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California Lutheran University formed a WASC Steering Committee in 2002 to initiate its three-stage WASC re-accreditation process. The Committee is made up of six task groups: 1) Assessment; 2) Faculty Development; 3) Program Review; 4) Co-Curricular Programs; 5) Diversity; and 6) Educational Effectiveness. Integrating campus-wide input, the Steering Committee targeted two main themes for CLU’s 2003-2006 WASC Review:

1. Raising expectations, challenge, and engagement levels in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs; and,

2. Enhancing engagement with diversity—in the classroom and in the campus community as a whole.

We have completed the first two stages of the re-accreditation process: WASC approved our Proposal in 2003 and our Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2005. Our Steering Committee is now guiding us through the third stage of the re-accreditation process--the Educational Effectiveness Review.

New Data Relative to the Capacity and Preparatory Review Approved in 2005

Our 2004-5 Capacity and Preparatory Review described a previous decade of significant growth and achievement at CLU. Progress has continued over the past year and a half, as is evidenced by the following:

- In May 2005, CLU’s $80 million Now is the Time capital campaign goal was met and exceeded by $13 million, bringing in a total of $93 million for new buildings, endowed professorships, academic programs, and scholarships.

- In August 2005, Jack Gilbert, chairman of the board of TOLD Corp., and his wife, Carol, pledged $5 million, the largest gift in the history of the University. Gilbert, one of Ventura County’s most successful businessmen, previously gave more than $4 million during the recent Now is the Time capital campaign.

- Two new endowed chairs were established and filled in the fall of 2005: the Uyeno-Tseng Professor of International Studies, and the Nena Amundson Professor of Biomechanics.

- CLU added 27 new faculty members in fall of 2005 (its largest and most diverse group ever), and 17 additional new faculty in the fall of 2006 (the number of full-time CLU faculty has increased 13% since 2002—from 119 to 134 in 2006).

- Successful Provost and Presidential searches were completed during the 2005-06 academic year.

- In January, 2006, CLU opened an expanded off-campus Center in Oxnard that replaced our Ventura site; the new facility has state-of-the-art technology and 55% more space than in our Ventura facility.

- In 2006, CLU enrolled 3,298 students, the largest number in its history: 1,843 traditional undergraduates, 281 Adult Degree Evening Program students, and 1,174 graduate students—an increase of 108 total students from the previous year.

- As part of our Branding Initiative, we have worked with a consultant and completed market research, audits, an evaluation of campus atmospherics, and developed a brand graphic identity, brand portfolio, and brand promise.
• The University has significantly enhanced its campus atmosphere with projects including the creation of a Welcome Center, renovations to the Luther Statue, creation of the Falde Plaza, a new Nelson Room entry terrace, an updated courtyard at the Peters Hall School of Business, new entrance plaza to the administration building, renovated footbridge to the Gilbert Sports and Fitness Center, and additional campus signage.

The clearest evidence of CLU’s recent growth can be seen in three new physical facilities:

• Grace Hall, a beautifully designed and landscaped 180-bed residence hall, opened in August, 2005.

• A 4,130-square-foot Counseling Center completed in 2006 houses both Student Counseling Services and CLU’s Community Counseling Services; the latter provides counseling field experience for CLU’s Psychology graduate students.

• The 97,000 square foot Gilbert Sports and Fitness Center opened in 2006 includes a 1,500-seat main gymnasium, the Soiland Recreation Center, the Lundring Events Center, classrooms and labs, the Forrest fitness center, dance and aerobics studio, sports medicine facility, offices for faculty and coaches, and showcases for the University and the Ventura County Sports Hall of Fame. The George “Sparky” Anderson Baseball Field was also completed in 2006 and construction is currently underway on the Ullman Baseball Stadium. The Samuelson Aquatics Center is scheduled to be completed in early 2007.

Time of Transition Reveals Underlying Stability of the University

The considerable achievements listed above seem especially impressive given that the last four years have been marked by significant administrative transitions at CLU. If we include “Interim” and “Acting” positions, CLU has (since 2002) had three Presidents, three Provosts, four Deans in the School of Education, two Deans in the College of Arts & Sciences (with a current search underway), two Deans of Undergraduate Admissions, and three Directors of Assessment.

A dedicated core faculty and a previously consistent senior leadership (a President serving 14 years and a Provost serving 12) helped provide the stable base that carried us through this period of change. We have been able to continue developing a culture of evidence, focusing on educational effectiveness, and enhancing many areas of the institution.

The Educational Effectiveness Review

The writing of this Educational Effectiveness document has been a collaborative effort with twenty-five people who contributed to the content. The early drafts of this document were given to the Provost, Deans, President, Vice Presidents, the WASC Steering Committee and the Assessment Committee. A revised draft was then presented to all faculty for review and feedback. We also posted the draft on the CLU portal for review by all staff, students, and members of the Board of Regents.

In preparing this Educational Effectiveness Report, we have kept in mind comments that the WASC Visiting Team made in their Capacity and Preparatory Report (2005). Appendix A includes our responses to the nine recommendations the visiting team made in that report. Appendix B includes the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (“Data Element 7.1”) which was requested at the last visit.
The WASC Handbook defines a “culture of evidence” as an effective internal system of data collection and analysis. This Review specifies how CLU’s design and approach is promoting and reinforcing a culture of evidence to enhance educational effectiveness at all levels of the organization:

- Chapter One, *Developing a Culture of Evidence*, describes how CLU’s Assessment System structures data collection and gathers evidence of educational effectiveness at the institution, college/school, program/department, and course levels for optimal use in self-reflection, decision making, planning, and improvement.

- Chapter Two, *Increasing Challenge and Engagement*, focuses on how we have collected, analyzed, and applied data relative to our first theme—raising the level of challenge and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs.

- Chapter Three, *Enhancing Diversity*, shows how we have collected, analyzed, and applied data relative to our second theme—enhancing engagement with diversity in the campus community and in the classroom.

We also include various strategies we have used to address our themes and assess their impact, and we identify implemented changes, and share our plans for future growth.

We conclude with final comments of our Educational Effectiveness Report, highlighting five key messages that have emerged and have permeated this report. Our reflections synthesize our findings, describe the impact, acknowledge the challenges to be addressed, and identify the recommendations and next steps for future growth.
Chapter 1: Developing a Culture of Evidence

Chapter 1 describes how California Lutheran University’s Assessment System structures data collection and gathers evidence of Educational Effectiveness at the institution, college/school, program/department, and course levels for optimal use in self-reflection, decision making, planning, and improvement.

Responding to CLU’s Capacity and Preparatory Review, the WASC Visiting Team noted in its 2005 Report that while we had “many activities under way to advance the University’s assessment of learning, [t]he full extent of these activities was not evident in the materials provided to the team prior to the visit. The team also discovered gaps in institutional knowledge about assessment activities” (Report of the WASC Visiting Team, 2005, p. 34). The WASC team’s response and the entire Capacity and Preparatory Review process made it clear that we needed to become “more systematic and intentional…[in]…gathering data about…performance and effectiveness,… using the resulting information to continuously improve” (Western Association of Schools and Colleges, 2002, p. 5), and about communicating assessment activity information to the campus community.

CLU’s Assessment System

In an effort to become “more systematic and intentional,” we developed an Assessment System (see Figure 1). The system helps us to illustrate “a clearer overview of assessments conducted, key findings, and uses made of these findings” and to “more effective[ly]…communicate” this information (Report of the WASC Visiting Team, 2005, p. 34).

An important added benefit of the Assessment System development process has been that the WASC Steering Committee and faculty from CLU’s two Schools and four College Divisions now have a broader perspective of assessment at CLU and a better understanding of how the evidence they gather in courses, departments, and programs fits in with CLU’s overarching Assessment System.

Figure 1. Diagram of CLU’s Assessment System
Figure 1 shows: 1) how we structure data collection and gather direct and indirect evidence of educational effectiveness at various levels of the University; 2) how communication and reflection occur through new and improved methods and events; 3) how this reflection leads to decision making and planning; and 4) how this action returns the cycle to begin the system again.

The Assessment System is an ongoing process in harmony with CLU’s Mission and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Each of the 14 institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes have intentionally been tied to the Mission Statement, as noted below:

*The mission of California Lutheran University is…*

*to educate*
- Field-specific knowledge and experience
- Critical thinking
- Information literacy
- Written communication
- Oral communication
- Disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives

*leaders*
- Interpersonal and teamwork skills
- Principled leadership

*for a global society*
- Cultural competency
- Appreciation of diversity

*who are strong in character and judgment*
- Ethical and professional judgment
- Integrate knowledge with ethical reflection

*confident in their identity and vocation*
- Identity and values

*and committed to service and justice.*
- Service to the community

**Creating a Culture of Evidence at All Institutional Levels**

In Chapter 1, we describe CLU’s efforts to develop a “culture of evidence”—defined in WASC’s Handbook of Accreditation (2001) as a culture “where indicators of performance are regularly developed and data collected to inform decision-making, planning, and improvement” (p. 8). In the following sections, we identify institution, college/school, department/program, and course level evidence and show how this evidence supports our 14 institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes and our WASC themes of challenge, engagement, and diversity.

**Evidence of Educational Effectiveness at the Institution Level**

Assessment at the Institution level refers to evidence and processes that cross the CLU Schools/College boundaries. Our efforts to develop a culture of evidence at the institution level include: 1) the work of our recently formed Assessment Committee; 2) the creation of an Assessment Website, including “Survey Central”; 3) the emphasis on Key Performance Indicators in the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan; 4) our new Continuous Improvement Process; and, 5) methods of assessing our 14 SLOs across the institution.

**Assessment Committee**

Assessment Committee members represent major academic, service, and business units of the campus. They work in areas related to academic programs, strategic planning, accreditation, institutional research, and programmatic evaluation. Meeting monthly, the committee collaborates to support a culture of evidence at
CLU, maintains an Assessment Website and Data Reporting Template, and plans the annual Assessment Symposium.

The Committee’s array of topics and projects (see meeting minutes) demonstrates the key role it plays in developing University assessment.

- Members reviewed survey data (including the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE) and Beginning College Student Survey (BCSS)) and chose data for use in Diversity, Challenge, and Engagement initiatives.

- Faculty members on the committee planned and presented two sessions at Faculty Meetings and at the 2006 WASC conference.

- Committee members provided consultation for the Course Evaluation Survey, Educause IT Survey, Strategic Planning Key Performance Indicators, Grade Distribution report, Program Reviews, and assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.

Assessment Website and “Survey Central”

The Assessment Website is located on the CLU homepage within the Academic Tab. The Website contributes to the culture of evidence as it houses program improvement plans, strategies to assess student learning outcomes, and the products of collaborative efforts with faculty and staff to develop effective research designs.

CLU is interested in raising the quality of its Survey Research at all institutional levels by: designing questions that are clear and which result in valid data; and coordinating research studies to avoid over-surveying of the same population and to avoid duplication of asking for the same type of data. (For example, issues with unsolicited e-mail and the frequency of surveys soliciting students, faculty, administrators, staff, and alumni participants affect the number of responses received which may then affect the reliability and statistical validity of the study.)

“Survey Central,” a segment of the Assessment Website, provides the following:

- Assistance to CLU faculty, administrators, and staff in implementing the different components in the survey process (e.g. design and administration of surveys);

- A Survey Inventory;

- Other survey and research resources.

Strategic Planning and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

The Strategic Planning process has benefited from the cycle illustrated in the CLU Assessment System. For example, in Spring 2006 the strategic goals were aligned to the University’s Key Performance Indicators, a critical change that has made our search for evidence more efficient.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) are measures that provide evidence about how we are meeting strategic goals. The KPIs facilitate the flow in the Assessment System: data are collected and reviewed at various administrative levels as indicators of progress for the purposes of decision making, planning, and improvement. The Strategic Planning process is currently under review with our new leadership team. The Key Performance Indicators will allow a culture of evidence to permeate through the ongoing strategic planning process.
Continuous Improvement Process (CIP)

The Continuous Improvement Process idea was initiated at a May 2005 retreat for CLU administrators, where they called for a more efficient procedure for sharing systems and processes information among University staff and administration. At the August 2005 “Continuing the Conversation” Retreat, a formal Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) at CLU was begun.

The Assessment Committee now facilitates an annual call for study topics from staff and administration, with 2-3 topics selected annually. A CIP team, formed with cross-functional representation, provides feedback to staff and administration, including a description of the current process, baseline data, and recommended strategies to enhance the process/system producing results that are quantifiable.

Three CIP studies have been completed: 1) **Traditional Undergraduate Retention Study**, 2) **Faculty and Lecturer Load Study and Course Schedule Development**, and 3) **Study Abroad Continuous Improvement Project**. The first of these studies relates most closely to Educational Effectiveness, and is described below as an example of a CIP study.

**The Traditional Undergraduate Retention Study** was completed as a cross-functional analysis of the retention status of entering first-time freshmen (FTF). The study was conducted by the following: the department of Planning and Budgets, the Center for Academic & Accessibility Resources, the Office of Institutional Research, and the Registrar’s Office. This study reviewed FTF by entering Fall 1999 through Fall 2004 cohorts. It identified the status of retention as well as best practices and programs aimed at improving retention and graduation rates.

This Continuous Improvement project is an example of the successful use of evidence to identify students in need of educational assistance, to recognize successful efforts on campus, and to use the evidence to implement changes.

Data were extracted from the fall census snapshots for each year of the study period (Fall 1999 through Fall 2004). Students were then grouped by six categories to provide a comprehensive view of retention at CLU:

- **First Time Freshmen (FTF):** All first time freshmen including underrepresented and SSS (Student Support Services) students
- **Underrepresented:** Students identified as Asian/Pacific Islander, African-American, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native American
- **Student Support Services (SSS):** Students participating in a federally funded program that services low income, first generation students and individuals with disabilities
- **SSS Eligible but Not Serviced:** Students eligible for SSS but not receiving services because federal funding limits to 200 students
- **Conditional Admit:** Students who do not meet SAT and/or GPA Requirement. Admission must be approved by Enrollment Committee. Students limited to 13 credits of academic courses. (Classification introduced in Fall 02)
- **Qualifying Spring Freshmen:** Student subset of Conditional Admits. Least academically prepared of the Conditional Admits (lowest SAT scores and GPA). Students must attend LRN (Learning Resources) classes

**Undergraduate Retention Study Results** Nationwide retention studies indicate that students most likely to have higher attrition rates are underrepresented, first generation, and academically under prepared. The study
group found this to be generally true at CLU. Overall, attrition as a four year average of FTF was 20.2% in the second year, 30.3% in the third year and 34.6% entering the fourth year. Attrition rates for all other categories listed previously were significantly higher in all years with the exception of those students in SSS. The average second year attrition rate in SSS was 16.7%. Third year attrition was 26.3% and remained the same entering the fourth year.

While CLU’s six year graduation rate is very respectable at 65.2%, the study group found that looking at a four year average, 3% of seniors who start the fourth year do not complete a bachelor’s degree in six years. Eighteen percent of underrepresented seniors retained to the fourth year do not graduate by the end of six years. SSS students did not attrit in the senior year. All SSS students who were retained to the third year graduated in six years or less.

Strategies Emerging from the Undergraduate Retention Study The data collected in this study was presented at the Assessment Symposium and to CLU’s Budget Committee, the Assessment Committee, and the Deans’ Council. The study was also presented by CLU’s Institutional Research Officer, Associate Provost/Registrar, and Senior Director of Academic Support Programs at the Fall 2006 National Symposium on Student Retention, sponsored by the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange, where it received recognition as one of the top five presentations of best practices.

The impact of the Continuous Improvement process resulted in the implementation of a new Academic Assistance Program (AAP) geared toward conditionally admitted students and students on probation. The AAP is administered by the Center for Academic and Accessibility Resources (CAAR) and is based on the student success plans used by SSS. The student signs a contract requiring weekly meetings with an academic counselor, mandatory study hours, attendance at workshops, increased communication with faculty, and tutor appointments.

Additional staffing was required for the CAAR office in order to properly run the program, and was funded through a mandatory advising fee assessed to all involved students. Initial results show a 6% increase in overall freshmen retention and a 10.4% increase in retention of conditionally admitted students.

Future Goals for the Retention Study include a longitudinal study using quantitative and qualitative data. In addition, the CAAR office intends to expand the AAP beyond the categories of students currently being served. The Institutional Research Officer and the Registrar will continue to monitor third year retention and six year retention rates. Finally, the study group will continue to gather information regarding those seniors who are retained to the fourth year but do not complete a degree by the end of six years, the intention being to develop an intervention that will positively affect this group of students.

Methods of Assessing Our 14 Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) across the Institution

Faculty began developing CLU’s institution-wide SLOs in 2000. During our 2003 two-day faculty retreat, Dr. Mary Allen helped us to define each outcome more exactly and also to determine where the outcomes would be embedded in the curriculum and co-curriculum. By the conclusion of the 2003-04 academic year, faculty had reached consensus on the Educational Objectives/Student Learning Outcome document and on definitions for each of the 14 SLOs.

We are now: collecting and analyzing base line data to determine our effectiveness in achieving these outcomes and generating conversations about how we can improve. The following are some of the ways that we are making use of our Student Learning Outcomes throughout the institution:

- **CLU Surveys** are now incorporating questions related to the 14 Student Learning Outcomes, including the Alumni Survey, Exit Survey, Internship/Co-op Employer Evaluation, the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, and the Noel-Levitz Adult Student Services Priority Survey.
• **Our Student Affairs division** has used the Student Learning Outcomes to set annual goals, and they focus on these outcomes when planning co-curricular activities.

