



***The Context for Revising
CSU, Chico's Five-Year
Program Review Process***

Phase

Fall 2007



A TEST OF LEADERSHIP

Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education

A Report of the Commission Appointed by
Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings

Pre-Publication Copy September 2006

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Every student in the nation should have the opportunity to pursue postsecondary education. We recommend, therefore, that the U.S. commit to an unprecedented effort to expand higher education access and success by improving student preparation and persistence, addressing non academic barriers and providing significant increases in aid to low-income students.

2. To address the escalating cost of a college education and the fiscal realities affecting government's ability to finance higher education in the long run, we recommend that the entire student financial aid system be restructured and new incentives put in place to improve the measurement and management of costs and institutional productivity.

Policymakers and higher education leaders should develop, at the institutional level, new and innovative means to control costs, improve productivity, and increase the supply of higher education.

3. To meet the challenges of the 21st century, higher education must change from a system primarily based on reputation to one based on performance. We urge the creation of a robust culture of accountability and transparency throughout higher education. Every one of our goals, from improving access and affordability to enhancing quality and innovation, will be more easily achieved if higher education institutions embrace and implement serious accountability measures.

We recommend the creation of a consumer-friendly information database on higher education with useful, reliable information on institutions, coupled with a search engine to enable students, parents, policymakers and others to weigh and rank comparative institutional performance.

In addition to this new consumer-oriented database, more and better information on the quality and cost of higher education is needed by policymakers, researchers and the general public.

Postsecondary education institutions should measure and report meaningful student learning outcomes.

Accreditation agencies should make performance outcomes, including completion rates and student learning, the core of their assessment as a priority over inputs or processes. A framework that aligns and expands existing accreditation standards should be established to (i) allow comparisons among institutions regarding learning outcomes and other performance measures, (ii) encourage innovation and continuous improvement, and (iii) require institutions and programs to move toward world-class quality relative to specific missions and report measurable progress in relationship to their national and international peers. In addition, this framework should require that the accreditation process be more open and accessible by making the findings of final reviews easily accessible to the public and increasing public and private sector representation in the governance of accrediting organizations and on review teams. Accreditation, once primarily a private relationship between an agency and an institution, now has such important public policy implications that accreditors must continue and speed up their efforts towards transparency as this affects public ends.

4. With too few exceptions, higher education has yet to address the fundamental issues of how academic programs and institutions must be transformed to serve the changing needs of a knowledge economy. We recommend that America's colleges and universities embrace a culture of continuous innovation and quality improvement by developing new pedagogies, curricula, and technologies to improve learning, particularly in the area of science and mathematical literacy.

5. America must ensure that our citizens have access to high quality and affordable educational, learning, and training opportunities throughout their lives. We recommend the development of a national strategy for lifelong learning that helps all citizens understand the importance of preparing for and participating in higher education throughout their lives.

6. The United States must ensure the capacity of its universities to achieve global leadership in key strategic areas such as science, engineering, medicine, and other knowledge-intensive professions. We recommend increased federal investment in areas critical to our nation's global competitiveness and a renewed commitment to attract the best and brightest minds from across the nation and around the world to lead the next wave of American innovation.

Examples of Student Learning Assessments

The Collegiate Learning Assessment

Among the most comprehensive national efforts to measure how much students actually learn at different campuses, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) promotes a culture of evidence-based assessment in higher education. Since 2002, 134 colleges and universities have used the exam, which evaluates students' critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using performance tasks and writing prompts rather than multiple choice questions. Administered to freshmen and seniors, the CLA allows for comparability to national norms and measurement of value added between the freshman and senior years. Additionally, because the CLA's unit of analysis is the institution and not the student, results are aggregated and allow for inter-institutional comparisons that show how each institution contributes to learning. For more information, visit www.cae.org/cla.

The National Survey of Student Engagement and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement

Administered by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and its community college counterpart, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), survey hundreds of institutions annually about student participation and engagement in programs designed to improve their learning and development. The measures of student engagement - the time and effort students put into educational activities in and out of the classroom, from meeting with professors to reading books that weren't assigned in class - serve as a proxy for the value and quality of their undergraduate experience. NSSE and CCSSE provide colleges and universities with readily usable data to improve that experience and create benchmarks against which similar institutions can compare themselves. With surveys from several million students already compiled, these instruments provide a comprehensive picture of the undergraduate student experience at four-year and two-year institutions. Results from NSSE and CCSSE, which are publicly reported, can provide institutions and external stakeholders data for improving institutional performance, setting accountability standards, and strategic planning. For more information, visit <http://nsse.iub.edu>.

