access versus acquisition question showed phenomenal success with database use, especially in business, psychology, and education where we also note the highest request rate for information literacy instruction. We have yet to see significant increases in database use in the arts and sciences. Over the summer, we added several key databases including: Classical Music Library, EBSCOhost Sociological Collection, JSTOR Arts and Sciences II and Ecology and Botany collections, Kluwer Online, and Literature Online. For a complete look at library materials spending, see trend analysis.
**Information Literacy**  The collection acquisitions are only a first step. We are in the early stages of developing a comprehensive information literacy program (pp. 37-8) the initial phase of which is to develop a comprehensive first year information literacy experience. Funding is in place and this program will be designed by a team of faculty, librarians, and IT staff through the Center for Teaching and Learning. In the meantime, librarians will continue to work with faculty to deliver information literacy instruction. During the 2003-2004 school year, the library staff provided nearly 70 information literacy sessions.

**Library Facility**  The third component of both the CIC and the draft library plans deals with the library facility. Students have complained about: poor lighting, difficult to use compact shelving, and in recent years, the worn out carpet. We addressed all of these issues in the summer of 2004. The worst of the carpet has been replaced, and the remainder will be done in 2005-2006. New lighting is on order at the time of this writing for the open computer lab area and new study area, and the compact shelving has been re-vamped into traditional stacks. An additional long term problem has also been solved: having part of the collection in compact shelving and the remainder in general stacks. Students will now be able to browse the stacks and see all print holdings in one continuous area.

The library has begun migrating from a legacy Sirsi Classic integrated library system running on an outdated operating system and hardware to Endeavor’s Voyager ILS. This project will be complete by the time of the upcoming site visit.

Other projects that need to be completed include: identifying increased funding for the book budget to grow the core collection; finishing the library renovation (carpet, additional lighting, and new chairs); determining the level of funding for print periodicals; and fully developing the information literacy program. We also need to complete a long range plan for a complete library renovation and addition and identify funding for these two projects.

**Information Technology (CFR 3.7)**

Over the past three years, CLU has developed a model for funding information technology (IT) and has nearly fully funded the IT Plan. The current IT Plan focused on a set of underlying assumptions for what should be funded. These assumptions were itemized by the IT staff and then reviewed and revised by the Information Technology Advisory Committee, the President’s Cabinet, and the Academic Affairs Sub-Committee of the Board of Regents. The plan has been 75% funded for the 2004-2005 fiscal year, and is projected to be 85% funded by 2006-2007. The plan includes benchmarks based on a custom report from The Campus Computing Project.

The significant projects completed during the summer of 2004 demonstrate CLU’s robust IT environment. These include:

- A complete network hardware infrastructure upgrade with enhanced security and traffic control. The upgrade also provided a “hot” port per pillow for residential students—which previously had to be physically connected at the beginning of each term;
- An automated residential student computer registration process that resulted in over 800 students being connected to the network within the first week of classes;
- Six additional “smart classrooms,” raising to 90% the percentage of “smart classrooms” on the Thousand Oaks campus;
- A single-sign-on account consolidation project for a single user email name and password, Web Advisor (administrative e-commerce system), WebCT (CLU’s standard CMS), access to CLU licensed library resources, and authentication to the University-wide wireless network;
- The Beta launch of myCLU portal for students, faculty, and staff;
- The initial stages of implementation of Voyager’s Endeavor integrated library system;
- An upgrade of four computer labs with all computer labs having equipment acquired in the last three years; and
CLU has continued to invest in the human resources needed to support the IT needs of the campus community. Funds have consistently been available for the IT staff so that they can keep skills up to date by attending classes, workshops, and conferences. The Information Systems and Services (ISS) staff run a well-organized help desk. Customer satisfaction surveys show that University employees are well-served. In the Help Desk survey administered in December 2002, 77% of the respondents reported that their most recent help desk experience was excellent (five on a five point scale). The remaining 23% rated their experience as a four on the five point scale. ISS also provides on-going training in face-to-face workshops, individual desk top orientations for all new employees, and an orientation program for all new students.

**Organizational Structures and Decision-Making Process (CFR 3.8)**

CLU is organized along the same lines as many other small independent universities. Its President, who is solely responsible to an independent governing board, supervises and leads the organization, as shown in the accompanying organizational chart.

The shared governance structure at CLU includes a faculty governance system (Faculty Handbook, Section I, pp. 6 – 16). Faculty meet as a whole and receive reports from committees assigned various tasks. Faculty are also involved in reviewing and approving curricular issues/changes. In addition, faculty members of the Appointment, Rank and Tenure (ART) Committee work with the provost to evaluate faculty on a regular basis.

