The issues that are raised in the WASC Commission Action Letter (dated June 30, 2005) are addressed within the California Lutheran University (CLU) Educational Effectiveness (EE) Report. The purpose of this response is to address each issue raised in the Commission letter and to indicate where further information can be found in the EE Report.

The following are brief responses to each specific recommendation made within the Commission Action Letter.

**Strategic Planning**

“The University is encouraged to move forward with the goal to develop, benchmark, and monitor key indicators.”

This is addressed in the CLU EE Report, on page 6, with a link to additional information on the CLU website. A list of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) related to the new Strategic Plan was established in the Fall of 2005 and was presented to the Board of Regents in February of 2006. A task group from the Strategic Planning Steering Committee was developed to focus on the KPIs, and met from April through August. This group reviewed the KPI definitions in the context of peer and aspirant university groups, aligned Strategic Goals with actions and measurements, and then further defined the relationship of institutional KPIs to divisions. In addition, professional readings and resources were reviewed regarding implementation issues and KPI electronic systems from other institutions were examined.

Our new Provost started in June, and has been working with the faculty to develop a list of comparative institutions that we will use to benchmark and monitor our key indicators through the next Strategic Plan. A list of possible comparative institutions was shared at the August 2006 faculty retreat, and has been discussed at two faculty meetings. Comparative benchmark data is being compiled on these institutions and we hope to have the list finalized within the next few months.

Our new President is reviewing the draft of the Strategic Plan and will be working with the Board of Regents to finalize the plan for implementation in the Fall of 2007. We will be prepared to monitor the key indicators through the five years of this Strategic Plan.

“The Commission is concerned, however, that the overall discount rate at the institution is at an all-time high.”

This is addressed in the CLU EE Report, in Appendix A (pp. 53-54). The necessity to reduce the institutional discount rate is well understood by the institution and is a goal of the emerging new Strategic Plan. The goal is to reduce the overall traditional undergraduate discount rate from its current 41.1% to 35% by 2012. The freshman discount rate has declined for two consecutive years and this will begin to positively impact the overall undergraduate discount rate next year. The goal to reduce the discount rate is believed to be achievable as the institution is at, or near full-capacity, and marginal revenues are not available to the institution through attracting additional students.
**Diversity**

“Efforts should continue to monitor and improve graduate rates of all students, especially those of color.”

This is addressed in the CLU EE Report on pages 7-8, where we describe a Retention Study which looked at a number of student subgroups, including underrepresented students. As a result of this study, we have implemented a new Academic Assistance Program, with positive initial results. We are continuing to expand our data collection and analysis of retention and graduation rates.

“It will be important for the University to continue its focus on diversity, with particular attention on how it will sustain these positive diversity initiatives after the Irvine grant concludes, and to address the need for greater faculty diversity.”

This is addressed in the CLU EE Report on pages 38-39 and 46. CLU’s new President and Provost have initiated plans to ensure that our current diversity initiatives are worked into the fabric and budget of the institution. Dr. Juanita Hall has been appointed as the coordinator of the Campus Diversity Initiatives. She will work under the supervision of the Provost to lead the newly developed President’s Diversity Council (PDC). The newly approved Center for Equality and Social Justice will provide the structure for CLU to continue to expand and deepen the treatment of domestic and global diversity in the curriculum. The CLU budget committee has been charged by the President to ensure that diversity initiatives receive operational funding.

Progress has been made in addressing the need for greater faculty diversity. Since 2002, CLU has increased the number of Latino, African-American and Asian-American full-time faculty by 29% (from 14% in 2002 to 18% in 2006). Eighteen percent of our current faculty are from diverse racial and ethnic groups, representing the most diverse group of faculty in the institution’s history. Thirty-three percent of the 27 full-time faculty hired in the fall of 2005 (the largest new faculty group since our founding year) came from diverse groups.

**Graduate Programs**

“The Commission is concerned, however, about the heavy reliance on part-time faculty…a faculty recruitment and hiring plan needs to be developed that acknowledges the need to provide an adequate core of full-time faculty with competitive salaries and support for their development, particularly in the area of scholarly and creative activity.”