• **The Library Information Specialists** use the Student Learning Outcomes in planning and teaching Information Literacy with faculty in a number of courses.

• **All non-academic departments** on campus have been involved in at least one meeting where the Student Learning Outcomes have been discussed.

• **The Fall 2006 freshman seminar instructors** were provided with copies of the SLO document so that they could discuss it in their courses.

• **The Student Learning Outcomes document is posted** on the CLU website and is printed in the general catalog.

• **The Program Review Process** includes an analysis of where Student Learning Outcomes occur throughout the program and how the outcomes are assessed.

• **Changes in CLU’s promotion and tenure guidelines** reflect a greater institutional emphasis on Student Learning Outcomes. The Appointment, Rank and Tenure Committee (ART) review faculty in their second, forth, and sixth years, and every five years after tenure. As part of the review process, faculty evaluate their own teaching by reflecting on and answering specific questions about three of their courses. After beginning our re-accreditation process, we changed one question and one instruction in the teaching evaluation section of the Review as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Wording</th>
<th>New Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: “Do the course objectives stated in the syllabus adequately reflect the teaching/learning goals of the course? If not, explain the objectives more clearly.”</td>
<td>“How do the course objectives stated in the syllabus reflect the educational objectives of the University or your department?” (This shifts the emphasis from a focus solely on the course to an alignment of course objectives with our institutional Student Learning Outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction: “Please appraise your own performance in teaching this course and include a syllabus and any course materials you feel are illustrative/relevant (i.e., handouts, samples of cases/problems used in class activities, exams).”</td>
<td>“Provide relevant material such as course syllabi, exams, assignments, exercises, and student work, which presents an accurate overall portrait of you as a teacher.” (Explicitly requires student products to be included as part of the dossier)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This change is helping us shift the focus of educational effectiveness from a sole emphasis on “teaching effectiveness” to an emphasis on student learning.

In our 2004 Capacity and Preparatory Review, we indicated that we would begin studying our Student Learning Outcomes by focusing on a few each year. In conjunction with the Irvine grant, we have focused extensively on the Student Learning Outcomes *Appreciation of Diversity* and *Cultural Competency*. These are discussed in detail in Chapter 3, which addresses our WASC theme of enhancing diversity.

The following are two examples of ways that we are assessing Student Learning Outcomes at the institutional level:

**Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (“WIC”)** In 2001, we began assessing student achievement levels relative to three of our SLOs: Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking (the Information Literacy SLO was added in 2006). One outcome of this five-year study has
been the creation of a collaboratively developed, non-discipline specific scoring rubric for assessing student writing samples.

From 2001-2003, instructors from English 111, Writing Intensive, and Capstone courses scored papers from their own courses and submitted scores to the Director of Assessment. The instructors used both the Writing Assessment Rubric and the Critical Thinking Rubric to score 704 student papers (382 from English 111 courses; 138 from Writing Intensive courses; and 184 from Capstone courses). The data collected from Spring 2001 to Spring 2003 contributed to a Pilot Study of this process. No data were collected in the Spring of 2004.

The scoring format was revised in 2005. Seventeen volunteer instructors met in May 2005 to score writing sample papers collected from courses offered in the Fall 2004 and Spring 2005 semesters. Dr. Joan Wines from our English department introduced the rubric and the group scored two sample capstone course papers demonstrating strong and weak writing skills. Each paper was initially scored by two people in order to determine inter-rater reliability. After determining that scoring was generally consistent, papers were only intermittently scored by two people. Faculty scored 339 papers: 88 from English 111 courses; 152 from Writing Intensive courses; and 99 from Capstone courses (see data).

A new Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions was used for the May 22, 2006 scoring session—to which all full-time and part-time faculty were invited. This rubric combined elements of the previous two rubrics and aligned scoring criteria with the definitions of the Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking SLOs previously developed by CLU faculty. During the calibration exercise, instructors used the Analytic Grading Rubric to score the same, pre-selected student paper. Data were collected as twelve instructors scored a total of 180 student papers: 56 from English 111 courses; 88 from Writing Intensive courses; and 37 from Capstone courses.

The Analytic Grading Rubric was presented at a Fall 2006 faculty meeting and faculty were encouraged to utilize this rubric in course assignments that focus on Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking. Faculty were asked to volunteer to help with the continued development of the rubric by using it in their courses, tabulating the scores, and attending a meeting to discuss the use of the rubric and to provide recommendations for improvements. Any revisions resulting from this meeting will be incorporated into the rubric to be used in the 2007 scoring session. Faculty have been informed that we will also be collecting graduate level papers for the first time to include in the 2007 scoring session.

In general, the scores in all of the data collected from 2001 to 2006 showed an increase in skill level each year from English 111, through Writing Intensive, and finally Capstone Courses. Also consistent is that the score related to the students’ ability to write a conclusion is the lowest criteria each year, with only two exceptions. The two highest areas generally found each year are in the categories: “Language and Vocabulary” (or “Uses conventions of standard U.S. English”) and “Clear Thesis” (or “Articulates Focus”).

This study indicates that CLU students are improving in Written Communication, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking as they advance from their English 111 courses to their Senior Capstone courses. The study also indicates a need for faculty to work with students to develop better writing skills, specifically as these relate to synthesizing information into a conclusion. These results were shared at the 2006 faculty retreat as part of a plenary session entitled “Educational Effectiveness.”

**Field-Specific Knowledge and Experience** This SLO involves both content comprehension and real world or laboratory experience. It was defined by CLU faculty as follows:

Students will:
- Demonstrate comprehension of field-specific content
- Analyze issues, problems, and/or questions based on disciplinary knowledge and experience, which may include real world or laboratory situation
- Integrate knowledge and/or experience.
Internships provide CLU students with opportunities to obtain this “real world” experience. Shortly after we developed our Student Learning Outcomes, the Career Services Center experimented with a new computer system entitled Ecampus Recruiter in an effort to increase student involvement in internships. This system was implemented in 2003 and allows us to match students with jobs, internships, and career events and to track job placement more efficiently. The following data demonstrates the impact of this system:

- In its first year of use (January to December 2003), we had 997 internships posted and 2,233 job postings. Two years later (January to December 2005), we had a 50% increase in number of internships posted (1,499) and a 32% increase in job postings (2,942).

- Through the use of Ecampus Recruiter, we offer employer follow-up and free posting services, and we have been able to increase employer contacts from 500 to over 7,000 in the past 5 years. Ecampus Recruiter provides us with a matching system where positions are e-mailed to students and alumni directly—resulting in instant matching and placement.

- More important than the increase in postings is the actual usage by students, and thus the opportunities for field-specific knowledge and experience. From 2003 to 2005, there has been a 609% increase in total logins by students and alums (from 17,009 to 103,616) and the total member number from 2003 to 2005 has grown by 14% (2,093 to 2,392).

The strategies we have used to implement this system include presentations given to the freshman seminar classes and emails about internships sent directly to students based on their career goals and majors. We also upload student data from the Registrar’s Office so that students receive a welcome email with login information without having to register themselves.

Since 2001, data from the annual Internship Evaluation form have been analyzed and sent to employers. The evaluation form asks supervisors to rate the students on a number of items, many of which are aligned with our CLU Student Learning Outcomes. For example, there are questions that relate to field-specific knowledge and experience, interpersonal and teamwork skills, ethical and professional judgment, critical thinking, written communication skills, oral communication skills, and appreciation of diversity. Using the scale, “poor, fair, good, and excellent,” no responses have indicated ratings lower than “good.” We are currently developing ways to utilize the data from these evaluations to provide evidence for our Student Learning Outcomes and to provide information by majors for our program reviews.

Other efforts by our Career Services staff to help CLU students and alums obtain field-specific knowledge and experience include:

- Career Services Résumé-Writing Program  The Career Services Center started reviewing résumés for quality within the online system in 2004. Better quality résumés help CLU candidates rise above their competition. In this short period of time, we have had a 20% increase in résumé reviews (from 483 in 2004-2005 to 582 in 2005-2006).

- Cooperative Education Program  CLU students can also gain field-specific knowledge and experience through the Cooperative Education Program, which allows them to receive academic credit for part-time work relating to their major. All Co-Ops must be approved by a sponsoring faculty member and students must enroll in an upper division course to receive credit. Evaluations emailed to employers provide student performance to faculty. Student participation in the Cooperative Education Program has increased 24.5% from 2000-2001 to 2005-2006 (from 151 students to 188 students). We believe these increases have been a direct result of the implementation of the Ecampus Recruiter system as it has provided significant increases in employer contacts, automatically matches students with placements, and notifies them by email. Other efforts of our Career Services staff and through the Career Services website have also contributed to this increase.
Service Learning is another area that relates to field-specific knowledge and experience and is addressed in Chapter 2.

Evidence of Educational Effectiveness at the College/School Level

Assessment at the College/School level refers to evidence and processes that cross the boundaries of a specific department or program, but are focused within the College or one of the Schools. Examples in this section of our efforts to develop a culture of evidence at the College/School level include: the alignment of internal and external assessment criteria in the School of Education; and, the alignment of SLOs with CORE 21 (our general education requirements).

Alignment of Internal and External Assessment Criteria

One challenge that we faced in designing our Assessment System was how to align the system with academic areas that also must meet other external criteria and expectations. As an example, the School of Education must meet the requirements of WASC, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) guidelines and align with CLU’s 14 institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes as well. The various expectations and differences in language initially created a barrier in our efforts to align the School of Education with our Assessment System. We addressed this challenge 1) by creating a document that aligns CLU’s Program Review process, the WASC and NCATE standards, and CCTC guidelines, and 2) by aligning the CLU institutional SLOs with the School of Education Core Values (“STRIVE”). This alignment has streamlined our process—in that rather than address each of these entities separately, we are now working to focus the School of Education program reviews and developments so they simultaneously meet the internal and external expectations required of them.

Alignment of Student Learning Outcomes with CORE 21

Three years ago, our General Education Subcommittee developed Learning Outcomes for each general education (“CORE 21”) requirement and created an approval process for courses that would fulfill a CORE requirement. Task groups developed the Learning Outcomes for each requirement, followed by faculty approval. All courses were then removed from the approved list for CORE 21. Faculty were required to submit their syllabus and a form indicating how their course would achieve the stated Learning Outcomes to fulfill a CORE 21 requirement. This lengthy and arduous task allowed us to create an outcomes-based curriculum and to properly align our courses to the requirements.

Some of the CORE 21 requirements are aligned directly with our institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes. For example, our Writing Intensive Course in CORE 21 uses the same language in the required Student Learning Outcomes as the faculty developed for the institution-wide Written Communication Student Learning Outcome.

CORE 21, developed nearly 20 years ago, is in need of review and revision. Since the CORE was already in place, we had to align our newly developed institution-wide SLOs around the CORE’s existing requirements. As we move toward creating new general education requirements, we will be able to design the curriculum based on the foundation of our established Student Learning Outcomes.

Evidence of Educational Effectiveness at the Department/Program Level

Assessment at the Department/Program level refers to evidence and processes that occur in the undergraduate departments and graduate programs. Efforts that we are making to develop a culture of evidence at the Department/Program level include: the use of program outcomes and curriculum maps; and, the progress we have made in conducting meaningful program reviews.
Program Outcomes & Curriculum Maps

Within each academic department or program at CLU, faculty have determined how the array of courses align with the institution’s 14 SLOs. Program-specific SLOs have also been identified. As an example, the School of Business website has a link to the undergraduate curriculum including a curriculum map for each program with the courses listed at the left and the SLOs at the top. Clicking on the course title links to the course syllabus, and clicking on the SLO links to a page where the SLO is described, including the definitions developed by the CLU faculty, along with additional information for each SLO as it relates to the School of Business (see example). Each curriculum map indicates which courses address each SLO, and the level of assessment based on Bloom’s taxonomy.

Rubrics, developed by faculty for many School of Business courses, are created for assignments on a case by case basis, customized for assignment type and Student Learning Outcomes served. The rubrics are made available to both full-time and part-time faculty and individuals are encouraged to edit, embellish and use the rubrics. Faculty are asked to submit the student scores from these rubrics each semester to the assessment coordinator in the School of Business. The School of Business began collecting data from the rubrics in a few courses in 2005-06 as a pilot, and in fall of 2006 they began collecting data from many courses, representing all levels of learning, including required core courses and electives. This overview of the curriculum through assessment data has involved the faculty in a continuous improvement process.

Program Reviews

In our February 2003 WASC Proposal, we noted that CLU had not made much progress in conducting program reviews. We have, therefore, made program reviews a central focus during this re-accreditation process and now have an effective program review process in place. We have been successful in its implementation and in using program reviews to effect change. This section describes the advances we have made and the outcomes from recent program reviews.

Advances in the Program Review Process

The Program Review is a focused, in-depth study that provides evidence for program planning and improvement. A Program Review Report documents the review process and is organized into four sections: 1) Setting Measurable Goals (Introduction, Mission Statements, Program Goals and Learning Outcomes); 2) Planning to Reach Goals (Assessment Plan); 3) Data Collection (Teaching and Learning, Institutional Capacity for Quality, Program Data); and 4) Data Analysis and Reporting (External Review, Summary and Action Plans).

The Program Review Report appendices provide supporting documents for the review. Data sources included in the Program Review Report are provided from the Office of Institutional Research, the program department, benchmarks in the discipline, and other sources of relevance.

Since our Capacity and Preparatory Review, we have made significant changes in our Program Review process, including the following:

- Revision of our program review template.
- Creation of a Program Review Handbook, designed to provide information and processes for CLU faculty, administrators, and external reviewers, to guide and support academic program reviews. It includes sections on the purpose of program reviews, guiding principles, the process, report components, external reviews, internal reviews, the Assessment Cycle, Assessment Plan, and Assessment Symposium.
- Establishment of a clearer timetable for each step of the process.
- Development of criteria and expectations for external reviewers.
- Redesign of our schedule for future program reviews.
- Inclusion of an on-going system of review and reflection. The CLU Program Review report occurs every seven years. Now, based on the data analysis within the Program Review, Year 1 and each
subsequent year in the Program Review Cycle will address a specific action. The culmination of six years of annual plans will then contribute to the program’s next Program Review—while ensuring that the entire program, reviewed on a more frequent basis, remains current.

- Incorporation of the “Assessment Plans” for our academic programs into the program review process.
- Allocation of funding to cover the stipend and travel expenses for external reviewers and a $1000 stipend to Department Chairs who complete the program review.

Faculty who were involved in completing program reviews from 2004-06 were asked to share their impressions of the process at a focus group meeting. The following are some of their comments:

- Template and information is a huge help. Get it to the people as soon as possible in order to get a start so that things can get done when there is time to do them.
- External reviewer was very valuable.
- Challenging to identify a person who would give a credible review.
- It takes a lot of time.
- Parts of the program review were split apart [and given] to various individuals.
- There has to be communication within the department in order for this work to be successfully completed.
- Helped increase communication and gave some focus as well as helped write a mission statement. It helped to clarify what the overall purpose of the major was.

Overall, faculty concurred that learning occurred and challenges were overcome. Throughout the learning experience, faculty and administrators contributed to defining the process and making improvements.

**Outcomes from Recent Program Reviews** The following four specific examples illustrate the outcomes of the current program review process at CLU:

1) **Revision of Mission and Curriculum (Ed.D. program)** Reviewing a program’s mission and its curriculum are important elements of the program review process. CLU’s Ed.D. program, currently involved in a program review, serves as a good example of how a program review results in revision of a program’s mission and its curriculum.

During its development in 2001, CLU’s Ed.D. program adopted a series of goals and objectives, all of which have been met or exceeded since the program’s inception (see report). In a commitment to continuous improvement, the School of Education has developed a series of formal processes to fine tune its efforts and to position the Ed.D. program for future success.

In June 2006, our Ed.D. faculty met for a two-day retreat, focusing on a review of the program mission (in relation to the larger School of Education and University mission), assessment of the Ed.D. progress and direction to date, and the development of an action plan to implement the suggested changes and additions designed to move us to our next iteration of success. Since that time, our Ed.D. review committee has been active in implementing the change initiatives outlined during the two-day retreat. A standing faculty subcommittee convenes regularly to monitor and review the assessment pieces of our program, including student and faculty feedback, analysis of the quality of our capstone projects (dissertations), reviewing the most up-to-date and emerging literature tied to professional doctoral programs, and other professional advisory information received from NCATE and other sources. Outcomes of these efforts include the development of nine areas of focus for the program and work is in progress on revising the curriculum.

2) **Implementation of the Assessment Cycle (Liberal Studies—Mathematics)** The Mathematics Department Single Subject program’s recent Program Review serves as a good example of how we are implementing our new ongoing system of review. Their seven-year Program Review Cycle includes annual departmental reviews of the program. To carry out the annual reviews, the Mathematics Single Subject program has divided assessment into a set of evaluation modules, two or three of which are reviewed by
department faculty in any given year. Those aspects are examined to ensure that the program remains in alignment with state criteria as well as with our own internal program goals. Aspects that are addressed in the annual reviews include program goals, learning strategies, program requirements, student outcomes and success, technology uses, student mentoring, assessment, and program outcomes. Breaking the annual review into evaluation modules makes it possible to assess aspects of the program more thoroughly than if everything were reviewed at the same time. This concept also provides for the flexibility to interchange modules should it become apparent that an aspect of the program needs to be addressed sooner than originally planned.