The National Forum on College-Level Learning

The National Forum on College-Level Learning has been called "the first attempt to measure what the college educated know and can do across states." Piloted in 2002 across Illinois, Kentucky, Nevada, Oklahoma, and South Carolina, the study collected data on student learning using multiple assessment instruments already in use or widely available such as the National Adult Literacy Survey, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (for four-year colleges) or WorkKeys (for two-year colleges), and graduate admissions exams. Results from these assessments provide states comparable information on how their colleges and universities contribute to student learning and identify challenges such as performance gaps and inconsistent teacher preparation. Comparable assessment also allows states to identify best practices, providing information useful in creating policy and programs that will improve the states' intellectual capital. For more information, visit <http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/centers/collegelevellearning>.

Changing Context of Higher Education in California

Excerpts from

HIGHER EDUCATION COMPACT¹

Agreement between Governor Schwarzenegger,
the University of California, and the California State University
2005-06 through 2010-11

This Compact is based on the value of the UC and CSU to the State of California and its citizens. To ensure these institutions are well positioned to serve the State's students and industry, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger commits to a long-term resource plan for UC and CSU that addresses base budget allocations, enrollment, student fees and other key program elements for 2005-06 through 2010-11. In exchange for this long-term stability, UC and CSU commit to focusing their resources to address long-term accountability goals for enrollment, student fees, financial aid, and program quality. To allow appropriate monitoring of progress toward these goals, UC and CSU commit to **providing student and institutional outcome data** in numerous program areas including program efficiency, utilization of system wide resources, and student-level information.

Student and Institutional Outcomes

UC will continue its efforts to achieve improved student and institutional outcomes and will place a high priority on providing needed classes so that students are able to graduate in four years or less. Similarly, the CSU will continue efforts to improve outcomes and will place a high priority on providing needed classes to reduce the time to degree.

The Administration places a high priority on student success as well as other mission related measures and seeks to foster greater student and institutional accountability through the inclusion of performance-based outcomes. In order to accomplish this, the Administration, in consultation with UC and CSU, will seek to remove barriers to these goals

As with the K-12 system, accountability for these outcomes should be highly visible and public. This will require that timely and reliable data be collected to provide a strong foundation for sound decision-making in these matters. Therefore, the UC and CSU each agree to provide a comprehensive single report to the Governor, Secretary of Education, the fiscal committees of the Legislature, the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Department of Finance by October of each year on the following measures that compare performance for each item for three prior years and the most recently completed academic year:

Efficiency in graduating students

- Number of undergraduate degrees awarded;

¹ The full report may be obtained at <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/calreports.html>

- Number of graduate and professional degrees awarded, including detail on degrees awarded in fields that are high priorities for meeting state workforce needs (mathematics, engineering, computer science and other science fields);
- Average time-to-degree for undergraduates;
- Total number and percent of graduating undergraduates who have accumulated excess units required for their degree, as determined by the segments, and the average number of excess units accumulated by these students;
- Persistence and graduation rates for freshmen and California Community College (CCC) transfer students;
- Number of undergraduates admitted as freshmen who leave in academic difficulty;
- Number of undergraduates admitted as (CCC) transfer students who leave in academic difficulty.

Utilization of systemwide resources

- Student-to-faculty ratio;
- Instructional activities per faculty member;
- Percent of total State-funded salary and benefit expenditures dedicated to direct teaching staff;
- Rate of change in total State-funded staff salary and benefit expenditures for instructional staff, administrative staff, and other student and public service staff;
- Faculty honors and awards;
- Information on technology transfer, including progress in achieving industry-university partnerships, number of patents, total annual income generated by UC-held patents, the proportionate split of those revenues between the University and third parties, and UC's annual patent-related legal costs (UC only);
- Federal, private, and other support for research (UC only);
- Total State-funded expenditures and staff levels for the President's and Chancellor's Office, together with rates of change from the previous year.