In attempts to streamline decision-making processes, a number of flow charts have been created to assist members of the University community in navigating the current decision-making processes, e.g., new program approvals, and hiring processes.

The President’s cabinet, comprised of the Vice-Presidents, assists him in making important operational and strategic decisions. For the most part the decision-making processes are understood and followed, but have proven to be cumbersome in some cases, i.e., new programs. The current Strategic Planning process includes a review of the University’s decision-making processes as well as other leadership and governance issues. One of the anticipated outcomes of the Strategic Planning process is that one or more goals surrounding the decision-making processes will be articulated.

**Leadership (3.9, 3.10, 3.11)**

**Independent Governing Board (CFR 3.9)** CLU’s governing board is now self-perpetuating, having changed its by-laws in 2004 to limit the role of the Convocation in the election of the Board of Regents members. The Convocation was formed at the founding of the institution and its members were elected, mostly, by supporting synodical members of the founding church bodies. The Convocation, though still in existence, no longer elects the majority of Board members. The Board of Regents, operating under the legal instruments of a California non-profit corporation, has the authority and responsibility to manage the institution in a legal and fiduciary manner. The governing board has chosen to hire a Chief Executive officer to manage the institution on a day-to-day basis. The Board conducts an annual evaluation of the President, usually at its summer Executive Committee meeting. The Board has always used its Executive Committee to provide management oversight and evaluation of the President.

The Board has several operating policies in place to ensure that major decisions are reserved for that body, including: Annual Budgets, Strategic Plans, Capital projects in excess of $250,000, new debt, tenure for faculty, and changes to handbooks. In order to execute its role, the Board of Regents is organized into several standing committees: the Executive Committee, the Committee for Academic Affairs, the Committee for Finance and Administration, the Committee for Student and Spiritual Life, the Committee for University
Development, and the Committee for Marketing and Communication. Each committee works closely with a senior manager of the institution, providing oversight and counsel.

**Chief Executive and Administrative Leadership (CFR 3.10)** The President, who serves as the chief executive officer, has served full-time in this capacity for approximately 12 years. President Luedtke came to the University in 1992 after a long and successful career at USC. The other senior leaders have served in higher education an average of 24 years. A review of the resumes of the Cabinet members provides evidence that these experienced leaders have an average tenure at the institution of 10 years. The University continues to try to improve performance at all levels through rigorous search processes and annual evaluations.

**Faculty Leadership (CFR 3.11)** Faculty participation in institutional decision-making concerning curriculum and instruction is strong and operates on a continuous basis. The peer-based norms for active participation in the development and improvement of the instructional program and in the committee structures that support faculty governance in these areas are also strong and enduring. (See Faculty Executive Committee website).

**REFLECTIVE ESSAY ON STANDARD 4**  
**CREATING AN ORGANIZATION COMMITTED TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT**

**PLANNING AT CLU: 1990 TO THE PRESENT**

In the early and mid-1990s, CLU made some significant changes in its top administrative and academic leadership positions. Many of the new appointees came from outside the institution, including the President, Vice Presidents for Finance, Institutional Advancement and Student Life, and the Deans for the (then only recently established) professional schools of Business and Education. Other key posts were filled by individuals promoted from the ranks of the CLU faculty, i.e., the Provost and the Dean of Arts and Sciences. Normal “term limits” and election policies also resulted in leadership changes in both the governing board and faculty governance system.

Prior to these changes, there was little in the way of institutional planning in place at CLU. The necessity for planning became obvious at this critical juncture, as did the need to integrate the new leadership into the ongoing CLU community of faculty, administration and staff. The leaders saw an opportunity not only to develop short- and long-term plans and planning processes for the institution, but also to involve all of the institution’s major constituencies in the overall strategic planning process.

In 1995-96, the CLU Board of Regents approved an extensive 5-year strategic planning process designed by the new leadership to effect improvements in the areas of enrollment, financial stability, and academic reputation. The overarching institutional goal of this plan (CLU 2001) was to enhance CLU’s academic quality and reputation. Focus areas included strengthening enrollment, increasing financial resources, hiring high quality faculty, and upgrading facilities. The resulting progress in these areas became obvious near the end of the planning period as the institution achieved significant enrollment growth, improvements in academic quality, an increased emphasis on character-building in the CLU community, upgrades in facilities, increased resources, more (and more desirable) outside recognition, and an improved CLU image.