Faculty evaluate the program through informal conversations, department meetings, and a focused Single Subject meeting following the oral defenses of the candidates. Also taken into consideration are recommendations from the Mathematical Association of America’s Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and California Commission for Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), as well as current research and trends in the discipline. The School of Education’s Director of Single Subject Programs participates and provides input on relevant educational trends and programmatic needs. The annual review also takes into account informal and formal discussions with our students and alumni, the results from course evaluations, our Senior Exit Surveys, and surveys completed by teachers within the K-12 school system who oversee students during their fieldwork experience in a course on Career Decisions in Education.

An assessment schedule has been developed by faculty to organize and guide the multiple review processes. The schedule identifies the timing for the assessment of each module, the level of assessment review, and the evaluation modules.

**3) Effective Use of External Reviewers** The External Review, an important component within the systematic planning and program review process is conducted by an individual or a team of scholars and experts external to CLU. These reviewers provide an objective assessment of the quality and effectiveness of our academic programs, services, resources, and operations. Faculty are expected to develop specific questions for their external reviewer as part of the Program Review process. Our Program Review Handbook includes a section on external reviewers, with information on criteria and process for selection of reviewers, description of the visit to campus, and expectations of external reviewers.

Two examples of outcomes from external reviews are:

- **Math** Following an external reviewer’s recommendation to increase the number of full-time faculty in the Math Department, the administration approved two new full time faculty positions for the 2005-06 academic year (for a total of five full-time faculty in Math). The external reviewer also provided suggestions regarding revising the curriculum, which supported ideas that had been discussed in the Math department. The Math faculty are considering the suggestions for future changes to the curriculum.

- **Computer Science** Comments by the external reviewer initiated conversations for a structural change for the Computer Science Department. Following the Program Review last year, CLU is considering the possibility of engaging Computer Science faculty more formally into programs offered in the School of Business.

**4) Involvement of the Library in Program Reviews** The library staff, partnering with faculty conducting program reviews, have become an integral part of the Program Review process. The library staff prepares an appendix for each program review, which includes a Library Collection Development Plan and a matrix comparing the department’s subject specific and multidisciplinary electronic resources with peer and aspirant institutions.

The Library Collection Development Plan is not intended as merely a document to be used as an appendage to the departmental program review. Since the guidelines for academic program review allow for design
flexibility, information specialists are able to craft innovative Library Collection Development Plans unique to each program. The Plan is developed to serve faculty and the library information specialists as an evolving, working document for internal assessment purposes. The document is to be used as a measurement tool to assess the value of the ways in which the library’s holdings support departmental needs.

At a recent California Academic and Research Libraries (CARL) Conference, Purnell and Knight (2006) conducted an informal poll with the 39 California academic institutions to determine the level of library involvement in a departmental accreditation program review process. The findings showed that libraries, such as California State University campuses San Jose and Stanislaus, provide documents for library resources only to support new academic programs or new courses, not as a routine part of the departmental review process. At Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, for example, the library is involved in curriculum review processes, but not in academic program reviews. According to the informal poll conducted at the CARL Conference, the California Lutheran University Library was the only library with a high level of involvement in departmental program reviews.

There is support for library involvement in program development. Wolff (1995) called for “building an effective culture of evidence” (p. 79) and a stronger instructional role for libraries, and stressed that assessment must reflect the library’s relationship to the teaching and learning functions of the institution. Participation in the program review process at CLU offers a unique opportunity for library Information Specialists to partner with faculty. This collaboration provides academic department faculty with the Information Specialist’s direct assistance as the department’s existing resources are reviewed and updates are suggested. In spring 2006, library collaboration was included in the Program Reviews for the Departments of Communication, Computer Science, Exercise Science and Sports Medicine, History, and Philosophy. Fall 2006 collaborations began for Economics, Accounting, Criminal Justice, Spanish, French, German, Counseling and Guidance, and the Doctoral Program in Educational Leadership.

The collaboration supports instruction and research resources for faculty and students and provides the opportunity to go beyond what Wolff (1995) noted was lacking in the American Association of Colleges and Universities program review handbook, the mention of “information literacy, library assignments, library or research support, or technology and the information explosion” (p. 86). The CLU Library Information Specialists are expanding their role to determine their connection to student learning and whether students have learned necessary information literacy skills. They are keeping a log of their meetings with faculty, documenting the specific changes made to library resources, noting subsequent information literacy sessions that resulted from collaboration conversations, and noting their personal comments as well as those made by faculty. A review of this log will assist Information Specialists to determine future changes.

Evidence of Educational Effectiveness at the Course Level

Assessment at the Course level refers to evidence of educational effectiveness that faculty gather within individual courses. Our efforts in developing a culture of evidence at the course level include: the incorporation of SLOs into course syllabi; and, our recent focus on aggregating data at the course level to encourage Assessment For Learning.

Incorporating SLOs into Course Syllabi

At our May 2004 Faculty Development Workshop, we conducted an instructional session on integrating our Student Learning Outcomes into each syllabus. Each semester since then, faculty have been provided with instructions to include references to the learning outcomes in their syllabi. Each year at our orientation for new full-time faculty, we also include a session on Student Learning Outcomes. And, we have held a number of workshops for part-time faculty instructing them about our learning outcomes and explaining how to include them in their syllabi. In our Program Review process, faculty are asked to complete a table aligning their courses with the 14 Student Learning Outcomes (as well as additional outcomes specific to each program). A copy of the SLOs was provided to freshmen in the fall 2006 Freshman Seminar course.
Assessment for Learning

The focus of assessment at CLU is shifting faculty discussion beyond ways in which we are teaching students to ways in which students are learning. In the fall of 2006, we conducted faculty workshops that focused on moving from the assessment of learning to assessment for learning. This shift began at the August 2006 faculty retreat where faculty participated in an Assessment of Learning exercise as part of a presentation on Educational Effectiveness. The purpose of the presentation was to develop common understandings for educational effectiveness, evidence, and the use of evidence. In the exercise, faculty were asked to list assignments, identify which of the 14 SLOs and themes of Challenge, Engagement, and Diversity the assignments addressed, and identify the assessment tool used. Sixty-two faculty members participated, sharing 159 examples. Every example provided an alignment of the assignment with student learning outcomes and themes. However, the description of the assessment tool ranged from no mention, to some who vaguely mentioned assessment, to some who mentioned and described an actual assessment tool.

The next step was to identify ways that assessment can be used for learning. Small faculty group workshops (by school and division) were implemented throughout the fall semester. Faculty worked through an Assessment for Learning exercise, a two step process, focusing on assessment at the course level. To begin, faculty recorded assessment of learning by aligning one course learning outcome with strategy, assignment, and assessment. An analytic and holistic scoring rubric was reviewed and faculty then contributed ideas for various ways of aggregating data and using it to improve the educational effectiveness of their courses. 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 progress, and how they are learning from the data and putting that learning into action.

Continued work with faculty will apply the shift to Assessment for Learning at the department/program level. Faculty, organized in groups by department/program, will review lessons learned at the course level and plan action at the department/program level. Discussions will contribute to providing updates to the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (“Data Element 7.1”; see Appendix B).

Communicating and Reflecting on Evidence

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Team encouraged CLU to look for more effective ways to communicate our activities related to assessment of learning, specifically with a clear overview of assessments conducted, key findings, and uses made of the findings. Two new developments that have helped us improve our communication are the Assessment Website and the Assessment Symposium. We have also made an effort to include discussions about assessment of educational effectiveness in a variety of meetings and workshops.

Assessment Website

Our newly developed Assessment Website provides an overview of CLU’s Assessment Cycle, and emphasizes the University’s commitment to continuous quality improvement and to a culture of evidence. There are links to the Key Performance Indicators of the Strategic Plan, Program Reviews, the Assessment Symposium, and CLU’s Core Values.

- A major section of the Assessment Website is the Data Warehouse (user=warehouse, password=access), where we store our Assessment Reports. We have created a template for all assessment reports to ensure consistency and thoroughness in the communication of our assessment results. The Assessment Committee has been integral in the development of the Website Assessment Reports. Faculty members on this committee were involved in choosing, analyzing and reflecting on data for report purposes. All CLU faculty have been provided with access to the Data Warehouse, as well as instructions and a demonstration at faculty meetings, to promote data accessibility. Prior to the development of this website, assessment reports were written and distributed to a very small group of
academic leaders. Occasionally there were presentations of data at faculty meetings, but often the reports were seen by only a few. Since the development of this website, the entire campus community has access to all of our assessment reports.

- The Assessment Website also includes an accreditation section where we are able to store our documents related to accreditation processes and re-accreditation visits. All of the documents for our WASC Educational Effectiveness Review have been posted on this site and are available for the entire CLU community to review.

- A final section of the Assessment Website is for assessment resources. Here, we provide information on a variety of valuable tools and information for our campus community, including presentations of workshops related to assessment. The Assessment Website has become a valuable tool that continues to be used and expanded.

Assessment Symposium

On May 22, 2006, CLU held its first annual “Assessment Symposium.” The purposes of the Assessment Symposium were to:

- Report on assessment evidence from the 2005-06 academic year;
- Determine ways in which the evidence was and will be used to improve student learning and the quality of our services;
- Improve communication;
- Demonstrate our use of evidence;
- Become familiar and supportive of the assessment efforts throughout campus.

The responses from participants and attendees indicate that these outcomes were achieved.

The ten presentations given at the Symposium included information on three program reviews, a student learning outcome, a continuous improvement project, challenge and engagement, the use of indirect evidence at the institution level, and student support services.

Each presentation included a PowerPoint presentation and touched on six points:

- Introduction to the program/practice assessed;
- Identification of one assessment goal;
- Description of the measure/tool used to collect data to determine progress towards achieving the goal;
- Description of data collection results;
- Review of data analysis;
- Recommendations/implications/future goals developed resulting from data analysis.

The presentation format encouraged presenters to portray ways in which assessment is a part of our academic and institutional practice. Attendees were encouraged to listen for implications and opportunities that the presenter’s goals would have on their college/school or department and to provide responses on two handouts: Implications and Opportunities, and Learning Together.

Over 70 people attended the Symposium, including the President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Provosts, faculty members, and staff from throughout the institution. The presentations at the Symposium parallel both the Institutional Capacity and the Educational Effectiveness components of the WASC accreditation process. Institutional Capacity was represented by presentations from Academic Affairs, Information Services, and Student Affairs staff and administrators. Educational Effectiveness was represented by presentations from the College of Arts and Sciences faculty and the library staff.
Planning for the 2007 Assessment Symposium has begun and will incorporate feedback from respondents as we continue to develop our University’s culture of evidence.

**Communication through Meetings and Workshops**

In an attempt to better communicate the results of our assessment activities, we have made a greater effort to include discussions on evidence of educational effectiveness through presentations at monthly faculty meetings, Divisional and School meetings, Deans’ Council meetings, and faculty workshops. As a result, there is more institution-wide involvement in reflection of data, and action resulting from assessment.

**Conclusion: Decision Making, Planning, and Improvement**

This chapter described the processes and strategies that we have implemented as part of the CLU Assessment System (Figure 1). Data collection occurs at the institution, college/school, program/department, and course levels for optimal use in self-reflection, decision making, planning, and improvement.

It was recommended in the Capacity and Preparatory Review team report (2005) that we “compile summaries that provide a clearer overview of assessments conducted, key findings, and uses made of these findings” (p. 34). We have developed a clearer overview of our assessments through our *Survey Inventory*, our *Program Review schedule*, and our Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (“Data Element 7.1”; see Appendix B). The findings from our assessments have led to university-wide data-driven decision making, planning, and improvement. Some examples of the outcomes from these findings include:

- Creation of the Assessment Symposium by the Assessment Committee
- Improved surveys resulting from the formation of “Survey Central”
- Development of Key Performance Indicators to assess our progress and to make decisions related to the new strategic plan
- Development of new systems and practices resulting from our Continuous Improvement Process
- Data-driven decisions about course and program content resulting from:
  - Embedding SLOs into course syllabi
  - Developing programmatic curriculum maps with embedded SLOs
  - Aligning internal and external assessment criteria
  - Aligning SLOs with “CORE 21”
  - Completing program reviews
- Actions resulting from program reviews such as:
  - Revised mission statements and curricula
  - Implementation of the annual assessment cycle
  - Effective use of external reviewers
  - Involvement of the library in reviews

The next two chapters focus on our two themes for this review, *increasing challenge and engagement* and *enhancing diversity*. 
Chapter 2: Increasing Challenge and Engagement

This chapter, *Increasing Challenge and Engagement*, focuses on our first theme, *raising the level of challenge and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs*. Chapter 2 begins with our process of defining challenge and engagement, and the gathering of data relative to the challenge and engagement definition. The following sections focus on how we have collected, analyzed, and applied data relative to three objectives related to our first theme:

First Objective: Increase academic expectations and challenge across the University and within each academic program;

Second Objective: Enhance intellectual/creative engagement in classes and in educationally related experiences beyond the classroom;

Third Objective: Improve the effectiveness of orientation and freshman year experiences by introducing students to an academically engaging campus culture.

CLU’s 2001 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results and a faculty workshop with George Kuh were influential in developing the first theme for our re-accreditation process. This chapter includes the strategies we have implemented and the outcomes and challenges we have experienced in addressing challenge and engagement at the University.

Defining Challenge and Engagement

Defining challenge and engagement has itself been a challenge—and one that has engaged us mightily for the last four years. At our August 2002 Faculty Retreat, breakout groups were organized by faculty committees to address how each committee could contribute to our WASC themes. Other breakout groups were organized by academic departments to respond to the following questions: 1) How do you define *challenge* and *engagement*? and 2) How can you raise the levels of student challenge and engagement?

Other groups in the University also worked to define challenge and engagement:

- The *Student Affairs division* submitted to the WASC Steering Committee the definition of challenge they formulated at their summer 2002 retreat.

- The *WASC Steering Committee* (in March of 2003) focused on the question, “What will we look like three years from now if we become a more challenging and engaged learning community?”

- The *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences* made a presentation on Challenge and Engagement at our 2003 Faculty Retreat.

- A “Challenge and Engagement Task Group” reviewed information gathered from the many discussions on challenge and engagement, developed a definition, and shared it with the faculty. The Task Group described challenge and engagement as likely to occur in diverse intellectual and perceptual situations designed to expand the boundaries of students’ assumptions, creativity, and reasoning. Noting our recurring difficulty with distinguishing challenge from engagement, the Task Group decided to intertwine the words challenge and engagement within their respective definitions: “Challenge involves being engaged in…” and “Engagement involves being challenged with…”

The bulk of the collected data on our process of defining challenge and engagement led us to conclude that challenge and engagement are inextricably overlapped—engaged students are students who have been challenged, and challenged students are students who must be engaged if they are to meet the challenges before them. For this reason, we often discuss the *increasing academic challenge* and *enhancing engagement* concepts together—so that our first challenge and engagement objective (to increase…challenge) may address
engagement as well as challenge; and our second objective (to enhance…engagement) may address challenge as well as engagement.

Gathering Data Relative to Challenge and Engagement Definition

In order to get further input and a broader perspective about challenge and engagement at the University, we set up a Focus Group Study (April through June of 2005) wherein 17 focus groups held one-hour-long discussions on the challenge and engagement theme.

- **Student Focus Groups** The eight student focus groups consisted of four groups of traditional undergraduate students, one group of Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP) students, and three groups of graduate students. There were 6-8 students in each group, and everyone was asked the same questions, first regarding challenge and then engagement. The questions are summarized below.
  
  o What does challenge / engagement mean to you?
  o What are some examples of being challenged / engaged in classes?
  o What are some examples of times that you didn’t feel challenged / engaged?
  o What suggestions do you have for being more challenged / engaged in classes?

- **Faculty Focus Groups** A total of nine faculty focus groups consisted of four groups of full-time faculty who teach in traditional undergraduate programs, two groups of full-time faculty who teach in the graduate programs, and three groups of part-time faculty who teach in the graduate programs or ADEP. Faculty were asked the same questions as the students had been asked, except that the questions were worded from a faculty perspective. Again, the questions were first presented on challenge and then engagement:
  
  o What does challenge / engagement mean to you?
  o What are some examples of how you have challenged / engaged students?
  o What are some examples of times when you don’t feel you challenged / engaged students?
  o What suggestions do you have for increasing challenge / engagement in classes?

- **Data Analysis** The five faculty who volunteered to lead the focus group sessions were provided with a script; the sessions were audio taped and then transcribed. Dr. Adina Nack, Sociology, and Dr. José Marichal, Political Science, analyzed the data.

Based on the comments from the student focus group discussions, the remarks were organized into the following three categories for both the challenge and engagement questions:

  o Students expect the following from themselves and each other
  o Students expect the following from their professors
  o Students expect the following from CLU

Within these categories, comments were separated by traditional undergraduate students, ADEP students, and graduate students.

Based on the comments from the faculty focus group discussions, the responses were grouped into the following categories:

  o Definitions of Challenge / Variables Associated with Engagement
  o Factors/Obstacles that Impeded Challenge / Engagement
  o Strategies Associated with Challenge / Engagement
  o Suggestions (at an institutional level) to Enhance Challenge / Engagement
A summary sheet of the data analysis was distributed for a 2005 Faculty Retreat session entitled “Challenge and Engagement.” The focus group study methodology was explained, the summary sheets were reviewed, and specific examples of student and faculty statements were shared. The presentation also included video clips from Declining by Degrees, a PBS program illustrating how institutions nationwide are dealing with challenge and engagement issues. Faculty were then divided into a total of 15 groups who engaged in deeper discussions about faculty action that would result in greater challenge and engagement. Five groups discussed each of the questions below:

- In addition to raising the admissions standards, what are other ways we can deal with the problem of students who lack basic skills?
- What can we do to change the CLU faculty culture to raise the level of challenge?
- What can we as faculty do to change the CLU student culture to be more engaged in the learning experience?