Student-level information

- Total enrollment (both headcount and FTE), by class level;
- Number of new CCC transfer students enrolled (headcount and FTE);
- Number of new freshmen enrolled (headcount and FTE);
- Number and percent of new freshmen and CCC transfer students who were admitted by exception;
- Progress on achieving course articulation agreements with CCCs;
- Number and percent of undergraduates who did not meet the UC entry level writing requirement for reading comprehension before entering UC.
- Number and percent of undergraduates who did not meet the math and English placement exam requirements before entering CSU.

Access to Excellence

A California State University Strategic Plan to Succeed Cornerstones

GOAL 1: ACCESS WITH SUCCESS

The first set of goals cluster around student access and success to the CSU. They address four dimensions of access and success: overall attainment (the proportion of the population completing college degrees); degree productivity (improving graduation rates for all student groups); affordability (maintaining affordability to low income students); and **quality of educational results (value-added measures of learning appropriate to the degree)**. Embracing **these goals and the related outcome measures** requires that the CSU commit to an agenda of growth and continuous improvement, and to acknowledge responsibility for contributing to improvements in performance in P-12 and community college preparation in addition to success within the CSU.

GOAL 2: MEET NEEDS FOR ECONOMIC AND CIVIC DEVELOPMENT

The second set of goals centers around the CSU's performance in meeting state needs for improving the quality of civic and democratic life, and in contributing to economic development- through workforce preparation, meeting employer needs in critical areas, environmental sustainability, research and development, and expanding international programs.

GOAL 3: SUSTAIN INSTITUTIONAL EXCELLENCE

The final set of goals speaks to institutional management, and to the leadership needed to sustain capacity for excellence by investing in success and quality. They address needs for resources for enrollment growth, for quality in faculty and staff, for better use of data-based experimentation to improve performance, and for continued use of evidence-based advocacy to advance the university's state and national reputation.

² The most recent draft of Access to Excellence may be viewed at http://www.calstate.edu/acadaff/system_strategic_planning/

GOAL 1: ACCESS WITH SUCCESS

Accountability Indicators for Goal 1: Access with Success

1. Increase overall educational attainment
 - P-20 goals and cross-sector structures to increase high school graduation rates among all student sub-groups
 - Widespread communication and outreach to document importance of eliminating achievement gaps, including consequences of failure to increase attainment among all groups
 - Increase the proportion of community college freshmen completing baccalaureate degrees in the CSU
 - Increase the number of baccalaureate and master's degrees awarded to all students; eliminate gaps in graduation among groups of students
 - Increase the proportion of the population with college degrees
2. Improve degree productivity
 - Improve level of academic preparation among CSU entering freshmen
 - Increase retention among all students; reduce excess credit accumulated for baccalaureate degree recipients
 - Strengthen California Community College-CSU transfer transition, through alignment of policies and marketing of transfer core curriculum; pilot test transfer Associate in Arts degree programs in high-growth areas with the best potential for community college and university partnerships in this area
3. Maintain affordability
 - Ensure that fee increases for resident undergraduate students are moderate and predictable, and accompanied with commensurate increases in need-based grant assistance
 - Reduce unmet financial need for all student groups
4. Quality of educational experience and results
 - All campuses participate in regular systems of assessment-driven accountability for results, through participation in Voluntary System of Accountability or other equivalent mechanisms
 - Conduct regular assessments of employer satisfaction with CSU graduates; incorporate feedback into campus and system evaluations of learning effectiveness
 - Refresh general education learning goals, to incorporate goals for international literacy, civic capacity, and improved workforce skills

GOAL 2: MEET NEEDS FOR ECONOMIC AND CIVIC DEVELOPMENT

Accountability Indicators for Goal 2: Meet Needs for Economic and Civic Development

1. Increase international competitiveness through competency in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields
 - Increase enrollments in STEM majors
 - Increase in the proportion of baccalaureate degree recipients going on to graduate school in STEM disciplines
 - Incorporate STEM goals into early outreach initiatives with middle schools, high schools, and communities
2. Meet state needs for high demand professions
 - Increase enrollments and degree completions in professional science programs and other high-need areas such as nursing and engineering
 - Conduct regular assessments of employer needs, as well as employer satisfaction with the quality of CSU graduates.
 - Incorporate employer assessments into curriculum planning and recruitment efforts
3. Extend commitment to civic engagement to engagement with government and politics
 - Identify opportunities for student placements in government roles
 - Model policies for civil political engagement in campus events
4. Expand funding for research and development and for CSU models of applied research
 - Market 'best practice' exemplars of CSU applied research
 - Identify funding opportunities for applied research through public initiatives such as technology transfer, economic competitiveness, infrastructure, and environmental sustainability
5. Environmental sustainability
 - Articulate integrated policy on environmental sustainability, affecting learning goals, institutional practices, civic commitments, and public policy models