In 1995-96, the CLU Board of Regents approved an extensive 5-year strategic planning process designed by the new leadership to effect improvements in the areas of enrollment, financial stability, and academic reputation. The overarching institutional goal of this plan (CLU 2001) was to enhance CLU’s academic quality and reputation. Focus areas included strengthening enrollment, increasing financial resources, hiring high quality faculty, and upgrading facilities. The resulting progress in these areas became obvious near the end of the planning period as the institution achieved significant enrollment growth, improvements in academic quality, an increased emphasis on character-building in the CLU community, upgrades in facilities, increased resources, more (and more desirable) outside recognition, and an improved CLU image.

A second planning cycle (the Strategic Plan for CLU 2001-2004), reaffirmed many of the environmental and institutional conditions cited in the CLU 2001 document as well as the longer-term institutional strategy of continuing to build quality and reputation. The new plan, however, went much farther than the earlier planning document in defining specific areas of action: identifying three critical success factors; setting forth seven areas of strategic goals; defining 30 strategic initiatives; and itemizing a large number of supplemental goals and activities.

The University now had a fairly detailed “roadmap” of initiatives and objectives deemed important to achieving the overall goals of enhanced quality and reputation. The articulation of so many areas of activity
was intended to have the advantage of bringing all University personnel into consensus with and participation in the vision underlying the plan. Its disadvantage, though, was that priorities sometimes became muddled, since such a detailed plan made it difficult for some to distinguish between things that were critically important to building quality and reputation and things that might be “nice to do,” but were not truly strategic.

It also became clear that the overall strategic plan needed to be supported by detailed operational plans in the key areas and that there was a need for greater integration of these supporting plans (e.g., academic planning and budget planning). As a result, detailed implementation plans were created: a plan for a capital campaign, an academic plan, and a business plan. Work also commenced on detailed plans for support areas such as undergraduate marketing, graduate and professional programs marketing, and information technology. In addition, attention has been given to the design of the planning, approval, and evaluation processes within the University. In some areas, organizational structure and processes have been revised to achieve better implementation and results.

Through all of this, CLU has moved much closer to having an authentic “planning culture” and more systematic processes for on-going evaluation and assessment. Much progress has been made and substantial tangible results have been achieved. We also, however, realize that there is still considerable work to be done—both in reaching the University’s stated goals for quality and reputation and in the planning, implementation and operational systems by which these achievements are to be realized.

Our third and current central planning document, The Bridge Plan 2004-2006, is intended to guide us in bringing to closure many of the initiatives and objectives of the past decade, and to position CLU to move ahead into another significant period of strategic planning, operations, and results. This “third wave” of strategic planning will create a coordinated university-wide process for planning, and subsequently, assessment and change. The Bridge Plan mandates a fuller integration between overall institutional planning and budget planning and the use of specific strategic indicators, or metrics, by which to assess progress.

Implementation of the Bridge Plan and the area-specific planning documents that flow from it should bring the University fully into compliance with the WASC model for an institution that conducts, “…sustained, evidence based, and participatory discussions about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives” (WASC Standard Four). We look forward to a much more focused action agenda, facilitated by a fuller integration of the University’s strategic, academic and business plans and by having the business plan and the budget on which it is based more fully informed by the institution’s strategic and academic goals.

The Bridge Plan, 2004-2006, approved at the October 2004 meeting of the Board of Regents, is now in its initial implementation stage. The planning time began during the summer of 2004 and will culminate with the next plan’s adoption in February 2006.

A major emphasis for this planning process is more assessment and analysis of the results than in previous plans. Currently, the institution is involved in the most extensive and inclusive SWOT analysis yet conducted. (See CLU’s website on Strategic Planning for more detail.) The Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC) is comprised of senior administrators and two research and assessment officers to ensure that a measurable plan is created and that its successes or failures can be objectively determined.

One goal of the Bridge Plan is to put CLU’s strategic indicators into place. Once developed, these indicators will be completed on at least an annual basis and benchmarked to competitive institutions. One of the steps in the Strategic Planning process is to conduct feasibility plans which will analyze each proposed goal—to determine its cost, its return, and its relative value vis-à-vis other proposed goals. This is the key linkage to the budget building process.