Notes from these groups were collected and summarized. A list of action items was generated from this summary and a poster presentation on this study was presented at the 2006 WASC Conference.

**Faculty and Student Focus Group Results** We found distinct differences in the student and faculty comments in the focus groups. Faculty responses tended to identify students as the source of the problem where challenge and engagement were lacking. Faculty responses related to the questions on “challenge” included the following:

- Students put forth insufficient effort
- Students have a tendency towards passive learning
- Students have a short cut mentality
- Students are unwilling . . . to be challenged . . . to critically engage their views . . . to do assignments not for credit . . . to reflect on material

Faculty reported that some of the obstacles that impede engagement include:

- Student attitude
- Student skill set
- Students too busy / time management

When asked how they challenge and engage students, faculty gave dozens of examples of types of assignments that they use.

Students, on the other hand, took personal responsibility for “challenge” and “engagement,” saying that students need to:

- Be accountable to the professor and fellow classmates by preparing for each class session, assignment, or exam
- Take an active interest in the course material
- Hold themselves to high standards of academic performance
- Be willing and able to think critically about course material
- Act and expect fellow students to act mature
- Seek challenge from themselves
- Be aware of why they are at CLU and have intentionality
- Be “determined to succeed” at becoming engaged
- Realize that engagement is a two-way street
- Be active learners
• Engage with the CLU community
• Reflect on their coursework outside of school

Interestingly, students stated that faculty should have high expectations of students (while faculty stated that students’ lack of ability or poor attitudes get in the way of challenge and engagement). Students went on to give examples of what they expect faculty to do to increase “challenge” and “engagement,” including:

• Expect students to apply course material outside of the classroom
• Expect students to apply all course material inside the classroom
• Not “dumb down” a course in terms of material and assessment
• Create a “very active environment where [professors] really challenge us to show what we know”
• Expect students to think critically
• Exhibit “passion” or “love” for their subject
• Tailor assignments so that the variety of students will be pushed to excel
• Avoid grade inflation
• Give rigorous assignments
• Require critical thinking and applied learning
• Set high standards/expectations for students
• Be positive, energetic, and open-minded
• Make classes as interactive as possible
• Connect personally with the students and show enthusiasm for their learning experiences

After reviewing the results of the Focus Groups at the Faculty Retreat, we saw a different set of responses emerge from the faculty discussion groups. These responses focused not on the inadequacies of the students, but rather on more productive ways faculty might be more pro-active in increasing challenge and engagement. Examples of responses from the Faculty Retreat discussions follow:

• Faculty need to hold students accountable
• Don’t grade papers that are not written well
• Increase the quality and capacity of the writing center
• Institute a summer “head start” program for freshmen or a summer tech boot camp
• Take grading more seriously
• Do not lower standards
• Offer more teaching workshops for faculty
• Be more active
• Establish specific goals for learning
• Be enthusiastic for your subject

Such comments were not evident in the initial focus group discussions. But after participating in this exercise and hearing the feedback from the students, faculty changed their focus, replacing comments that blamed students to comments indicating that faculty were willing to take ownership of the situation. We were all encouraged by this shift from a position of helplessness where it seemed impossible to challenge and engage students because of their lack of ability and motivation to a position of having the power and ability to create an environment of challenge and engagement. We consider this a major step forward in our efforts to achieve higher levels of challenge and engagement at CLU.
First Objective:
Increase Academic Expectations and Challenge
across the University and within each Academic Program

We have implemented four strategies in an effort to increase challenge across the University and within each of the academic programs: the development of an Honors Program; an intensified focus on student research; holding faculty development workshops on challenge and engagement; and the incorporation of “Challenge” and “Engagement” into Program Reviews.

The University Honors Program

The University Honors Program (UHP) was developed in the Fall of 2002 as an effort to challenge and engage those students in the CLU traditional undergraduate program who have the highest academic abilities. The program is offered on a by-invitation-only basis to incoming students with superior academic credentials. The required coursework is described below:

- First year UHP students attend one of two year-long foundational seminar courses. The foundational seminars, infused with lively, intellectual discussions with talented peers and professors, are designed to engage and stimulate the exceptional student beyond the level of mere comprehension. The UHP emphasizes critical thinking, one of CLU’s 14 Student Learning Outcomes.

- Second and third year UHP students attend at least one semester-long honors seminar per year. A wide variety of seminar topics are available in courses that often explore interdisciplinary perspectives (another of CLU’s Student Learning Outcomes).

- In their final year, UHP students attend a single, one-semester capstone course. Upon completion of the UHP curriculum, a student is awarded University Honors at graduation.

- A Departmental Honors Program is also offered at CLU, open to students both in the UHP and students outside the UHP. Seniors in selected majors receive Departmental Honors by completing 6-8 credits of mentored research.

In addition to coursework, the program is enhanced by out-of-classroom academic experiences in the form of field trips, films/performances, and outside speakers. A Departmental Honors Program is also offered at CLU, open to students both in the UHP and students outside the UHP. Seniors in selected majors receive Departmental Honors by completing 6-8 credits of mentored research.

In the spring of 2006, we conducted an Exit Survey for the first graduating group of Honors students for the purpose of gathering qualitative and quantitative data about their experience in the UHP experience. Specifically, data included students’ perceptions of challenge and engagement levels in the program and their perceptions of program experiences.

The first cohort of 88 students entered the CLU Honors Program in the Fall of 2002; 31 of those students were registered in the program in the 2005-06 academic year. The survey population was composed of 74 Honors students currently enrolled at CLU, including all students who entered the first cohort, whether or not they had continued in the program.

A town-hall style gathering was scheduled to collect data from participants. Those participants attending completed a paper version of the 2006 University Honors Program Exit Survey. Students not in attendance received an invitation to complete an online version of the Exit Survey. A total of 36 surveys were completed.
The results of the Exit Survey study indicated the following:

- 81% “found the Honors Program Courses ‘more’ or ‘much more’ intellectually challenging than other courses taken at CLU.” None of the students indicated that the honors courses were less challenging.

- 77% “talk about ideas raised in my Honors Courses ‘more’ or ‘much more’ often than ideas raised in my other courses taken at CLU.” Only 6% said “less” or “much less.”

- 66% “found the co-curricular activities of the honors program (field trips, films/performances, and outside speakers) ‘more’ or ‘much more’ stimulating than other courses I have taken at CLU.” 31% said “same”; 3% said “less.”

- 89% “found the Honors Program courses ‘more’ or ‘much more’ connected to diverse historical context, cultural settings, and fields of knowledge than other courses taken at CLU.”

- When asked if the Honors Program “Improved my level of knowledge, skills and abilities,” 89% responded “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree.”

Responses to the open-ended questions continued to provide evidence that the UHP was challenging and engaging. When students were asked “why were you initially interested in joining the UHP?” they responded overwhelmingly that they wanted to be challenged and engaged. Out of 35 responses to this question, 13 were specifically about challenge and 4 about engagement. Students were also asked to identify the three most positive features of the Honors Program. Fourteen responses (out of 35) included “challenge” and 13 identified areas related to “engagement.” Examples of responses to the three most positive features of the UHP include: “more difficult classes and challenging topics”; “level of thinking and coursework required”; “the program really pushes you”; “gets you to engage in deep critical thinking”; “more interaction with content”; “inspiring class conversations.”

Students were asked on the survey to provide advice for a student considering the UHP. Here are a few of their responses that clearly support the challenging and engaging nature of the program:

- “It is more work than you may expect but worth it”

- “It will be challenging but every minute spent will be worth it.”

- “Be prepared to expand your understanding and step outside your comfort zone.”

- “Be prepared to put your dedication and love of learning to the test because the program really maxes out your potential and abilities.”

- “It’s definitely worth it if you want to be challenged and exposed to fun topics.”

- “I would have to say that honors is a lot of work. For sure a lot of reading. Also, I enjoy writing, so if a student is not big on essays, honors is not for them.”

- “Come in with an open mind and eagerness to learn.”

- “The honors program is a great way to interact and really get to know some of Cal Lutheran’s top professors in a small classroom setting. The ideas are challenging and it’s a great place to get into some very interesting discussions.”

- “Be an active member in it; participate and offer constructive criticism and praise to keep making it better. You will get out of it what you put in.”
“If you are considering taking the honors program make sure that you like to read and to write. There are tons of papers and even more reading throughout the program. However, if you do like to read and write the program is more than worth the time that you put into it. Be willing to think about and analyze issues whether you like them or they make you a little uncomfortable. It is predominantly through classes like these that you will be able to grow as an intellectual and an individual. If you have the opportunity to enter this program take it.”

The data gathered in April 2006 indicate that the University Honors Program is supporting our efforts to challenge and engage students. This study is, of course, just one piece of evidence regarding the UHP. The CLU Honors Committee is currently using the Exit Survey data to assist in evaluating the program. The committee is currently working to develop a mission statement, add more courses to the program, develop clear program objectives, and align the program with CLU’s Student Learning Outcomes.

A University-wide Intensified Focus on Student Research

Our emphasis on challenging and engaging students in the learning environment has led to discussions about the importance of student and faculty/student collaborative research:

- At our January 2006 faculty workshop, Dr. Mitchell Malachowski, from University of San Diego and former president of the Council of Undergraduate Research gave a presentation entitled, “The Wonders of Research at a Small, Comprehensive University . . . and the Hazards.” Faculty then engaged in five discussion groups including: Research and teaching commitment/loads; Research and promotion and tenure; Research and information technology; Research and undergraduate and graduate pedagogy; Administration’s support for research.

- The topic of faculty/student research has been included in a number of our weekly Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Series discussions. Some examples of those discussions include:

  1) “Student Research: Summer 2006 Student/Faculty Science Projects”; and “Preparing Your Students for the Undergraduate Research Conferences,” Michael Shaw and Tim Hengst (September 21, 2006)

  2) “Faculty and Student Research: The Facts and the Fictions,” Susan Liberthal (November 25, 2005)

  3) “Southern California Conference on Undergraduate Research (SCCUR) from a Student’s Perspective,” Josh Carr (October 6, 2005)—See history of CLU student research presentations from a wide variety of disciplines

  4) “Preparing CLU Students for the Fall 2005 SCCUR (Southern CA Conference for Undergraduate Research),” Cindy Wyels (April 21, 2005)

  5) “Getting Students Hooked on Research,” Ellen Andes (April 12, 2004)

  6) “Building Student Research Skills from the Ground Up,” David Marcey (February 12, 2004)

We have seen a number of positive outcomes from this focus on faculty/student research that we believe contribute to an increase in challenge and engagement:

- Our Master of Education program enhanced their focus on student research by developing a Master’s Colloquium in 2003. The Master’s Colloquium, held in December and in May, features 70-80 students annually giving poster presentations. Prior to 2003, students completed thesis projects, but
did not have an opportunity to present their work in this manner and to share their research with other students and faculty.

- A main component of the Science Division Strategic Plan is to offer research opportunities for science students, both within classes and outside traditional classes. Recent activities of student research include:

  1) **The Science Showcase Poster Session** which has been held for 8 years and represents most every department and program within the division with approximately 25 student presentations annually. The purpose of the event is to highlight research from the academic year including some of the most excellent Capstone and independent projects. Students must submit an application and have faculty support/approval to present.

  2) **The Undergraduate Research Symposium (URS)** involves approximately 16 students each year, all of whom make formal podium presentations about their (primarily summer) research projects. These are students who have conducted research projects with faculty at CLU and students who have participated in National Science Foundation REUs (Research Experiences for Undergraduates) at other institutions (See list of the 2005-06 presentations).

  3) Many students from the Science Division have also presented their work at conferences outside of CLU (see list) and some have received awards. Examples follow:


    - *Best Poster Presentation* Katie Pabst received this award at the SoCal-Nevada Mathematical Association of America Section Meeting at USC in April 2004

    - *Goldwater Fellows* from CLU include:
      2006-2007 Jennifer Lovick (Biology)
      2004-2005 Michael Alberti (Biochemistry and Molecular Biology)
      2000-2001 Ronald Scrofano (CS and Math double major)

- The Ed.D. dissertation process is now being redesigned to provide a collaborative partnership with our students and local superintendents. Students will be engaged in real-world projects focusing on problem-based action research. Extensive analysis of the emerging literature on the future of the Education Doctorate prompted our doctoral subcommittee to collaborate with professionals from Vanderbilt University, the University of Southern California, and the University of Washington for the purpose of generating ideas for program modifications that will ensure relevancy to the future educational leaders enrolled in our Ed.D. program. As a consequence of these efforts, we have formed two doctoral advisory committees comprised of 15 superintendents from school districts within a 60-mile radius of our University. The committees are working with us to develop a challenging and engaging experience for our doctoral students.

- In the School of Business, several Economics majors wrote research papers on Agriculture which were published in a UCSB Economic Forecast book.

- The College of Arts and Sciences is planning the First Annual Festival of Scholars to be held in March, 2007. Its purpose is to showcase student research and to celebrate student achievements. Students from each division and department will exhibit research in a variety of forums across campus.
Faculty Development Workshops on Challenge & Engagement

We have been very intentional about focusing on challenge and engagement in our faculty development efforts. Each year, we hold a 1½ day Faculty Retreat in August, a half-day faculty workshop in January, and a half-day faculty workshop in May. We also have weekly discussion groups sponsored by our Center for Teaching and Learning. The following are examples of sessions that have focused on challenge and engagement (see more complete list):

- “Assignments that Challenge and Engage,” Michaela Reaves (2006 Faculty Retreat)
- “Challenge and Engagement in the Writing Center,” Marja Mogk (CTL Series, Sept 1, 2005)
- “Challenge and Engagement,” Jose Marichal, Adina Nack, Leanne Neilson (2005 Faculty Retreat)
- “Teaching and Learning Strategies for the Year of the WASC” (May Workshop 2004)
- “What Our Library Data Tells Us about the Realities of Student Challenge and Engagement” (CTL Series, January 29, 2004)
- “Challenge & Engagement—Making it Happen: Tips From the Trenches” (January Workshop 2004)

These workshops have provided faculty with tools and techniques to increase challenge and engagement in their courses.

Incorporating Challenge and Engagement into Program Reviews

We are experiencing positive results after using the following strategies to incorporate challenge and engagement into departmental program reviews:

- The Teaching and Learning section of the Program Review begins with a focus on challenge and engagement.
- Data related to challenge and engagement from the NSSE survey (for traditional undergraduate programs) and from course evaluations are provided in one of the Program Review appendices (see example).
- Faculty are asked to discuss their data in relation to their programs and to their challenge and engagement initiatives.
- Faculty identify in their program review the teaching strategies that are used to foster challenge and engagement in the classroom.

The Communication Department’s recent program review provides an example of the types of outcomes that result from our focus on challenge and engagement within Program Reviews. Based on course evaluation data, students in Communication courses perceived that the Department was above average in engaging students. Communication faculty were perceived as generally using active learning pedagogies such as classroom discussion and debate, case studies, small group activities, student projects, films and guest speakers. Students did not, however, perceive the major to be as challenging as some of CLU’s other disciplines, and the questions related to academic challenge were slightly below the University mean. After discussions on how they might foster challenge, the Communication faculty began using strategies that require students to: read more primary text material; reflect more purposefully on reading assignments through writing response papers; and, write more research papers at the lower division level. They are also planning a curriculum change that will add a research methods requirement to the major. Several desired outcomes are anticipated from the addition of this new course:

- Requiring research methods earlier rather than later will prepare students for more challenging upper division research papers which would developmentally rely on knowledge of methods.
• The research methods requirement will better prepare honors students for their senior honor’s thesis in the Communication department’s newly approved honors’ program.

• Students will become more critical and sophisticated in evaluating their own research and the research of others.

First Objective Outcomes

The following examples highlight measures used to evaluate our progress toward increasing challenge:

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) & Beginning College Student Survey (BCSS)  The NSSE survey, conducted by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning, is administered nationwide to hundreds of thousands of first-year and senior students at four-year colleges and universities and includes questions directly related to challenge and engagement. CLU administered the NSSE in the spring of 2001 and the spring of 2005. The results provide an opportunity for us to compare data taken prior to developing our WASC themes with data available two years into our efforts.

BCSS (developed by NSSE) invited CLU to be part of a pilot which administers a survey to students just starting their freshman year, asking them what they expect of and from their college experience. The questions in the BCSS align with those in the NSSE, giving institutions an opportunity to compare their students’ expectations at entry with their experiences at the end of the freshman and senior years. CLU participated in the BCSS in the fall of 2004, so we are able to align the responses from the BCSS with the first year student responses on the NSSE which was administered in spring of 2005.

Questions on the NSSE are grouped into categories. One category is called the “Level of Academic Challenge Benchmark.” When all survey items in this category are combined into one aggregate score, the results from CLU’s 2001 administration are comparable to those in 2005 (see NSSE Data). In looking at individual items, however, we found some interesting data:

• In both 2001 and 2005, seniors reported writing more papers (of any length) than first year students.

• In both 2001 and 2005, seniors reported more emphasis in coursework of critical thinking skills (e.g., analysis, synthesis, application) compared with first year students.

• Compared to 2001, there was a slight increase in 2005 for both first year and senior students in writing papers of 20 pages or more and short papers of 5 pages or less.

• Compared to seniors in 2001, seniors in 2005 reported more coursework emphasizing synthesis, judgment, and application.

• Compared to 2001, seniors reported slightly higher scores in 2005 on “Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations.”

These results all indicate that our efforts to increase challenge as students progress through their University experience are bearing fruit.