GOAL 3: SUSTAIN INSTITUTIONAL EXCELLENCE

Accountability Indicators for Goal 3: Institutional Excellence

1. Funding adequacy sufficient to grow enrollments and degree attainment to meet state needs for civic and economic growth
 - Increase state funding through marginal funding increases for all enrollment growth attained
 - Allow moderate and predictable increases in undergraduate resident fees, as necessary to maintain academic quality; increase need-based grant funding
 - Reduce unmet financial need among all student groups
2. Funding adequacy for faculty and staff quality; model personnel practices to support quality in faculty and staff
 - Increase funding to reduce compensation gaps and grow tenure and tenure-track faculty
 - Build faculty and staff development programs through experimentation of models in different university settings, expanded appropriately when success is documented
 - Develop CSU leadership development program, designed
 - to identify and nurture in academic and administrative leadership positions for the future
3. Improve evidence-based advocacy about state needs for CS U capacity and excellence to public audiences
 - Strengthen messaging about CSU's capacity to meet state needs for baccalaureate production in cost effective ways
 - Document cost-effectiveness of investments in CSU, through value-added assessments of learning and achievement attained for public investments
 - Conduct regular assessments of public opinion about the CS U and its effectiveness; incorporate assessments into public communication efforts
4. Enhancement of state, national and international image of CS U as innovator, leader, and model public university for the 21st century
 - Marketing of successes to key policy audiences
 - Strengthen involvement of alumni in advocacy and messaging strategy

WASC: Creating a New Model of Accreditation³

A New Framework for Accreditation

In response to the changing context of higher education, and to reflect the principles adopted by the Commission for accreditation in the WASC region, the Commission has developed a new framework for accreditation. The elements of this new framework align under the core principles called “Core Commitments” to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness which are embodied significantly by revised Accreditation Standards and a three-stage, sequential institutional review process. Each element is described in the following sections of the *Handbook*. Together these components represent a holistic system and process of review that enable WASC to work collaboratively with institutions in a spirit of ongoing experimentation and mutual learning as defined by the Commission values stated above.

Higher education exists in the United States as a public trust and a public good. It is linked to the improvement of individuals, groups, and society as a whole. It provides the basis for conserving and transmitting the values of society and for reflecting on and identifying needed areas of change. Through research, scholarship and creative activity, institutions of higher education also promote the value of discovery and learning. In offering educational programs, institutions prepare their graduates for productive and meaningful lives as citizens and members of society.

The accrediting process functions to promote and sustain this special role for higher education, while providing assurance to the public that institutions of higher education continue to warrant public trust and support. Accreditation evaluation of institutional resources, structures, practices, and results serves an important role for the higher education community and the public in this context. Yet accreditation is not well understood and is too often considered reactive to external minimal standards.

(WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p.4)

³ The WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001 may be obtained from <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/evaluation.html>

WASC: Creating a New Model of Accreditation

Organizing Around Core Commitments

To become and remain accredited, each institution is expected to demonstrate that it is committed to developing and sustaining Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness.

Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity:

The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.

The Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity enables the institution to consider resource issues from a holistic perspective, and to consider capacity as an institutional attribute beyond minimum compliance and a review of assets. Looking at itself through a “lens” of institutional capacity enables the institution to reexamine what it *is* in terms of its capacity to fulfill its aspirations, and to integrate and synthesize findings and recommendations for improvement gained through its self review under Commission Standards. While the Standards provide an opportunity to review institutional performance within a defined area, the framework of institutional capacity allows an institution to explore cross-cutting issues such as whether resources, structures and processes are aligned with the institution’s mission and priorities, and whether there is good evidence of effectiveness in their actual deployment. An important dimension of institutional capacity reflected in the Institutional Review cycle is the institution’s potential to define and sustain educational effectiveness.

Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness:

The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program level. The institution employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate awarded.

The Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness provides an opportunity for the institution to explore holistically its approaches to educational effectiveness and assess whether institutional systems, such as course and program design, faculty support, and program review are effectively linked to evidence of student learning and are consistent with the educational goals and academic standards of the institution. By design, elements of educational effectiveness were incorporated into all four Commission Standards, so that institutions would explore the relationships between capacity and educational quality and effectiveness. The Accreditation Standards identify key elements of educational effectiveness.

(WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p. 5-6)

WASC: Creating a New Model of Accreditation

Focusing on Educational Effectiveness

Articulating a Collective Vision of Educational Attainment. Centers on the degree to which the institution sets goals and obtains results for student learning at both the institutional and program levels that are:

- clearly stated and widely understood;
- appropriate for the type and level of the degree or credential offered; and
- adequately assessed to ascertain mastery of these levels.

Organizing for Learning. Centers on the alignment of appropriate institutional assets and characteristics with the goal of producing high levels of student learning, consistent with the mission of the institution, including:

- curriculum, pedagogy, and method of delivery;
- faculty recruitment, development, scholarship in support of improved teaching and learning, rewards, and incentives;
- organizational structures and processes;
- information resources and planning capacity;
- student services and co-curricular activities; and
- resources and facilities.

Becoming a Learning Organization. Centers on the degree to which the institution has developed systems—**to assess its own performance and to use information to improve student learning over time**—that:

- are systematic and regular;
- reinforce a climate of inquiry throughout the institution;
- reflect the input of stakeholders and an awareness of the distinctive characteristics of its students;
- **identify key dimensions of performance that include student learning;** and
- are based on standards of evidence that prominently feature educational results.

CSU, Chico Institutional Proposal for Reaffirmation of Accreditation⁴

CSUC Promises for its Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

Following an iterative series of discussions by campus stakeholders and decision makers, CSU, Chico outlined the following themes for the research programs to be undertaking under the EER:

“The vision, mission, and strategic priorities of CSU, Chico served as the framework for the selection of the following areas of emphasis to be examined in the course of this Educational Effectiveness Review:

- The Nature of Student Engagement at a Residential Campus.
- **The Refinement of the Academic Program Review.**
- The Innovative Use of Technology in the Delivery of Effective General Education Offerings.” (p. 7).

The Refinement of the Academic Program Review

Program review processes play a key role in the improvement of undergraduate education at CSU, Chico. Such reviews have the potential to systematize a program’s approach to academic quality and educational excellence. They provide a framework for quality management in our program offerings and other educational activities. Accordingly, we propose to refine our Five-Year Program Review processes as part of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

More specifically, we plan to:

- ***Develop a New Framework for Academic Program Review.*** The elements of this new framework will align under the strategic priorities of the university, the ten principles of *Cornerstones*, the principles of the CSU Accountability Process, and the “core commitments” to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that are embodied in the new WASC accreditation standards. The new review process is intended to refocus programs toward becoming more systematic and intentional about gathering data about the *right things* – performance and effectiveness—and on *using* the resulting information to continuously improve what the program does. The first- year milestone of this project, involving three degree programs (American Studies, Sociology and Mathematics) as test units for the new standards, has been successfully reached. The continuing “plan-do-assess-revise” analysis of efforts in this area will demonstrate our increasing capacity for assessment, diversity and quality improvement.

⁴ For details see: <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/wasc/instProposal.html>

WASC Commission Letter, July 6, 2007⁵

Western Association of Schools and Colleges

Commission Action Letter; July 6, 2007

California State University, Chico

At its meeting on June 20-22, 2007, the Commission considered the report of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) team that conducted the visit to California State University, Chico (CSU Chico) on March 7-9, 2007.

The Commission acted to:

1. Receive the report of the Capacity and Preparatory Review team and continue the accreditation of California State University, Chico.
2. Proceed with the scheduled Educational Effectiveness Review in spring 2009. The Institutional Presentation is due 12 weeks before the review.
3. Request that the institution incorporate its response to the issues raised in this action letter and the major recommendations of the Capacity team report in its Educational Effectiveness Report.

The Commission highlighted several areas for the institution to address at the time of its next review:

- *There is a concern that there is a "lack of widespread progress on analysis and interpretation of data" and a "lack of evidence that data are routinely used for programmatic improvement."*

This will need to be remedied by the time of the Educational Effectiveness (EE) Review, by which time there is an expectation that assessments of the University's General Education Program, the First-Year Experience Program, and **all degree programs** will be well underway, with evidence of student learning outcomes and effectiveness presented.