Another component of the Bridge Plan is the creation and adoption of the next plan: CLU – 2006-2014. Senior staff have determined that this plan will likely be broken into two phases of four years each, with the first four years much more specific than the second four years.
CLU AS A PLANNING, LEARNING, AND ACHIEVING ORGANIZATION

Quality Assurance (CFR 4.4)

**Academic Planning** The University’s broad academic goals and aspirations are articulated in mission and vision statements. Academic planning, a widely inclusive process at CLU, is coordinated by the Provost, the University’s chief academic officer. The Academic Plan is developed in support of the Strategic Plan, and does the following: articulates the role of the University’s academic sector in achieving the targeted overall institutional results; states CLU’s current educational objectives; identifies marks of institutional quality; and sets forth specific academic objectives both for the institution as a whole and for individual academic units and programs within the University.

Specific planning and assessment processes exist for new program development, the review of existing programs, and the formulation of the ongoing academic plans for the institution.

**New Program Planning** Procedures for new program planning and approval take place under the Major Program Change Review Process. New program proposals, generated at the department, program, or school level, are sent to the Provost. The Provost reviews the proposals with the Academic Council and with the President’s Cabinet. Proposals consistent with university goals are then reviewed by the appropriate faculty committee (EPPC for undergraduate proposals, GPEC for graduate proposals). The committees assess the academic merits of the proposals, and then the University Budget Committee assesses their financial viability. Final academic approval is obtained through a vote of the full University faculty. Proposals successful to this point are also examined by the Academic Affairs Committee of the University’s Board of Regents and require approval of the full Board.

**Program Review** Existing academic programs are reviewed on an on-going basis. Faculty prepare a description of their programs and compile appropriate documentation. (A full description of the Program Review process is described in Essay Two.)

**Curriculum Revision** The faculty assume ownership and responsibility for the curriculum at CLU. To offer a new course, a faculty member must submit a proposal to the Educational Policies and Planning Committee for an undergraduate course or to the Graduate and Professional Education Committee for a graduate course. If approved, the proposal must then obtain approval from the full faculty.

**Assessment** Over the last six years, CLU has been developing a strong culture of evidence. The Institutional Research Officer and the Assistant Provost for Assessment planned, selected, and developed assessment instruments to measure capacity, curriculum fidelity, and student learning. Data are analyzed, updated and communicated in writing and/or orally to the administration, appropriate faculty committees, academic support programs, academic departments, and to the faculty as a whole.

CLU’s goal is to use the process of assessment to become a learning and learner-centered institution. The assessment plan will develop a web of information from a variety of sources. This information will inform planning and current practices related to the academic mission of the university. To achieve the University’s learning and learner-centered goals, we collect data in response to the following questions:

1. Does CLU provide resources and engage in practices that support student attainment of our educational objectives?

2. Do CLU students acquire the skills and knowledge embodied in our educational objectives?

3. How well do our academic majors/programs prepare students in their respective disciplines? How do they contribute to students achieving additional student outcomes?
4. How well do individuals majors/programs support and enhance academic quality at CLU?

The assessment system is focused on the CLU Student Learning Outcomes developed through faculty consensus over the last three years. The outcomes reflect concern for students’ development in the areas of a liberal learning background, professional preparation, and character and leadership development. The system is flexible in that it allows for a general assessment system as well as more focused systems for Arts and Sciences and the Schools of Business and Education. In addition, the system includes procedures for analyzing the University’s curriculum through program reviews and course evaluations.

Data collection is focused on a variety of indicators including commercially available instruments, student work, and general institutional data. Data sources were chosen for their competence in assessing institutional effectiveness. Criteria for selection included: clear linkages to program content and skills; capabilities for tracking over time; and appropriateness for feedback to programs, faculty, and administration.

The system is coordinated by the Assistant Provost for Assessment and the University Assessment Committee. In addition, the Assistant Provost works closely with the Provost, Associate Provost for Accreditation, Institutional Research Officer, Deans, and the faculty (directly and through faculty committees).

Commitment to Learning and Improvement

**Institutional Research (CFR 4.5)** The institutional research function for the University is formally vested in the Provost’s office. Beginning in 2001, the Institutional Research Officer produces an annual compendium of academically related data titled the CLU Fact Book. The book, now in electronic form, is widely disseminated across the institution. It includes data related to admissions, financial aid, enrollment trends and student profiles, majors and degrees, faculty data, comparative institutional data, and more.

**Commitment to Improvement (CFR 4.6)** Leaders at all levels are encouraged to use evaluation and assessment tools to improve institutional effectiveness. The institution has begun using nationally recognized surveys to track student satisfaction and administrative and academic performance, including National Study of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (Noel-Levitz). The NSSE and Noel-Levitz surveys have now been conducted for several years. The results of these surveys have been used to identify and to address co-curricular issues and administrative support functions that need attention. Other surveys are periodically conducted, i.e., alumni and employer surveys and the image and reputation survey. These surveys are used to determine the effectiveness of the institution in particular areas of interest.