Two of the NSSE “challenge” items in the Academic Challenge Benchmark and also found in the BCSS, are noted in Table 1, and provide interesting data:
Table 1

NSSE / BCSS Items on Academic Challenge Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Challenge Benchmark</th>
<th>NSSE 2001 (n = 231)</th>
<th>NSSE 2005 (n = 333)</th>
<th>BCSS 2004 (n = 383)</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week doing each of the following... Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, etc. related to academic activities)*</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how often have you done each of the following... Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations**</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These means denote blocks of hours spent preparing for class (1=0hrs/wk; 2=1-5hrs; 3=6-10hrs; 4=11-15 hours; 5=16-20 hours; 6=21-25 hours; 7=26-30 hours; 8=more than 30.)

**On a 4-point scale (1 = Never to 4 = Very Often)

The BCSS score indicates that students are expecting to spend approximately 14 hours per week preparing for class, but at the end of their first year (in 2005) they estimated spending about 11.5 hours per week studying, and at the end of their senior year, about 9.5 hours per week. The expectations on the BCSS for “Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations” also were significantly higher than what was reported at the end of the first year and senior year.

Some of the data from the 2004 BCSS and 2005 NSSE were shared at a plenary session on “Educational Effectiveness” at the 2006 Faculty Retreat. We have only just begun to reflect on this data, and we look forward to continued use of the information to encourage dialogue and change as we further our efforts to increase challenge and engagement.

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey & Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey was administered in 2002 and 2004 to sophomore and junior students enrolled in the traditional undergraduate program at CLU. These surveys provide an opportunity for institutions to add supplemental questions. We have written these questions to match our 14 Student Learning Outcomes and our WASC themes of challenge and engagement. One of the supplemental items that we included in 2002 was, “I find CLU academically demanding.” In 2004, we changed the wording to “I find CLU academically challenging.” In the Noel-Levitz, students provide two responses to each item using a 7-point scale. For each item, students indicate “Importance to me” and “My level of satisfaction.” A “gap” score provides the difference between “importance” and “satisfaction.” Table 2 provides the results of the item on challenge for the two administrations:

Table 2

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey results on “Challenge”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I find CLU academically challenging (demanding)</th>
<th>2002 (n = 408)</th>
<th>2004 (n = 354)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses on these items indicate that, from 2002 to 2004, students believe challenge is more important, and they are more satisfied with the level of academic challenge. The reduction in the gap score is an indication that we are closer to satisfying this area for our traditional undergraduate students.

The Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey was administered for the first time at CLU in the summer of 2006 to students enrolled in our graduate programs and our Adult Degree Evening Program (a bachelor’s degree program for working adults). Two of the supplemental items that we included were related to challenge and engagement (“Overall, the program content provides a level of academic challenge: expanding my assumptions, creativity, and reason”; “Overall, the program content provides a level of engagement: expanding my time and energy to take learning to new levels”). These two items were among the top 10 items of what students rated as “important” (out of 79 items). However, the items were among the top 20 of what students rated as “satisfied.” This indicates that while students are ranking their satisfaction of these items quite high in comparison with other items, there is still room for improvement to bring the satisfaction level more in line with the level of importance of challenge and engagement.

California Lutheran University Course Evaluations Every term, students evaluate all courses taught at CLU. We have included questions in the course evaluation forms that relate to challenge and engagement. The average responses on these questions by students institution-wide have remained consistent over the past three years. The greatest value of the course evaluation data is the comparisons that we are able to make within Program Reviews. Each program is provided with the averages for their program along with the institution-wide averages. Faculty are then able to reflect on their level of challenge and engagement compared with institutional data.

Evidence of Challenge in Academic Programs In preparation for this review, the faculty have reflected on changes that they have made to increase challenge and engagement in their classes and in academic programs. An inventory of those reflections includes the following examples on increasing challenge:

- Increased primary source emphasis as well as material artifacts
- Department prepared a proposal to increase challenge of BS degree to include a 3rd semester of research
- Created a student research course for junior and senior majors with the goal of writing original research papers to be delivered at student research conferences
- Instead of one research paper, I now require five, 5-page papers allowing me to assess better (each paper compared to last paper)
- Added senior portfolio project to major
- Increased assignments that combine student research and presentation
- Students submit rough drafts of their papers, I assign a provisional grade, and then work with each student to improve their papers, to refine arguments, to reconsider the structure of the presentation, etc. Students then turn in the revised draft for the final grade, and most of them show tremendous progress in their thinking and clarity of expression.
Second Objective:
Enhance Intellectual/Creative Engagement within Academic Programs
and in Experiences beyond the Classroom

Because of the inter-related nature of “challenge” and “engagement,” some areas related to engagement within academic programs were addressed in the First Objective. Two of the ways that we are engaging students in the learning process beyond the classroom are through Service Learning and Study Abroad. Other opportunities for engagement beyond the classroom occur with internships, which were discussed in Chapter 1, Field-Specific Knowledge and Experience.

Service Learning

Service Learning is relevant both to our mission statement (…to educate leaders who are… committed to service and justice) and to one of our Student Learning Outcomes, Service to the Community. Service Learning enhances academic learning by enabling students to apply knowledge and skills gained through academic study to real world problem solving, and to appreciate the connections between their academic work and real world activities. It combines community service with explicit academic learning objectives, preparation, and reflection.

Service Learning was first introduced at CLU in one School of Education class in 1996. By 2003, Dr. Silva Karayan, a faculty member at CLU, developed the Center for Academic Service-Learning (CASL) as an institution-wide initiative. Its mission is to introduce and promote academic service-learning as a powerful pedagogy for all disciplines. CASL has provided faculty development workshops and academic service-learning resources, as well as personalized mentoring, peer consultation, partnership building, and interdisciplinary team project development opportunities.

A fictitious course for students from all School of Education programs is located on the School of Education Webfolio system where students can post their service learning reflections.

Study Abroad

One of the ways that we have increased student engagement in educationally related experiences beyond the classroom is through Study Abroad. Three years ago, Study Abroad at CLU was coordinated by a faculty member as an “overload” assignment. There was no budget and the location for the Study Abroad Office was in a storage room. Given the significance of Study Abroad with the CLU mission, to educate leaders for a global society..., and our emphasis on student engagement as well as our Student Learning Outcome of Cultural Competency, we have made recent efforts to enhance the opportunities for CLU students to study abroad.

A ten-hour per week Coordinator for Study Abroad was hired in the Fall of 2004. Since that time, Lisa Bjelke has been promoted to Director of Study Abroad and devotes 2/3 time to the position. In February of 2006, a Study Abroad Continuous Improvement Project was undertaken with 10 team members representing Academic Affairs, the Business Office, Admissions, Institutional Research, and the Study Abroad Center, as well as a visiting faculty member who had experience directing Study Abroad at another institution. This Study Abroad Team met twice each month and resolved a number of issues. As a result, we now have better coordination with the Registrar’s Office, Student Accounts, and Admissions. We have also developed a budget for Study Abroad with accounts for each program, and we renovated an office space for Study Abroad across from the cafeteria, which is an area with heavy foot traffic. These efforts have resulted in a 100% increase in number of students involved in Study Abroad from 2003 to 2006 (50 students were involved in 2003-04 and 100 students in 2006-07).

The Director of Study Abroad created a survey for students to complete when they return to CLU. This survey was first used in Spring of 2005, was revised in Spring 2006, and was more recently revised in Fall
Second Objective Outcomes

The following examples highlight measures used to evaluate our progress towards increasing engagement: National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) & Beginning College Student Survey (BCSS) The results of the NSSE items related to engagement indicate some areas of growth as well as some concerns (see NSSE Data):

- On questions related to the “Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark,” first year students’ combined results were similar in 2001 and 2005, while seniors increased slightly from 2001 to 2005.

- On items related to “Student-Faculty Interaction Benchmark,” seniors reported an increase (46.3 to 49.4); however, first year students showed a significant decrease—from 44.7 to 33. The decline in first year responses from 2001 to 2005 brings us more in line with nationwide averages for these items. This decline comes from first year student responses to the following questions:
  - Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
  - Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
  - Discussed ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
  - Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)
  - Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)

On these same items, senior responses either remained the same from 2001 to 2005, or increased. Table 3 compares the BCSS questions about expectations for the first three NSEE items noted above:

Table 3
NSSE / BSSE Items related to Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Means Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About how often have you done each of the following...</td>
<td>NSSE 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(on a 4-point scale)</td>
<td>(n = 231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>Senior Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In each case, beginning students’ expectations were higher than what they experienced at the end of their first year; however, the expectations were more in line with what senior students reported that they experienced.

Other areas in the NSSE results indicate improvement on student engagement in the learning process. Comparing 2001 to 2005, both first year students and seniors scored higher in 2005 on the following questions:
• Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
• Made a class presentation
• Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)

This data indicates that we are making progress getting students involved in class activities and presentations, and that students are engaged in the subject matter through discussions outside of class. While progress is being made in these areas, we realize that we need to make more effort to improve faculty-student interactions, particularly with first year students.

Evidence of Engagement in Academic Programs In preparation for this review, the faculty have reflected on changes that they have made to increase challenge and engagement in their classes and in academic programs. An inventory of those reflections includes the following examples on enhancing engagement:

• Use of project-based learning assignments
• Run a survey at the beginning of the semester to tailor a course to student interests
• Added service learning option to SOC 300
• Many more field trips/re-enactors/speakers
• Game show format to encourage students to assume responsibility for the course material and to evaluate their classmates
• Use of Educue in classroom
• Added international component with visits to: National College school leadership in England, Regional leadership centers in England, schools in suburban and urban areas of England

Third Objective: Improve the Effectiveness of Orientation and Freshman Year Experiences by Introducing Students to an Academically Engaging Campus Culture

To address this third objective within the Challenge and Engagement theme, we developed a First Year Experience Task Force. Co-chaired by Dan Geeting, Coordinator of the Freshman Seminar course, and Bill Rosser, Vice President of Student Affairs, this group’s charge was to assess the first year student experience of CLU, articulating its goals, key components, strengths and limitations, and recommending future directions for this critical student transitional experience. To identify what constituted “first year experiences,” the task force conducted a survey to develop an inventory of the programs and courses that serve the freshman population, and to identify which of CLU’s Student Learning Outcomes are addressed in each program and course. Through this process, 36 programs and 23 courses were identified as serving freshmen. The programs and courses reported meeting the full spectrum of institutional Student Learning Outcomes.

After identifying and defining the “first year experiences,” the Task Force spent many months of evaluation, assessment, and analysis, including structured conversations with first year students. In March, 2005, they submitted an Executive Summary and Recommendations to the Provost, which listed 10 recommendations. A progress report on these recommendations was prepared in October, 2006.

The most significant change that has occurred in the past three years to improve the effectiveness of orientation and freshman year experiences by introducing students to an academically engaging campus culture has been the development of a theme for the freshman year with a related summer reading assignment and cultural activities throughout the fall semester. In 2005-06, the theme of “War and Responsibility” was selected for the first year experience. First year students received a copy of the book All Quiet on the Western Front with instructions to read it before arriving on campus for Orientation. In addition to using this book in the Freshman Seminar course, the following speakers were scheduled during the fall semester:
• “World War I–Lest We Forget”: Hal Ranzenhofer
• “The War Years 1941-1945”: Leonard Zerlin
• “Jungle Surgeon in the Highlands of Vietnam”: Robert Hochman, M. D.
• A Veterans Day panel

In addition, four movies were shown on campus related to the War and Responsibility theme (All Quiet on the Western Front, Memphis Belle, M.A.S.H., and Behind Enemy Lines).

For 2006-07, in an effort to focus on global issues and to tie into CLU’s mission statement, “to educate leaders for a global society,” it was decided to focus the first year experience on India. During the summer, first year students received Nectar in a Sieve by Kamala Markandaya. On the second day of Freshman Orientation, the peer advisors from the Freshman Seminar course led a discussion on the book. That night, the cafeteria served Indian food and students attended an evening performance of “Cultural Dances of India” by The Rangoli Foundation for Art and Culture—which included an interpretive dance related to the book. Later in the semester, a presentation introducing the study of India was given to all freshmen by Dr. Paul Hanson, Professor of History. Dr. Dan Geeting, Professor of Music and Director of Instrumental Music at CLU, presented a concert introducing the fundamentals of Indian Music. In addition, all freshmen participated in a field trip to the Hindu Temple in Malibu.

The incorporation of a theme, with a required book for all first year students, has helped us establish a culture of challenge and engagement with the students at the very outset of their experience at CLU. Another way that we have attempted to be more intentional about challenging first year students is through greater consistency in the Freshman Seminar course by establishing General Guidelines for Conducting a Freshman Advising Seminar. These Guidelines clarify the objectives of the course, as well as expectations for homework and written assignments.

Our work on the first year experience continues with a recently formulated First Year Experience Council, made up of three faculty, three staff from Student Affairs, three student orientation coordinators, and the Senior Director of Academic Support Programs. This Council meets monthly during the academic year and weekly during the summer. Its intent is to increase communication among those who are directly involved with freshman programs and courses.

**Conclusion**

This chapter, Increasing Challenge and Engagement, described how we have collected, analyzed, and applied data relative to our first theme—raising the level of challenge and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs. Some of the strategies and programs that we have implemented to address this theme include our focus group study, the development of the University Honors Program, and our focus on student research, faculty workshops, service learning, study abroad, and first year experiences. The evidence that we have gathered indicates we have made progress in raising the level of challenge and engagement at CLU.
Chapter 3: Enhancing Diversity

Chapter 1 described our Assessment System and institution-wide efforts to develop a culture of evidence at CLU. Chapter 2 addressed our first WASC theme: Raising the level of expectations, challenge, and engagement in CLU’s academic and co-curricular programs. In Chapter 3, we concentrate on the second theme that has served to focus the re-accreditation process: Enhancing engagement with diversity in the classroom and in the campus community as a whole.

The WASC Handbook (2001) suggested that “it is useful to think of diversity in higher education as having three vital and related dimensions: 1) representation; 2) the nature of campus community; and 3) the impact of group membership on both individual development and the content of academic scholarship and study (p. 71).” Our WASC Proposal followed this guideline and outlined three diversity-related objectives:

First Objective: Increase the diversity of the student body, faculty, staff and governing board;

Second Objective: Strengthen the understanding and appreciation of diversity, and strengthen global awareness in the campus environment and community;

Third Objective: Expand and deepen the treatment of domestic and global diversity in the curriculum.

Our diversity plan is ambitious and has unfolded in many stages and incorporated many components. We have sought to transform the very nature of the campus: the composition of the students, faculty and staff; the nature of relationships between people; the priorities in strategic planning; the content of courses and co-curricular offerings; and interrelationships with external communities. Because the diversity plan is an ongoing process, many of our efforts are “under construction.” Some CLU sectors still consider diversity only as an afterthought, a product and not a developmental process, and some students report being dissatisfied with the existing level of diversity on the campus.

While our process of developing and implementing the diversity plan has not been linear, it has been consistent in its goals. Our initial plans and strategies have evolved to take advantage of emerging opportunities. The flexibility and the support of the administration have been key factors in increasing our student, faculty and staff diversity, fostering a more diversely engaged campus climate, and establishing an infrastructure for the continued strengthening of CLU’s academic culture through engagement with otherness.

In 2003, we obtained a $400,000 James Irvine Foundation Grant to support our diversity efforts. The grant has made a lasting impact on the campus so that, while there is still work to do, a critical mass of students and faculty demand exposure to diverse peoples and perspectives. Diversity has become not simply an openly discussed and debated issue; it has become a central element in our thinking about the future.

This chapter includes descriptions of studies we have conducted, our strategies and their outcomes, continuing challenges, and future plans relative to each of our three diversity objectives.

First Objective: Increase the Diversity of the Student Body, Faculty, Staff and Governing Board

Increasing the Diversity of the Student Body

Since developing its diversity initiatives in the 2003 WASC proposal, CLU has increased the percentage of underrepresented (African American, Latino, Asian-American/Pacific Islander, American Indian, Multiracial) first time freshmen to the highest levels in the history of the institution. In 2003, underrepresented and international students (non-resident aliens) made up 23% of CLU’s first-time freshmen; in 2004 this increased to 35%. We were at 30% in 2005 and 31% in 2006.
The significant gains in diversity of all students since 2003 are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4  
**Diversity of CLU Students in 2003 and 2006 by Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Categories</th>
<th>Traditional Undergraduate</th>
<th>ADEP</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>30 (1.8%)</td>
<td>49 (2.7%)</td>
<td>7 (2.5%)</td>
<td>9 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>199 (12%)</td>
<td>249 (13.5%)</td>
<td>46 (16.4%)</td>
<td>48 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American/</td>
<td>72 (4.3%)</td>
<td>91 (4.9%)</td>
<td>14 (5%)</td>
<td>15 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17 (1%)</td>
<td>20 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.7%)</td>
<td>2 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>60 (3.6%)</td>
<td>101 (5.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Resident Aliens</td>
<td>41 (2.5%)</td>
<td>50 (2.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0.7%)</td>
<td>6 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Campus Total %)</td>
<td>419 (25.3%)</td>
<td>560 (30.4%)</td>
<td>67 (23.8%)</td>
<td>80 (28.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLU is at a record high in the institution’s history in number of underrepresented students enrolled in the traditional undergraduate program, the Adult Degree Evening Program (ADEP), and the graduate programs. CLU’s success in improving its student diversity is due to a variety of factors. The following six strategies are examples we have put in place to increase student diversity:

- **Increased outreach** through the United Outreach Services (UNOS) program. UNOS, a regional consortium of college counselors, reaches out to Latino students in Ventura County, giving presentations to area schools and working closely with the Chicano Youth Leadership Conference. CLU’s admission personnel have been involved with UNOS for 10 years, presenting college and career information to high school students and their parents. The consortium includes one representative school from: the UC system, the CSU system, the community college system, and the private school system (CLU has always been the singular private school representative). Anecdotal evidence suggests that a number of students have enrolled at CLU because of their exposure to this program.