- *The visiting team also found that the University "needs to find ways of identifying and committing resources to the program assessment initiative in order to support that initiative and to implement the inevitable changes that will emanate from" the various assessment endeavors.*

Thus, while the Educational Effectiveness Review will focus on educational results and effectiveness, it will also be important for the University to demonstrate that it has put into place the infrastructure for

*Use Assessment to improve:
GE program
FYE programs
Degree Programs*

Commit Resources to Assessment

⁵ The Commissions' Letter may be found at <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/wasc/visitation/index.html>

ongoing, comprehensive and systematic assessment of student learning, that support is given for faculty and staff to develop the capacities to assess and use data effectively, and that students are also engaged in this process.

- *The visiting team was impressed with CSU Chico's student support systems and staff. It probed the meaning of the "Chico Experience" ...*

and recommended that the institution "invest in a unique opportunity to build first-year learning community programs by carefully articulating the aspects of the Chico Experience that enhance student affinity for the community and that support academic success."

*Articulate
Chico
Experience*

- *The team also supported the partnership between Academic and Student Affairs as beneficial student success. Furthermore, given the overwhelming numbers of students who live on campus ...*

called for formalizing the "linkage between the curricular and co-curricular" in the residence halls to provide a "truly distinctive residential learning community."

*Residence Halls
as Learning
Communities*

- *It (the team) also called for a "long-range deferred maintenance plan and refresh plan for the residence halls" and a "housing master plan ... compatible with the University's enrollment plan"*

The Commission expects that a housing master plan, with a timeline for developing additional housing and strategies for working with the off-campus community on housing-related issues, will be a component of the Educational Effectiveness Review.

*Housing
Master Plan*

- *The lack of diversity in the student body [as well as among the faculty and staff] continues to be a problem facing CSU Chico. ... "there are still significant concerns about the climate in the community, and recruitment and retention of minority students, faculty, and staff."*

Evidence of continued attention to and success in the area of diversity will need to be an integral component of the EE Review presentation.

*Continue
Diversity
Project*

- *CSU Chico has "achieved many successes in the integration of technology" into academic life. "In addition, information technology is helping to provide more effective linkages between academic and other administrative functions on campus ..."*

However, as in other areas, "performance measures for information resources and technology at CSU Chico will need to be refined for the Educational Effectiveness Review."

*Performance
Indicators for
IRES*

Additionally, it will be important for the campus to document that, in terms of student attainment of learning outcomes, "online and other distance modes are the educational equal of face-to-face learning on campus."

Student Success Indicators for Distance Modes

- *There is abundant evidence of the significant activities of the University within its North State service area. ... However, the visiting team was struck by the fact that these latter activities, though happening "at a level that would be the envy of most campuses," do not appear to have an overall focus.*

This lack of focus led the team to ask a number of questions: "Why doesn't Chico identify these activities as a hallmark of a Chico education? Would it not be possible to show highly positive learning outcomes from these experiences? Does[n't] it make sense to encourage even more students to participate?" These are excellent questions and ones for which answers should be sought as part of the preparation for the Educational Effectiveness Review.

Focusing North State activities for students

- *CSU Chico has structured a well-developed strategic plan with priorities that are embedded in everything the institution does. As importantly, the strategic plan does influence resource allocation decisions throughout the institution.*

The University, however, needs to establish performance indicators related to each of the priorities of the strategic plan, and to implement an assessment plan demonstrating successes in meeting anticipated outcomes. The results of this assessment endeavor should be presented as part of the institution's Educational Effectiveness Review.

Key Performance Indicators for strategic priorities

- *The team felt that the University had not yet developed a "true culture of evidence through a university-wide strategic management plan." It urged the campus to "improve the manner in which it attests to its achievements" throughout the academic, co-curricular, and non-academic arenas of the institution.*

All of the major divisions of the University would profit from comprehensive program review and from a more organized approach to data gathering, analysis, and use of findings and conclusions for programmatic and institutional improvement.

Develop Culture of Evidence through a university-wide strategic management plan:

Implementation of the Enterprise Knowledge Management Initiative, being developed as a system to use technology to support the assessment of student outcomes and institutional effectiveness, would be a concrete and extremely beneficial step in this direction.

- *Divisional comprehensive program review*
- *EKMI*