In an effort to improve evaluation and assessment, two additional positions were created to assist the institution in capturing, storing, and analyzing data in order to improve operations and allocate resources when corrective action needs to be taken. The first was the appointment of an Institutional Researcher who reports to and is located in the Provost’s Office. Among other duties, the Institutional Research Officer now regularly updates the CLU Fact Book begun in 1998-99. The second position is that of the Assistant Provost for Assessment. This person is responsible for developing, monitoring, and reporting on the results of the University’s assessment system and activities. In addition, the Assistant Provost works closely with the Associate Provost for Accreditation, Institutional Researcher, and the Registrar in examining and addressing assessment and accreditation issues and needs at CLU.

In some cases, the institution has determined that it does not have sufficient expertise and has engaged consultants to collect and analyze data to improve operations, e.g., Hardwick Day, a consulting firm which helps establish enrollment and financial aid policies; Gonser, Gerber, Tinker, which helps the institution improve its fundraising functions; and Stamats which is involved in our current branding initiative.

The results of assessment activities have also been incorporated into academic planning. For example, the NSSE results from 2001 and 2002 revealed lower levels of challenge and engagement than the University desired, so the two topics became themes for faculty retreats, faculty development activities, and this WASC
review. In addition, results from alumni surveys, the NCATE and other accreditation reviews, and the current study of the Freshmen experience all produce data that informs our efforts to offer quality programs and activities to our students.

**Inquiry into Teaching and Learning (CFR 4.7)** Faculty are actively involved in the process of inquiry into teaching effectiveness in several ways:

- The University regularly asks all students to complete end-of-course evaluations each semester. These are returned to faculty so that they might use the feedback for improvement.

- Faculty teaching effectiveness is also explored in periodic reviews for promotion and tenure. These reviews, conducted by the Appointment, Rank and Tenure Committee, include the completion of a teaching portfolio, course evaluations, and faculty peer-completed classroom observations and reviews of teaching materials.

- Faculty collect and use data to explore teaching effectiveness through department level assessment plans and use of challenge and engagement data from the NSSE and BSSE surveys that are regularly administered to undergraduate students.

- Faculty are involved in the development and implementation of assessment plans in all academic programs, both undergraduate and graduate. Also, faculty serve on the University Assessment Committee which examines assessment needs and issues and creates assessment policy.

- Faculty also address teaching effectiveness through several venues. Faculty participate in workshops conducted at the beginning and end of the fall and spring semesters, as well as in workshops, presentations, and discussions offered throughout the academic year by the Teaching and Learning Center. Topics for workshops are chosen based on faculty needs and information collected through assessments and surveys.

Data collected through assessments and surveys that demonstrate teaching effectiveness will be presented in more detail in the Educational Effectiveness review.

**Involving Other Stakeholders (CFR 4.8)** The institution uses various stakeholders to obtain feedback and advice. The Alumni Association, advisory councils for both the School of Business and the School of Education, and the President’s Advisor Council each perform this role for curricular issues in their respective areas. The Alumni Association is particularly concerned with the undergraduate experience and the President’s Advisory Council provides advice to the President on general management issues as well as on curricular issues. The School of Business Board of Counselors and the School of Education Advisory Committee both provide feedback and advice to these programs on new opportunities, program relevance, and changes in these professional communities in job markets and professional requirements.

**CONCLUSION**

The Capacity and Preparatory Review process has provided an opportunity for CLU to reflect on our capacity to provide a quality educational experience for our students. In these essays, we have demonstrated our capacity related to resources, structures, and processes. Since the last WASC review we have made considerable progress in all areas; however, there is still work to be done. We continue to be challenged in the area of fiscal resources, including the need to increase salaries, faculty development funds, library resources, and academic program budgets. We need to expand our science and library facilities, and we need to build an arts center, a student center, and a social science building. We also need to fully implement our assessment plan and new program review processes.

To continue our efforts of assessing educational effectiveness, we have established an assessment schedule designed to: assess each of our 14 student learning outcomes; complete a Program Review in all academic
areas; and implement the newly developed assessment plans for all academic programs and areas of student services. Our Educational Effectiveness Review will address our progress in these assessments as well as focus specifically on our themes of challenge, engagement, and diversity.