- **The Multicultural Overnight (MCO) Program**, one of our most successful strategies in attracting students of color to our traditional undergraduate program, is a three day Spring semester celebration of social, cultural and academic events intended to showcase CLU’s institutional strengths. CLU provides travel and lodging to students of color who have already been admitted, but not yet enrolled. The average yield rate of 62% for the past three years far exceeds that of the student of color pool that did not participate in the program (120 matriculates out of a possible 381 admitted students for a 31.5% yield rate).

- **The Division of Undergraduate Enrollment** has demonstrated its commitment to our diversity objectives by awarding institutional financial aid to increase matriculation rates of underrepresented groups at CLU. The University upgrades both scholarship awards and the percentage of need met for students who identify themselves as Latino, Asian, Native American or African American.

- **The College Summit** has been hosted by CLU since 2002. On August 10-13, 2006, 44 students from predominantly African American and Latino schools stayed on the CLU campus and participated in workshops geared toward helping them navigate the college application process.
• *The Division of Undergraduate Enrollment* hired a coordinator for multicultural admissions to increase diversity in the undergraduate student body. This position was initially funded through the Irvine Grant, but has now been institutionalized. The position was recently upgraded to Associate Director of Multicultural Recruitment.

• *The University hosted* 43 high school counselors from area high schools for tours of campus, lunch and a presentation on the benefits of a CLU education (September 15, 2006). The Division of Undergraduate Enrollment targeted its invitations to include counselors from Los Angeles and Ventura County schools with large percentages of ethnic minority students. The event was part of a broader initiative by the University to enhance its relations with counselors who have regular interaction with students who are considering their college options.

**Retaining a Diverse Student Body** We have made appreciable gains in retaining the number of undergraduate Hispanic, Caucasian and African-American students from the first to second year. We have also seen a greater proportion of Asian-Americans, African-Americans and Caucasian students graduated by their *sixth year*. Three of our strategies designed to improve retention rates of underrepresented students include:

• *Two new programs specifically for Black students* were implemented in the Fall of 2006 to improve retention in response to lower overall GPAs and graduation rates: 1) BEST (Black Students Engaged in Study) included twenty-four Black students divided into 6 teams according to major; 2) the TAPPS Project (Taking Academic Performance and Persistence Seriously) included 41 Black male participants. This program tracks co-curricular, academic, and social progress while providing programming and individual advisement to encourage strong academic performance, participation, and persistence.

• *The FOCUS (Faculty/Administrator Outreach and Commitment to Underrepresented Students)* Mentoring Program has been successful in retaining students of color by providing them with vital mentor relationships. Each mentor attends a one-hour mentoring workshop and receives a handbook and two meal tickets to assist with the mentoring process. In 2004, five FOCUS Mentoring faculty members and twelve administrators mentored a total of 48 new students. The following fall, 94% of these students were registered for classes. In 2005, fifteen faculty members and ten administrators volunteered to mentor 41 new students of color who signed up for the program. Eighty-eight percent of those students registered for fall 2006 classes. This year, twelve faculty members and eight administrators are mentoring 37 new students of color.

• *Summer Orientation to Academic Resources (SOAR)* is part of our Student Support Services Program. This week-long orientation gives first generation/low income freshmen opportunities to interact and to access resources before Freshman Orientation. The program has proven to be a strong indicator of success for the students who participate. Fourteen of the original 17 SOAR participants (2002) graduated in 2006. In 2005 and 2006, we saw a decline in the number of students interested in taking part in the program, which is an area of focus for the current staff.

**Increasing the Diversity of the Faculty**

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. The strategies we have implemented to encourage hiring of diverse faculty include the following:

• The Department of Human Resources worked with the Provost, Associate Provost, and Deans’ Council to update the academic search policies and procedures.
In the fall of 2004 and 2005, two workshops were facilitated for deans and faculty department chairs who were conducting searches to ensure a more consistent approach to faculty recruitment. Presentations were given at these workshops on hiring for diversity.

In 2005, CLU offered five $5,000 development grants to faculty of color who had applied for faculty positions. Each of the five faculty of color who were offered development grants ultimately decided to accept CLU’s employment offer.

**Increasing the Diversity of the Staff, Administration, and Board**

In 2005, persons from underrepresented populations accounted for almost 30% of full-time classified staff positions. This increase of 29% since 2002 came almost exclusively from increases in hires from Asian-American and Latino populations. The percentage of underrepresented staff increased an additional 6% to 36% in Fall 2006, partly due to in-sourcing our housekeeping staff. Housekeeping staff had previously been out-sourced; due, however, to the fact that these employees were receiving minimal benefits, it was decided to discontinue the outsourcing contracts and make these individuals employees of CLU. Although this resulted in additional costs to the University, we felt that it was an ethically appropriate decision and supported the mission of the institution.

The percentage of administrators from diverse racial and ethnic groups increased slightly from 2004 (20%) to 2005 (23%), but has dropped back a bit in 2006 (to 21%). The percentage of new hires of administrators and staff from underrepresented groups in 2004-05 was 31.8%, compared with 19.5% the previous year. While CLU has added a number of diverse administrators to the campus, there was a 30% turnover in administrative staff from fall 2005 to fall 2006.

The following are examples of strategies that CLU has put in place to increase the diversity percentages of staff and administration:

- In May 2004 and 2005, the Department of Human Resources facilitated two supervisory training workshops for staff and administration on effective interviewing strategies including hiring from underrepresented groups. Over 60 participants attended.

- The Department of Human Resources revised their search process and guidelines to include a renewed emphasis on hiring from underrepresented groups. Guidelines for searches are posted on CLU’s intranet.

- Search committees are intentionally designed to include representatives from underrepresented groups whenever possible.

An analysis of the Board of Regents membership over the past eight years indicates that we have made progress in increasing Board diversity. Comparing the data from the first four years with the last four years, we have increased diversity on the Board Regents by 86%, from an average of 7% in 1999-2003 to an average of 13% in 2003-2007.
Second Objective:
Strengthen the Understanding and Appreciation of Diversity, and Strengthen Global Awareness in the Campus Environment and Community

The Second Objective within this theme is related to one of our institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes, *Appreciation of Diversity*. The faculty defined this learning outcome as follows:

*Students will:*
- Understand and express the social importance of race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexuality, class and religion
- Understand and express an awareness of similarities and differences among groups and individuals
- Understand and express an increased understanding and respect for people of different cultures

CLU has embedded strategies in numerous events and programs to strengthen the understanding and appreciation of diversity, and to strengthen global awareness in the campus environment and community.

- **Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World** In the summer of 2004, 11 students were taught to be Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World during a three-day experience. During the fall of 2004, the CLU Ambassadors facilitated a total of nine diversity workshops, primarily in the Freshmen Seminar classes. The purpose of the workshops was to improve campus climate for diversity by increasing student awareness in addressing issues of difference, inclusion, and social justice among peers. In 2005, another nine workshops were facilitated, and this year we are continuing the program with 12 Ambassadors. Student feedback from these workshops has been overwhelmingly positive (see student reflections).

- **Mini-grants for diversity programming** A number of mini-grants were awarded to campus members for diversity programming. The presence of this grant program is important for community building within diverse constituencies and resulted in the following outcomes:
  1. Expansion of the Asian Festival program
  2. Presentations to CLU diversity clubs on Study Abroad
  3. Development of *The Word*, a journal featuring original multicultural writings and art work by students, faculty and administrators
  4. Purchase of a video on diversity hiring for a workshop prior to the hiring of the new faculty in 2004 titled, “New Paradigms for Diversifying Faculty and Staff in Higher Education: Uncovering Cultural Biases in the Search and Hiring Process.”
  5. Development of an annual Cinco de Mayo Celebration
  6. Field trip sponsored for the Gay Straight Alliance
  7. Expansion of the campus World Fair—a celebration and learning opportunity that focuses on CLU’s international students and a way to promote study abroad programs.

- **Campus Diversity Initiative Retreat** CLU hosted an all-day retreat for faculty, staff, administrators, and students in January 2003 with Drs. Sharon Parker, Betty Schmitz, and Caroline Turner as guest facilitators. The purpose was to think about diversity within the context of a larger administrative and organizational strategic plan to help us genuinely pursue institutional improvement. A total of 109 were in attendance: 47 admin/staff, 55 faculty, and seven students (the event was scheduled during the winter break when most students were not on campus). Feedback from participants was provided on: the role of faculty and students in the diversity initiative; particular aspects of diversity and inclusion to which we especially need to give attention and resources; and, changes we want to make in our curriculum, programming, recruitment, and hiring.

- **Diversity Leadership Retreats** CLU held its first Diversity Leadership Retreat in February 2005. The “Lead Strong” retreat attracted over 100 student leaders who spent an entire day developing a student *campus diversity plan*. “Building Bridges,” the second Diversity Leadership Retreat (November,
2005), was a collaborative effort between Student Life and Multicultural Programs. The purpose of this retreat was to build on the student diversity plan from the previous spring and to help foster a stronger community among the 40 to 50 diverse student leaders across campus. An ethnically diverse group attended, including students from student government, RAs, peer advisors, multicultural club leaders, and interested students. At the conclusion, students reflected on what they learned about themselves or others as a result of this experience, and how the retreat would enhance their ability to lead on a diverse campus.

- **Culturally Proficient Practices** This diversity training event was co-sponsored in January, 2005, by Student Affairs and Dr. Randy Lindsey, the Interim Dean of the School of Education. The 30 attendees, equally divided between School of Education faculty and participants from Student Affairs, were introduced to the four tools of Cultural Proficiency. Participants were exposed to the idea that organizations thrive in diverse environments where individuals and organizations are committed to culturally proficient practices.

- **SST Diversity Workshop** On May 24, 2005, over 150 CLU employees attended a diversity workshop facilitated by SST Communications from Chicago. SST provided dramatic presentations that addressed: recognizing differences and capitalizing on them, identifying stereotypes, identifying and modifying problematic behavior, and paying attention to how language is used. After the presentations, small groups participated in various workshops led by SST consultants who facilitated discussions.

- **Focus group sessions** A task force from the President’s Diversity Council held several sessions with staff and administrative employees from underrepresented groups to gain insight into concerns and issues and to articulate their recommendations relative to embracing diversity on campus.

**Second Objective Outcomes**

CLU freshmen and seniors completed the National Student Survey of Engagement (NSSE) in 2001 and 2005. The NSSE results gave us an opportunity to compare data taken prior to our WASC diversity initiatives, and two years into our efforts. The data shows appreciable gains from 2001 to 2005 for both first year students and seniors in:

- students having serious conversations with students of a different ethnicity
- the institutional environment encouraging contact among students of different backgrounds
- students developing an understanding of people from other ethnic backgrounds

While these items were generally lower than those of “Selected Peers” and NSSE Nationwide results in 2001, by 2005 the CLU results were above these comparison groups.

In comparing disaggregated results from majority and minority groups, the NSSE data indicates general satisfaction from both student groups with the level of academic support at CLU. While no gains were made between 2001 and 2005, the mean responses are over “three” on a scale of 1 to 4, which means that the average respondent thought that CLU provided “quite a bit” of academic support.

Although the NSSE data also indicates that CLU students seem generally satisfied in their relationship with faculty, a small gap does exist between students of color and majority students, with majority students being higher in satisfaction. When Focus Groups were held in 2005 with students and faculty on questions related to challenge, engagement and diversity, the general consensus was that CLU is a welcoming place for diversity, particularly in classroom settings. Many of the students cited instances where diversity in the classroom enhanced the learning environment.

Additional data on appreciation of diversity is included in the discussion on “continuing challenges,” later in this chapter.
Third Objective:
Expand and Deepen the Treatment of Domestic and Global Diversity in the Curriculum

The Third Objective within this theme is related to one of our institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes, Cultural Competency. The faculty defined this learning outcome as follows:

Students will:
- Demonstrate an understanding of one or more historical eras and cultures outside of their own
- Identify and analyze critical ideas, traditions, and artifacts of other world cultures
- Compare cultures and their interactions systematically
- Describe how different cultures have contributed to the contemporary world
- Demonstrate strong cross-cultural analytic and communication skills

CLU has used several strategies to expand and deepen the treatment of domestic and global diversity in the curriculum.

• Changes in curriculum requirements Changes were made after we examined the undergraduate general studies requirements (“CORE 21”), particularly the Gender/Ethnic course requirement and the Global Perspectives course requirement. The courses listed in the catalog as satisfying the Gender/Ethnic requirement were intended to introduce students to both U.S. and global diversity issues, but many of these courses were either not being taught any more or were only peripherally related to issues of gender/ethnic diversity in the United States. At the urging of the President’s Diversity Council, a task force was initiated by the Educational Policies and Planning Committee (EPPC) in 2004 to look into revising the criteria for the Gender/Ethnic studies requirement. EPPC and the faculty approved renaming the requirement “U.S. Diversity” and creating clearer guidelines regarding the content. Faculty teaching courses that had previously qualified for the Gender/Ethnic requirement were asked to submit new applications to have the course qualify for the new U.S. Diversity criteria. The re-approval process was completed in the fall of 2005.

• A Center for Equality and Justice at CLU In an effort to create an institution-wide focus on diversity, three CLU faculty (José Marichal, Nandra Perry and Julia Fogg) began work in the summer of 2005 to develop a formal Center. Faculty working groups met in the spring of 2006 to form learning communities that address the following issues: religion and global change; immigration, Diaspora and cities; global media; health and social change; peacemaking and coalition building; and diversity and educational excellence. The learning communities are designed to engage faculty, students, staff, and others in questions of topical importance. The Center for Equality and Justice was officially approved by CLU in the fall of 2006 and is co-directed by two faculty members, Adina Nack and Greg Freeland. The mission of the Center is to promote social equality and justice by integrating teaching, service, scholarship, and community-based research through partnerships with diverse groups and communities.

• Thrivent Grant To strengthen the focus on diversity in our courses, CLU applied for and received a $50,000 grant from Thrivent Financial to initiate a service learning partnership with the neighboring community of Oxnard, a city with a majority Latino population. The co-principals on this grant are Pastor Melissa Maxwell-Doherty and Dr. José Marichal. Over 60 students (from Religion, Business, and Political Science) were involved in service projects with community-based organizations in Oxnard.

• Cultural Proficiency: Accessing Privilege and Entitlement as Components of Confronting Systemic Issues of Oppression Sixteen School of Education faculty participated in this workshop on November 17, 2006. The goals of the workshop were: 1) to develop capacity of members to discuss issues of oppression in the classroom; and 2) to develop strategies for working with degree and credential candidates to confront in a constructive manner issues that negatively affect students in P-12 schools.
• **McNair Program** In the spring of 2007, CLU is submitting a grant proposal to the United States Department of Education for a Ronald E. McNair Program (a federal TRIO Program). The McNair program would be the fourth TRIO program on campus providing services to first generation, low-income students and students with disabilities. The focus of the Ronald E. McNair program is to provide academic and social support to first generation/low income college students pursuing a graduate degree at the institution through involvement in research and other scholarly activities. The project would provide: academic counseling, financial aid assistance, mentoring, research opportunities, seminars, summer internships, and tutoring.

**Third Objective Outcomes**

**NSSE Data** The 2005 NSSE added the following new questions dealing directly with the development of cognitive complexity which result from increased exposure to diverse persons, experience and ideas:

How often have you…
- Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue?
- Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
- Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept?

Responses by CLU’s first year students on these items are comparable to other institutions; however, by the senior year, there is a noticeable gain by CLU students in all three of the areas ([see results](#)).

We are also encouraged by the student responses on the 2005 NSSE to “How often do courses include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.” The mean score, close to 3 on a scale of 1 to 4, indicates that the mean respondent thought there was “often” a discussion of diverse perspectives. (This question was not asked in 2001, so we do not have comparison data over time.) Compared to other institutions, both freshmen and seniors (2.88 and 2.97 respectively) scored above the means for selected peers (2.80 and 2.89) and NSSE Nationwide institutions (2.77 and 2.83).

**The School of Education** has emphasized diversity in its curriculum, and through its “STRIVE” value statement:

- **S** erve as mentors and models for moral and ethical leadership
- **T** hink critically to connect theory with practice
- **R** espect all individuals
- **I** nclude and respond to the needs of all learners
- **V** alue diversity
- **E** mpower individuals to participate in educational growth and change

CLU participated in a Comprehensive Evaluation of Professional Teacher Preparation in 2005, conducted by David P. Wright of the Institute for Education Reform. A survey was sent to supervisors of CLU alumni, and administered one year after students completed their program at CLU. Questions from the survey related to diversity indicate that the School of Education Multiple Subject program is effectively preparing graduates to meet the needs of students from diverse cultural backgrounds when compared with the other institutions that participated in the survey ([see data](#)). Graduates from our Single Subject program are doing well in understanding how personal, family and community conditions may affect learning, and knowing about resources in the school and community for at-risk students/families, however, there is still work to be done in the Single Subject program to prepare our graduates to meet the instructional needs of students who are English language learners and who are from diverse cultural backgrounds.
Conclusion

CLU has made great progress in its efforts to enhance engagement with diversity in the classroom and in the campus community as a whole. Since the start of this WASC re-accreditation process, we have reached the highest levels in the history of the institution in the percentage of underrepresented individuals in the following groups:

- First time freshmen
- Traditional undergraduate students
- ADEP undergraduate students
- Graduate students
- Full time faculty
- Staff and administration
- Members of the Board of Regents

We have implemented many successful strategies to increase enrollment and retention of underrepresented students. Indirect evidence from the NSSE also indicates improvements in areas related to strengthening the understanding and appreciation of diversity, and strengthening global awareness in the campus environment and community and expanding and deepening the treatment of domestic and global diversity in the curriculum.