Our new Strategic Plan calls for competitive faculty salaries, and an increase in the graduate program full-time to part-time ratio to be 60:40 by the year 2012. Currently, our average ratio is 40:60 in our graduate programs. We have not yet established a specific plan to carry out these goals. Once we receive approval for the strategic plan, we will move toward developing strategies to reach annual goals. In the meantime, one example of our current efforts to increase the number of full time faculty is in the graduate programs in psychology. Prior to last year, we had one full-time faculty member for two graduate programs with over 100 students enrolled. We changed a part-time administrative position to a full-time faculty position and hired a new faculty member in the fall of 2006 to oversee the clinical training of our MFT students. We are currently searching for a third full-time faculty member to teach in the graduate psychology programs beginning in fall 2007.

One change to our budget since the CPR review is the addition of $1000 for each faculty member to support scholarly and creative activity. We also have stipends now available to encourage faculty to conduct summer research that includes students.
“The University also needs to assure attention to identification of learning outcomes and assessment at the graduate level, and provide part-time faculty with opportunities to participate in the learning-centered and assessment initiatives underway.”

We held a number of meetings with part-time faculty in the past year to discuss the student learning outcomes with them. Two meetings were held with part-time faculty in the School of Education, as well as meetings with the School of Business, Graduate Psychology, and MPPA (Masters in Public Policy and Administration) part-time faculty. We also recently held a workshop with 23 Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP) part-time faculty and discussed our student learning outcomes as well as the School of Business assessment plan. We realize that we will need to make this an on-going effort to involve part-time faculty in our assessment initiatives, and we address this in the CLU EE Report on page 47.

Full-time faculty who serve as Directors of Graduate Programs who are coordinating their department’s Program Review are involving adjunct faculty in the review of curriculum, identification and achievement of learning outcomes. The Program Review schedule identifies all graduate and ADEP reviews to be completed by 2010.

Assessment of Student Learning and Program Review

“Performance indicators are needed in all programs to assure that students are meeting desired learning outcomes.”

The Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (“Data Element 7.1”) can be found in Appendix B in the CLU EE Report, on page 56. Nearly all programs have developed performance indicators. We have also worked with faculty in divisional and school workshops on an “Assessment for Learning” exercise, focusing on assessment at the course level. Faculty were encouraged to continue shifting from assessment of learning to assessment for learning by keeping a record of how they are aggregating data as evidence of student learning, and how the faculty are learning from the data and putting that learning into action. A description of this process is in the CLU EE Report, on page 17.

“…it is critical that the institution move beyond the use of student survey data to an actual review of student work in academic programs to determine if it is at an appropriate level and that actions are taken to improve learning.”

Our efforts to analyze Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking through scoring student papers is an example of how we are reviewing student work to determine whether students are achieving these learning outcomes. This process is described on pages 9-10 of the CLU EE Report. The “Assessment for Learning” workshops described in the paragraph above were also an effort to get faculty to aggregate their assessment of student work to demonstrate whether students are achieving the desired outcomes. Our School of Business has an assessment system in place and is using rubrics to review student work to determine whether they are achieving their stated student learning outcomes. A summary of their system can be found on page 13 of the CLU EE Report.

“To ensure that assessment and program reviews are taken seriously at the University, the results of the processes need to be integrated into the academic planning and budget process.”

Since the Capacity and Preparatory Review, we have increased our budget to fund a $1000 stipend to department chairs upon the completion of their Program Review, and a stipend and travel expenses for
external reviewers. The annual Assessment Symposium, which began in May of 2006, is an example of how we are taking assessment more seriously, reporting on it openly, and encouraging the use of evidence in our planning processes. A description of the Assessment Symposium can be found on page 18 of the CLU EE Report.

Preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review

“Although the faculty has identified University learning goals and key indicators, the plan to assess them systematically and across the institution will need to be implemented…the campus will need more time to demonstrate a sustained commitment to assessment and evaluate assessment results for improvement of learning.”

This is an on-going process that will take time for us to fully implement institution-wide. Some of our programs and departments are collecting and analyzing data related to student learning, while other departments have a plan in place, but have not yet analyzed data. And, still other departments are not yet on board. The plan to assess systematically is challenged by the large number of new faculty hired within the last two years. The Program Review process is helping us address the assessment plans in more depth as we work closely with 6-8 programs each year. More information on our Program Reviews can be found on pages 13-16 of the CLU EE Report.