General Comments on Improvements:

- CLU has made **significant progress** since its Capacity and Preparatory Review in building and strengthening its system of quality assurance and improvement.
- California Lutheran University has made **impressive progress since the WASC visit in March 2005**. This progress, a continuation of progress since the Fourth-Year Report to WASC in 1999, speaks to the fundamental strength of CLU. That so much could be accomplished while multiple changes were occurring at the very highest levels of institutional leadership… is indicative of a broad-based commitment to building a system of quality assurance and continuous improvement.
- CLU has **successfully created a structure to support a culture of evidence** at all levels of the University, including an assessment system that is beginning to gather systematic evidence of educational effectiveness at institutional and program levels, well-defined university-level student learning outcomes, and strategies to increase diversity and the levels of challenge and engagement in the University’s academic and co-curricular programs.
- CLU has **created a good infrastructure for quality assurance**. CLU is confident and optimistic about its ability to move forward with its assessment plans and improvement in student learning.
- The team commends CLU on its progress in creating an infrastructure to support educational effectiveness and in **generating wide faculty involvement** in enhancing challenge, engagement and diversity at the institution.
- CLU has **invested considerable energy and resources** to meet each of the three objectives.
- A **commendable feature of CLU’s assessment system is the Annual Assessment Symposium** in which faculty and staff share their assessment and continuous improvement activities with other members of the campus community.
- CLU is **currently in general compliance with the spirit and intent of the four WASC standards and Criteria for Review**.

Challenge & Engagement:

- Since 2005, it is clear that the institution has devoted a great amount of energy to define “challenge and engagement.”
- The team commends CLU for the collaborative and all-inclusive approach it has taken to define challenge and engagement.
- Through this “bottoms-up” effort to define challenge and engagement, California Lutheran has achieved **significant faculty buy-in**, active dialogue and the generation of much innovative activity.
- The visiting team was **impressed with the wide array of creative efforts and ideas** around the goals of engagement and challenge.
- CLU has also made progress in its efforts of **incorporating the goal of challenge and engagement into its program review process**
- **Most impressive is the institution’s “Festival of Scholars”** in which roughly one hundred students, working with faculty, presented their scholarship to the University community over the course of a week… The students were bursting with enthusiasm for what they learned and the process and environment in which they worked… The team found a similar level of **passion about the subject of learning with nearly all the students and faculty it met**.

Diversity:

- The team **commends CLU for its web of strategies** designed to improve recruitment, retention and success of a more diverse group of students.
- The visiting team was **impressed with the wide spectrum of efforts** organized to enhance diversity at CLU.
The team commends CLU for its ambitious slate of activities designed to strengthen understanding and appreciation of diversity. Indirect evidence demonstrates progress throughout the CLU community.

Ownership of diversity initiatives has successfully spread beyond the PDC, and diversity-related activities are generated throughout campus.

Discussions with student groups on campus (traditional undergraduates and graduates, as well as students in the adult learning program) revealed that students engage diversity issues in many of their classes.

The team’s discussion with a group of students of color revealed unanimous enthusiasm and appreciation for their faculty whom many described as their “family away from home.”

The School of Education, in particular, has made demonstrable progress in integrating diversity issues throughout its curriculum.

The analyses threaded throughout these reports (the annual reports of the President’s Diversity Council) provide good models for informing the reflection and evaluation process of future diversity activities.

Student Learning Outcomes:

CLU has a set of 14 institution-wide Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) adopted in 2003-04. These SLOs are very congruent with the University’s mission statement.

Institutional student learning outcomes are clearly articulated, and there is ample evidence of students’ enthusiasm and deep engagement in their learning processes.

CLU has made progress on the assessment of learning outcomes and established good ways to share approaches, results, and improvements.

CLU has done an excellent job of mapping courses to the institutional SLOs in most programs.

The Business School... has an exemplary website on its undergraduate curriculum... The overall approach the Business School has taken is an excellent model that other programs might follow.

The Education School has also done a commendable job of nesting program-level SLOs within broader school-level learning goals, which in turn are nested within the institutional SLOs.

Program Reviews:

Since the CPR visit, CLU has developed a very useful Program Review Handbook, which provides information about how to conduct a program review, including an exemplary Program Review Template.

These and other improvements are appreciated by the faculty. The visiting team heard much praise for these improvements and the support provided by the Office of Assessment and Educational Effectiveness and the Institutional Research Office.

CLU has also made progress in its efforts of incorporating the goal of challenge and engagement into its program review process.

The program review self-study process has created an infrastructure for collecting and reflecting on direct evidence of student learning about diversity.

Another positive development since the CPR visit is the active involvement of the library in the program reviews conducted by academic departments.

The visiting team met separately with chairs of departments that have completed program reviews and those that have not. It was pleasantly surprised by how positive both groups were about program review—in fact more positive than any other faculty group of similar size with which it has ever interacted.

Particularly impressive is the increasing quality of program reviews and the unusually high level of faculty commitment to meaningful program reviews and quality assurance.
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