We have seen many developments and positive results in our efforts to enhance engagement with diversity, but we know that there is still much to be done. We will now address some of the challenges that we continue to face, followed by our plans for continued improvement in the future.

Continuing Challenges

While we have made significant improvement in our efforts to increase the enrollment and retention of diverse students, we still face the following challenges:

- The percentage drop in transfer students from underrepresented groups (including multiracial and non resident aliens) is an area of concern. We were at an all time high of 40% in 2003, but that dropped to 31% in 2004, 32% in 2005, and 33% in 2006 (Latino enrollment is down 10% from 2003). We believe that much of this decline can be attributed to increased competition from the newly developed California State University Channel Islands, located approximately 15 miles from CLU. We are, however, disturbed by this trend and want to refocus our efforts in recruiting a diverse pool of transfer students.

- The decrease in Latino students who graduated by their sixth year is another notable and troubling trend. Sixty-three percent of the 1997 cohort of Latino students graduated in six years, while only 51% of the 1999 cohort of Latino students graduated in six years. The CLU exit survey data suggests that Latino students are more likely to stop out or drop out for financial reasons.

We also face challenges in hiring and retaining diverse faculty, staff and administrators:

- Our desire to increase the diversity of part-time faculty has not improved as much as we would like. Although we have slightly increased from 9% in 2001 to 12% in 2006, discussion within the President’s Diversity Council speculated that the low per-credit wages offered to adjuncts relative to other institutions made it more difficult for part-time faculty outside of the area to teach courses at CLU. Because Thousand Oaks has a low number of persons of color, low wages become a particular problem in recruiting diverse faculty.
• A challenge for CLU is to attract quality staff and administrators of color to an area with an increasingly high cost of living. This is particularly difficult because salaries at CLU are below average. Several faculty members have identified the lack of race/ethnic/gender diversity in CLU’s senior administration as a significant problem.

Although we have developed many activities and events to strengthen the understanding and appreciation of diversity, and strengthen global awareness in the campus environment and community, the following issues still concern us:

• The perception remains among a number of students and faculty that there is a reluctance to discuss or address issues of racism, sexism or sexual orientation discrimination. This is further challenging because of the low number of African-American, Asian-American and American-Indian students at CLU. Students from these groups are often the only one from their group in the residence hall suites, in student leadership groups or in the classroom, which can place a great deal of pressure on many students of color who feel their views are excluded or marginalized.

• When we disaggregated the data from the 2005 Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey, there were disturbing differences in the perceptions of minority students versus majority students, illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5
Comparison of Statistically Significant Means, Minority vs. Majority Groups (2005 Noel Levitz Survey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (Student Satisfaction)</th>
<th>Minority mean (N=75)</th>
<th>Majority Mean (N=244)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most students feel a sense of belonging here</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of pride about my campus</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are made to feel welcome on this campus</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a significant amount of respect for people of different ethnic and racial backgrounds</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a significant level of exposure to diverse cultures at CLU</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority Profile (African-American = 4, American Indian = 1, Hispanic = 31, Asian-American 24, Other Race = 15) 1-7 scale (1 = not satisfied at all and 7 = very satisfied)

Of note is that these same questions did not produce statistically significant differences when asked in 2001. The Diversity Council and Assessment Committee have discussed these data and the feeling in both groups was that this trend may indicate that the students of color are claiming a greater sense of ownership over the campus. Clearly, we need to continue to focus on these areas to ensure that all students feel a sense of belonging, have a sense of pride about the campus, and perceive that there is respect for diversity at CLU.

• A web-based campus climate survey was administered to all staff and administration in 2005. The results indicated strong endorsement (82%) for the overall campus climate being “accepting and welcoming for employees of underrepresented groups.” However, less than 60% of the respondents felt that the University thoroughly addresses campus issues related to ethnic diversity, and that the University has visible leadership from the administration who foster diversity. We are concerned about comments from the survey from a smaller number who indicated that they hear insensitive or disparaging remarks on campus about underrepresented groups and have observed or experienced conduct that has been offensive, intimidating, or has interfered with work. The majority felt that it would be helpful to provide more awareness/sensitivity workshops and to develop a mentoring program for new employees to help create a sense of community for underrepresented groups.
The results of both the Noel-Levitz and the Campus Climate Survey provide clear evidence that there is still much work to be done at CLU to enhance engagement with diversity. The following section describes the plans that we have developed for continued work in this area.

**Future Plans for Enhancing Institution-Wide Diversity at CLU**

In terms of admissions and financial aid for ethnic minority students, our Division of Undergraduate Enrollment has recommended the following strategies for the future:

- *Focus recruitment among specific diversity organizations*, while maintaining traditional high school visits and college fair outreach. Specifically, the admissions staff should work with the following groups: UNOS, Fulfillment Fund, Upward Bound, Young Black Scholars, College Summit, Project Grad., Posse, MESA, National Hispanic Institute, Talent Search, Ventura County African American Churches, and other organizations that work with American Indian and Asian American high school students.

- *Establish ongoing strategic planning to enhance minority transfer recruitment* including documentation of initiatives and best practices. An initiative will be to develop a Transfer Minority Recruitment Plan that includes:
  - recruitment with specific groups like MESA/Community College Honors Program
  - creating CLU Summer Minority Academic Programs for transfer students
  - creating a Minority Student Transfer Day and/or transfer overnight program

- *Focus matriculation efforts* on American Indian, Asian, and African American students by inviting a greater number of admitted minority students to the Multicultural Overnight program.

- *Review and evaluate the success of financial aid strategies* for targeted students among ethnic minority groups, especially in terms of matriculation and retention of those students.

- *Build and develop a larger MCR admissions staff* by focusing on the recruitment and hiring of interns, student workers, Team Hospitality Hosts, and Tour Guides. In addition, we will explore the idea of creating a student admissions club (CLU Inclusive) which would help our overall recruitment efforts among all ethnic minority groups.

CLU’s new President and Provost have initiated plans to ensure that we continue to enhance engagement with diversity. 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 new charge to the PDC is to gather information, analyze data, disseminate information, make recommendations, and put together a yearly diversity summit.

The newly approved Center for Equality and Justice serves to develop teaching, research, and service by becoming a nexus for collaboration and interdisciplinary collegiality. This Center will provide the structure for CLU to continue to expand and deepen the treatment of domestic and global diversity in the curriculum.
The final comments of our Educational Effectiveness Report highlight five key messages that have emerged and have permeated this document. Our reflections synthesize our findings, describe the impact, acknowledge the challenges, and identify the recommendations and next steps for future growth:

1. **Program Reviews** We have implemented a new process, developed a handbook and template, and successfully completed program reviews for the past three years. By the end of the 2006-2007 academic year, we will have completed 13 program reviews in the Arts & Sciences (45%), 3 in Business (27%), and 4 in Education (67%). Although we have not yet completed reviews of all programs on campus, we are confident that through our collaborative efforts and the dedication of resources, we will continue to complete the remaining programs and then start the cycle again. We also anticipate that during the interim years, faculty will implement annual plans to support and contribute data towards the cycle. The impact of program reviews is evident in the positives outcomes that are described in Chapter 1.

One challenge in getting program reviews up and running has been the skepticism of faculty due to past experiences of completing a program review report only to find that it just “sits on a shelf.” We are beginning to change this mindset as faculty who recently completed program reviews are able to articulate the positive outcomes from their reviews and are mentoring their colleagues. Our new leadership team at CLU is very supportive of program reviews and has been helpful in encouraging faculty participation.

Our recommended plans for future growth related to program reviews include:

- Following the schedule and completing the full cycle of program reviews by 2010
- Reviewing and revising our process in support of continuous improvement
- Inviting faculty who complete program reviews to present their findings at the annual Assessment Symposium
- Implementing a process for regular follow up of annual progress within the cycle

2. **Student Learning Outcomes** It took three years for us to develop faculty-driven institution-wide student learning outcomes and to create definitions crafted and approved by the faculty. Ten years ago, “student learning outcomes” was not a phrase to be heard at CLU. The impact of our efforts is evident in the integration of SLOs throughout the institution. We realize, however, that there is a large number of new faculty who have been hired at CLU in the past five years. In preparing for this WASC review, questions by newer faculty have arisen about the institution-wide SLOs, wondering how and why they were selected. As a result of these comments, we are planning to revisit the SLOs in 2007-08 to encourage discussion, ensure that there is full faculty buy-in, and to make students more aware of our SLOs.

One challenge is to raise the awareness of our adjunct faculty regarding SLOs. While our full-time faculty are very familiar with the institution-wide student learning outcomes, it is more of a challenge to reach our adjunct faculty. We have attempted to do this by mailing the SLO document to adjunct faculty with their contracts, sending instructions on how to imbed them into syllabi, and holding a number of workshops with adjunct faculty to discuss the SLOs. We are making efforts to communicate with our adjuncts, and we realize that we need to continue to include them in the conversation.
Our recommended plans for future growth related to SLOs include:

- Reviewing our institution-wide SLOs in 2007-08 to provide opportunities for all faculty to engage in conversations about the relevance of our current list of 14 SLOs, as well as the definitions.
- Continuing to measure SLOs at the course, program, and institution levels.
- Reviewing “CORE 21” (to begin within the next two years) with conversations about aligning the requirements with our institution-wide SLOs, as well as establishing a set of SLOs specific to our general education.
- Reviewing the Honors Program with a particular focus toward the mission of the program and the alignment of SLOs with the program.
- Creating an Information Literacy learning continuum that specifies incremental levels of expectation from undergraduate to graduate levels. Data will be collected to indicate whether students have achieved the learning outcomes along the continuum.
- Redesigning our Alumni Survey to increase response rates and to gather data from alumni related to our SLOs and programs.
- Analyzing data already collected on Service Learning to support our institution-wide SLOs on Service to the Community and Field-Specific Knowledge and Experience.

3. **Diversity** We have made improvements in all three of our diversity objectives: increasing numbers of diverse people; improving appreciation of diversity; and, incorporating diversity more into the curriculum. The impact is evident through both the momentum on campus and the many new initiatives and programs. We realize that while we are on the right path, there is still a long journey ahead. A faculty development workshop in January, 2007, will reflect on the areas that still need our attention to enhance diversity at CLU.

One challenge resulted from our recent transition in leadership, which occurred as our Irvine Diversity grant came to an end, causing a brief delay in planning our next steps. With a permanent President and Provost now in place, we have designated a Coordinator of the Campus Diversity Initiatives, created a new President’s Diversity Council, and approved a new Center for Equality and Social Justice. The budget committee has been charged by the President to ensure that diversity initiatives receive operational funding.

Our recommended plans for future growth related to diversity include:

- Working the initiatives from the Irvine Diversity Grant into the permanent budget for 2007-08.
- Establishing a plan for continued growth and new strategies to enhance diversity at CLU.
- Contributing to diversity initiatives within our academic programs and research through the newly established Center for Equality and Social Justice.

4. **Challenge and Engagement** We were advised by WASC when we first proposed this theme that it would be difficult to tackle, because it is so extensive and it permeates everything that we do. But we decided to continue with the theme for that very reason: challenge and engagement are the essence of why we exist and are central to educational effectiveness. We have been impacted by discussions on this theme which delve into the very nature of who we are and what we do.
One challenge in our early attempts to define and assess challenge and engagement was with faculty concerns about how these are measured (e.g., the NSSE criteria: number of books assigned; number of papers required; etc). We found it difficult to define challenge and engagement in ways that were both acceptable to faculty and that were measurable. Looking back on the experience, our struggles with defining challenge and engagement led us to deeper levels of conversation and enriched the process. Because we had to struggle with these concepts, it forced more conversation and led to our focus group study. Faculty are encouraged to consider how challenge and engagement occur within their discipline, and through the program review process they will continue to be engaged in discussions about program initiatives, assignments and activities that foster challenge and engagement.

Our plans for future growth related to challenge and engagement include:

- Analyzing and reflecting on data collected from students who have studied abroad to determine how the experience has enhanced their engagement in the learning process
- Reviewing our course evaluation forms to develop items that best reflect perceptions of “challenge” and “engagement”
- Encouraging continued efforts to enhance student and faculty/student research
- Incorporating more direct evidence of challenge and engagement

5. **Culture of Evidence** We were surprised that there was such a strong emphasis on Assessment in the Capacity and Preparatory Review team visit. Our expectation was that the CPR visit would focus mainly on capacity issues: facilities, strategic planning, infrastructure, policies, personnel, etc. Clearly, the visiting team was concerned about our lack of information on Assessment in our CPR report, and much of the visit focused on our preparation for the Educational Effectiveness review. It became evident to us that there was much work to do to enhance our Assessment work. This has been a primary focus since the CPR visit, and has resulted in a clear shift in our culture.

One challenge that we faced was when our former Director of Assessment left CLU three months after the CPR visit, and we had a six-month vacancy in the position. However, we have made enormous strides since we hired our new Director of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness. One example of our progress was at the first annual Assessment Symposium, held in May 2006, where people throughout the campus were able to hear examples of ways that we are collecting evidence and using it for reflection and decision making. Data-driven problem solving is becoming a common practice at CLU.

Our recommended plans for future growth related to a culture of evidence include:

- Continuing to revise surveys and improve processes assisted by “Survey Central”
- Reviewing all School of Education programs and analyzing outcomes evidence in preparation for our 2008 NCATE review
- Hosting the second annual Assessment Symposium in May, 2007, where we will highlight the use of evidence throughout the institution
The more we reflect on these five areas, the more we realize that they are all interrelated, and in fact, are impossible to tease apart:

- Our shift toward a Culture of Evidence comes as a result of the work we have accomplished in program reviews and measuring SLOs, as well as our emphasis on collecting and analyzing evidence to support challenge, engagement, and diversity.

- Our discussions on challenge and engagement overlap with discussions on SLOs

- Our work on enhancing diversity also leads to an increase in challenge and engagement. As students are expected to address diverse viewpoints, they are challenged to a new level. And, as we encourage interaction among diverse students, they are more deeply engaged.

- Our Program Reviews replicate the Culture of Evidence described by WASC. Data are provided to faculty for review and reflection, to analyze and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program, and to make data-driven plans for the future.

- Sections of the Program Reviews ask faculty to write about challenge, engagement, and diversity. Institution-wide SLOs are aligned in a curriculum map, and faculty develop program-specific SLOs.

Preparing for our WASC re-accreditation has been a meaningful learning experience for our community. We have grown through self-reflection, the development of new processes and strategies, and the achievement of our goals. We are proud of our progress and confident that we are developing a culture of evidence at California Lutheran University that will support us as we continue into the future.
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Appendix A
Responses to Recommendations from the Capacity & Preparatory Review

The Report of the WASC Visiting Team for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (2005) listed nine specific recommendations. These recommendations are listed below with an explanation of the progress we are making in each area.

1. **Continue the recent progress it has made in program review and the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes, making them an ongoing and integral part of the academic enterprise.**

   We have been very deliberate to make program reviews a central focus during this re-accreditation process. We now have an effective program review process in place and have been successful in its implementation and in using program reviews to affect change. Since our Capacity and Preparatory review, we have revised our program review template which incorporates the previously separate Assessment Plan, created a Program Review Handbook, established a clearer timetable for each step of the process, developed criteria and expectations for external reviewers, and redesigned our schedule for future program reviews. We have also established the concept that program reviews are an ongoing annual process of gathering, interpreting, and reflecting upon data which is cumulatively reported at the end of the seven year cycle, as opposed to the previous notion that the review occurred once every seven years. Our progress on program reviews is addressed in detail in Chapter 1 of this report. The assessment of Student Learning Outcomes is an integral part of the institution and is discussed throughout this report.

2. **Ensure that the current diversity initiative is worked into the fabric and budget of the institution so that it is sustainable beyond the period of the current Irvine Foundation grant.**

   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 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.

3. **Continue its strong focus on increasing academic challenge and engagement.**

   We have continued to collect, analyze, and apply data on increasing academic challenge and engagement. Some of the strategies and programs that we have implemented include our focus group study, the development of the University Honors Program, and our focus on student research, service learning, and study abroad. The evidence that we have gathered indicates we have made progress in raising the level of challenge and engagement at CLU. This is addressed in detail throughout Chapter 2 of this report.

4. **Increase support for faculty development, particularly in the area of scholarly and creative activity.**

   We have made progress in support for faculty development through increased funding, faculty workshops on scholarship, and grant writing support. In the fall of 2005, funding of $1,000 per faculty member was added to the budget for faculty development; this is in addition to the Hewlett Grants which are available by application. This is the first effort by CLU to provide significant development funding annually for all faculty.

   Workshops on scholarship/creative activity have also been offered to support and encourage faculty development. A January 2006 faculty workshop was held with Dr. Mitchell Malachowski from the University of San Diego, who spoke on “The wonders of research at a small, comprehensive university . . . and the hazards.” The 2006 faculty retreat included sessions on Librarians as Partners in Teaching and Scholarship, How to Write a Grant Proposal, and a panel presentation, Spotlight on Faculty Scholarship. In February and
March 2006, faculty and staff presented five topics at the Faculty Research Series organized by Drs. Sue Bauer and Deb Erickson.

In July 2006, CLU filled a new position to provide grant writing support for faculty scholarship. The new Assistant Director of Foundation Relations, Marsha Anderson, is assigned to the institutional advancement department. With a background in college-level teaching, student services administration and grant writing, her role is to research, plan, and develop new grant seeking opportunities for the University with foundations, corporations, and federal agencies. At the time of this report, Anderson had worked with 10 faculty; 24 letters of inquiry and/or full proposals for funding had been submitted. In a new decentralized model for advancement, a development officer, Kristine Calara, was hired in September 2006 to work with the School of Education. She was previously a development officer with Scripps. Additionally, a development officer for the School of Business will begin work at CLU in January 2007.

5. Redouble its efforts to provide competitive faculty compensation and to assist faculty in securing affordable housing.

A Faculty Compensation Paper was prepared in May 2006 by the Deans Council and presented to the President’s Cabinet, the Board of Regents, and the faculty. This document presents a list of issues that need to be addressed in the context of total compensation and the strategic management of our human capital related resources:

- Base Compensation and Salary Increases
  - Base pay
  - Increases at promotion and tenure
  - Gender based differences in pay
  - Discipline-based differences in pay
  - Merit Increases

- Housing

- Building a System for Managing Total Compensation
  - Creating Perceived Value
  - Load Assignments and Overload Pay

- Adequately Supporting Professional Development
  - Support for new faculty members
  - Support for more senior faculty members to build or rebuild scholarship skills
  - Grants of time and/or money could be rewards (awards) for meritorious scholarly performance

Discussion groups at the August faculty retreat addressed these issues, with feedback and further conversation at faculty meetings during the Fall of 2006. Faculty and staff compensation are among the highest priorities for the 2007-08 budget. A faculty housing plan is underway and will be presented in the Spring of 2007.

We made some progress on our adjunct salaries by increasing them 12.5% in 2006. We plan to increase these salaries an additional 11% in 2007. This will bring the adjunct faculty salaries from $800 per credit in 2005 to $1000 per credit in 2007.

6. Reduce its high discount rate.

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 table below illustrates the movement of the freshman and overall discount rates for the past five years. 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. The one note of concern is how the reduction of the discount rate will impact accessibility of students with lesser financial means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Discount Rate</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Discount Rate</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Increase on-line information resources to support academic programs, especially at the graduate level.

Since March 2005, the Office of Information Systems and Services and in particular Pearson Library has made a concentrated effort to build on-line collections that will support all academic programs with a focus on graduate and adult re-entry students. The on-line resources added over the past 18 months are listed below (see descriptions)

- American and French Research on the Treasury of the French Language (ARTFL)
- Black Drama
- Black Thought and Culture
- Books 24x7: Business Pro
- Business Abstracts – Wilson
- E-BRARY
- General Sciences Full Text
- Grove's Art Online
- GuideStar
- Latino Literature
- OmniFile Full Text Mega
- Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center
- Oxford Reference Collection
- PsycBooks
- Readers' Guide Full Text
- Reference Library – Gale Virtual Reference
- Sage On-line Publications
- SCOPUS
- Social Sciences Full Text

In addition to acquiring these additional resources, the staff has promoted these additions by continuing to hold workshops for faculty in the Schools of Business and Education, new student orientations for all graduate and adult programs, adding links to the resources on the Electronic Resources web page, highlighting new resources, and plans are under way to hold a workshop in January 2007 to promote Pearson Library’s 47,000 e-books. Library support for the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership is summarized in the Library Collection Development Plan developed for the Ed.D. program review.

8. Clarify the role of the Provost in relation to the President and the other vice presidents.

At the time of the Capacity and Preparatory Review, our Provost of 12 years had recently resigned and we had an Interim Provost in place. During the term of the Interim Provost, the Vice President of Administration and Finance was designated as the second in command, after the President. There was concern from the faculty at that time that academics were not at the forefront. This situation has changed with the appointment of Dr. Chris Kimball as Provost in June of 2006. Our new President, Dr. John Sladek, has made it clear that the Provost is second in command, and the concerns from the faculty about the role of the Provost have been put to rest.
9. Consider reducing the proliferation of small academic departments to see if the University can achieve greater synergies and efficiencies.

We have not yet addressed this issue due to the significant upper leadership transitions that we have experienced. We anticipate this issue will be addressed by the permanent Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences who will be hired this summer.
## Appendix B

### Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (“Data Element 7.1”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination).</th>
<th>Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Catalog, brochures</td>
<td>Student Work Samples</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 21 (General Ed)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td>Student Work Samples</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Arts and Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Have formal learning outcomes been developed?</th>
<th>Where are these learning outcomes published? (Please specify)</th>
<th>Other than GPA, what measures/indicators are used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination).</th>
<th>Date of last program review for this degree program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>BIEN 210, 220 Capstone</td>
<td>(2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Chem 405 / 111</td>
<td>(2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Midterm &amp; Final mapped to objectives - Com 101 / 401, Criteria-referenced evaluation, embedded assignment - Com 231 / Capstone course</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Assignments, programming/Written Exams, Capstone course</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science (Masters)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Course assignments in upper division major courses, survey with course evaluation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science &amp; Sports Medicine</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Embedded ESSM 201, 202, 494 Clinical proficiency check-off sheets</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Capstone, work samples: written assignments, research papers, Powerpoint presentations, email journals, audio cassette recordings. Final exams</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Cumulative Final Exam - Geol 331 / 311 / 312 / 335 /; 332 Embedded Evaluation -Geol 421</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Syllabus Requirement</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #1, #2, #3, #4, #5 - Hnrs 115 (Criteria referenced assessment of 1 assignment each semester)</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>website, syllabi, webfolio Webfolio Assessment</td>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #3 Mus 258; Embedded #4 Mus 302; Recital Score - Senior Recital</td>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #3 Mus 258; Embedded #4 Mus 302; Recital Score - Senior Recital</td>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Final Exam - Phys 211, 212, Final Exam (mapped to different fields), Embedded #3 - Phys 211; Embedded #4 - Phys 211L / 212L</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #3 - Pols 323; TEST Pols 102; Embedded #4 - Pols 420</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #3 - Pols 323; TEST Pols 102; Embedded #4 - Pols 420</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Embedded #3 Psych 315 / 416 Rubric; Embedded #4 Psych 425 - Rubric; Embedded #2 Psych 325 - Common Criteria Referenced Evaluation</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (Masters)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Comprehensive exams, thesis, supervisor evaluations, licensing exam results</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Post Test Essay based - Capstone; Embedded #3 (Research paper) Capstone - rubric completed; Embedded #4 (Ques. #3 of rubric) Capstone - rubric completed</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Post Test Essay based - Capstone; Embedded #3 (Research paper) Capstone - rubric completed; Embedded #4 (Ques. #3 of rubric) Capstone - rubric completed</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi Capstone course, assessment report reflecting achievement levels for all Student Learning Outcomes adopted and defined by the School of Business and from selected courses, graded homework using rubrics with Student Learning Outcomes designated, alumni feedback,</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Course Components</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone course, assessment report reflecting achievement levels for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes adopted and defined by the School of Business and from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>selected courses, graded homework using rubrics with Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>designated, alumni feedback, employer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration (MBA)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>(2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone course, assessment report reflecting achievement levels for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes adopted and defined by the School of Business and from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>selected courses, graded homework using rubrics with Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>designated, alumni feedback, employer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Course Syllabi</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capstone course, assessment report reflecting achievement levels for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes adopted and defined by the School of Business and from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>selected courses, graded homework using rubrics with Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>designated, alumni feedback, employer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling &amp; Guidance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Brochure, website, Webfolio</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio assessment/rubric, field logs, comprehensive exam, site observations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supervisor evaluations, thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Syllabi, Brochure, website, Webfolio</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio assessment, program goal rubric, thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Education in</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brochure, website, syllabi, Webfolio</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership w/Tier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio assessment/rubric, dissertation, Tier II - field logs, site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Admin. Credential Option</td>
<td></td>
<td>observations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership with a</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brochure, website, syllabi, handbooks, Webfolio</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier I Admin. Credential</td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio defense, self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brochure, website, syllabi, handbooks, Webfolio</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio assessment, program goal rubric, supervisor evaluations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cooperative teacher evaluations, thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Brochure, website, syllabi, handbooks, Webfolio</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-reflection, Portfolio Review, Student Teaching evaluations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Webfolio assessment/rubric, field logs, comprehensive exam, site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>observations, supervisor evaluations, thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(scheduled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C
## List of Links to Supporting Evidence in Chronological Order

### Introduction
- WASC Steering Committee members
- Task groups for WASC Steering Committee
- WASC proposal
- Capacity and Preparatory Review
- Branding initiative
- Contributors to Educational Effectiveness report

### Chapter 1 Developing a Culture of Evidence
- WASC Team visit report 2005
- Assessment Committee meeting minutes
- Survey Central website
- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)
- Continuous Improvement Process
- Undergraduate student retention study
- Faculty and lecturer load study and course schedule development
- 2003 faculty retreat agenda
- Educational Objectives/Student Learning Outcome document
- Definitions of Student Learning Outcomes
- Writing Assessment Rubric
- Critical Thinking Rubric
- Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) Pilot Study data
- Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) 2005 data
- Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions
- Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) 2006 data
- Internship evaluation form
- WASC, NCATE, and CCTC alignment of assessment criteria
- Alignment of SLOs with School of Education STRIVE statement
- Learning outcomes for CORE 21 curriculum
- Assessment plans for School of Business undergraduate curriculum
- Student Learning Outcome related to School of Business example
- Program review report appendices
- Program review template
- Program review handbook
- Timetable for each step of the program review process
- External reviewers criteria and expectations for program reviews
- Schedule for future program reviews
- Doctoral program report on goals and objectives
- Doctoral program nine areas of focus
- Math program review AY 03-04
- Assessment schedule for Math department
- External reviewers criteria and expectations for program reviews
- Log of collaboration between library staff and faculty for program reviews
- Agenda from May 2004 faculty workshop
- Instructions for incorporating SLOs into syllabi
- Alignment of SLOs and courses for program reviews
- Assessment of learning exercise
- Presentation on Educational Effectiveness at 2006 faculty retreat
| Small faculty group workshops for Assessment for learning [agenda example](#) |
| Assessment for learning [exercise](#) |
| Assessment Website |
| Assessment Cycle |
| Strategic plan (KPIs) |
| Program reviews |
| Assessment Symposium |
| CLU Core Values |
| Data warehouse (user = warehouse; password = access) |
| Assessment report [template](#) |
| Assessment symposium [report](#) |
| Feedback from attendees of the Assessment Symposium |
| Presentations given at the Assessment Symposium |
| Implications and opportunities from presentations |
| Learning Together [response sheet](#) |
| [Survey Inventory](#) |
| Program review [schedule](#) |

### Chapter 2: Increasing Challenge and Engagement

- [Agenda](#) from August 2002 faculty retreat
- Student Affairs Division [definition of challenge](#)
- WASC Steering Committee [discussion](#) of defining challenge and engagement
- [Presentation](#) by Dean of College of Arts and Sciences at 2003 faculty retreat
- [Definition](#) of challenge and engagement
- Questions from [student focus groups](#)
- Questions from [faculty focus groups](#)
- [Moderator script](#) from focus groups
- [Report of student responses](#) from focus groups
- [Report of faculty responses](#) from focus groups
- [Summary](#) from all focus groups
- [Presentation](#) of focus group responses at 2005 faculty retreat
- [Discussion questions and breakout groups](#) from focus group presentation
- [Summary of notes](#) from focus groups
- Summary of notes from [break out group discussions](#)
- University Honors Program [list](#) of seminar topics and descriptions
- Honors program [exit survey](#)
- University Honors Program [committee work](#)
- Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) [website](#)
- [Presentations](#) from the Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research
- Masters colloquium [projects](#)
- Undergraduate Research Symposium [2005-06 presentations](#)
- Science Division [student presentations](#)
- Ed.D. dissertation CIP [goals](#)
- [Workshops](#) offered through the CTL
- Workshops focused on challenge and engagement
- [Teaching and learning section](#) of program reviews
- [Example of data](#) found in program review appendix H for course evaluations
- [Academic challenge data](#) found in the NSSE
- [Challenge data](#) from the NSSE by item
- Challenge and Engagement [averages](#) from course evaluations
- [Faculty inventory](#) of challenge and engagement
| **Center for Academic Service Learning**  |
| Study Abroad **CIP team**  |
| Study Abroad survey results Fall 2005  |
| **Engagement data** from the NSSE  |
| NSSE data on engagement **comparing 2001 to 2005**  |
| **Faculty inventory** of challenge and engagement  |
| First Year Experience task force  |
| Survey conducted by First Year Experience task force  |
| **List of programs** that serve freshmen  |
| Table showing that courses taken by freshmen meet SLOs  |
| First Year Experience task force executive summary and recommendations  |
| First Year Experience **progress report** on recommendations  |
| **Snapshot India** theme for Freshman Seminar, Fall 2006  |
| Book discussion during Freshman orientation  |
| **General guidelines** for conducting a freshman advising seminar  |

### Chapter 3: Enhancing Diversity

- WASC proposal
- Multicultural Overnight participants average yield rate
- Human Resources **process and guidelines** for recruiting diverse faculty
- Board of Regents membership trend
- Reflections on presentations made by the Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World
- Application process to receive a mini-grant for diversity programming
- **Action plan** from campus diversity retreat
- Student reflections from campus diversity retreat
- **Diversity data** from the NSSE
- Center for Equality and Social Justice
- NSSE items on cognitive complexity
- STRIVE statement for School of Education
- Survey of supervisors of alumni from the School of Education
- Table of the diversity of students graduated by their sixth year
- Campus climate survey
- Campus climate survey results

### Appendix A

- Program review **template**
- Program review **handbook**
- **Timetable** for each step of the program review process
- External reviewers criteria and expectations for program reviews
- Schedule for future program reviews
- Faculty compensation **paper**
- Descriptions of new databases in the library
Appendix D
List of Links to Supporting Evidence in Alphabetical Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003 faculty retreat agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic challenge data found in the NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan from campus diversity retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda from August 2002 faculty retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda from May 2004 faculty workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of SLOs and courses for program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of SLOs with School of Education STRIVE statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Grading Rubric for Evaluating Written Compositions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application process to receive a mini-grant for diversity programming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Committee meeting minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for learning exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of learning exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment plans for School of Business undergraduate curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment report template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment schedule for Math department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment symposium report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Regents membership trend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book discussion during Freshman orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus climate survey results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity and Preparatory Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Academic Service Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Equality and Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge and Engagement averages from course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge data from the NSSE by item</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLU Core Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors to Educational Effectiveness report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data warehouse (user = warehouse; password = access)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of challenge and engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of new databases in the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion questions and breakout groups from focus group presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity data from the NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral program nine areas of focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral program report on goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. dissertation CIP goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Objectives/Student Learning Outcome document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement data from the NSSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of data found in program review appendix H for course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reviewers criteria and expectations for program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and lecturer load study and course schedule development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty compensation paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty inventory of challenge and engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from attendees of the Assessment Symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience progress report on recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience task force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Experience task force executive summary and recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General guidelines for conducting a freshman advising seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors program exit survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources process and guidelines for recruiting diverse faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications and opportunities from presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions for incorporating SLOs into syllabi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship evaluation form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes for CORE 21 curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Together response sheet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of programs that serve freshmen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of collaboration between library staff and faculty for program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters colloquium projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math program review AY 03-04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator script from focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Overnight participants average yield rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE data on engagement comparing 2001 to 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE items on cognitive complexity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation by Dean of College of Arts and Sciences at 2003 faculty retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of focus group responses at 2005 faculty retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Educational Effectiveness at 2006 faculty retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations from the Southern California Conference for Undergraduate Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations given at the Assessment Symposium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review handbook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review report appendices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program review template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from faculty focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions from student focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on presentations made by the Ambassadors for a Peaceful Multicultural World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of faculty responses from focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of student responses from focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule for future program reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Division student presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small faculty group workshops for Assessment for learning agenda example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapshot India theme for Freshman Seminar, Fall 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan (KPIs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRIVE statement for School of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs Division definition of challenge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome related to School of Business example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student reflections from campus diversity retreat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad CIP team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Abroad survey results Fall 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary from all focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of notes from break out group discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of notes from focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Central website</td>
<td>Survey conducted by First Year Experience task force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Inventory</strong></td>
<td><strong>Table of the diversity</strong> of students graduated by their sixth year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey</strong> of supervisors of alumni from the School of Education</td>
<td><strong>Table</strong> showing that courses taken by freshmen meet SLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task groups for WASC Steering Committee</td>
<td>Teaching and learning section of program reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timetable</strong> for each step of the program review process</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research Symposium <strong>2005-06 presentations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student retention study</td>
<td>University Honors Program <strong>committee work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Honors Program <strong>list</strong> of seminar topics and descriptions</td>
<td><strong>WASC proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASC Steering Committee discussion</strong> of defining challenge and engagement</td>
<td><strong>WASC Steering Committee members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC Team visit <strong>report</strong> 2005</td>
<td>WASC, NCATE, and CCTC <strong>alignment of assessment criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong> focused on challenge and engagement</td>
<td><strong>Workshops</strong> offered through the CTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing Assessment Rubric</strong></td>
<td>Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) <strong>2005 data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) <strong>2006 data</strong></td>
<td>Written Communication, Information Literacy, Critical Thinking (WIC) <strong>Pilot Study data</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>