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Introduction

In recent times, President Norma Rees has described California State University, Hayward (CSUH) as a place where “good things are happening in bad times.” In this report, you will read about important developments at CSUH: recruiting the largest incoming freshmen class in CSUH’s history to join our university community; the newly-implemented mission for the university; the acceptance by the Academic Senate of the student learning outcomes for our General Education program; a proposal that faculty use *The Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* as a guide for their teaching and advising; re-organization of the Office of Institutional Research for better coordination of assessment; ground-breaking for a Business and Technology Center to provide students with a state-of-the-art environment in which to learn and grow; expansion of the University Union; plans for increased student housing; a “Best in the West” designation from the Princeton Review, largely based on input from our own students; and our recent initiation of a name change to California State University, East Bay to more accurately represent the regional nature of our multi-campus university (Hayward Hills, Concord Hills, and Oakland Center) and our commitment to serve our local communities.

You will read about challenges facing CSUH. First and foremost, CSUH has experienced another round of serious budget cuts with attendant staff shortages, work overloads, deferred maintenance, concern for the institution’s well-being, and dreams set aside. The consequences of this set of budget cuts is compounded by the fact that we did not fully recover from the cuts in the early nineties. Other challenges include: the slow progress of faculty diversity and the necessary resources to implement change as we work to integrate our new mission and our student learning goals. There is, however, a hope that perhaps, within the next two to three years, the California economy and the allocations to the CSU will improve and that we will be positioned well for a new era based on the plans we are developing now.

Preparatory Review Report and Goals

Our Institutional Proposal was based upon an ambitious comprehensive model. In its acceptance letter, WASC encouraged CSUH “to take every opportunity to narrow its focus. Greater attention and priority should be given not only to the university’s strategic planning initiatives, but most particularly and directly to the development of an overarching institutional emphasis on the improvement of student learning.”

[Institutional Proposal]

From the inception of the WASC process, President Rees has committed the university to using WASC accreditation to improve the university’s planning process and to re-energize and re-organize planning around educational effectiveness and ongoing dialogue about student learning. As a result, we are leveraging the process to integrate and institutionalize our structures and systems in order to assess our performance, and to use that assessment to improve student learning over time. (WASC Handbook 2001, p. 6). In this review phase, our goal has been to understand our current capacity for educational
effectiveness. Hence our re-examination of the mission, along with student learning outcomes, program review structures, support and resources for student learning, and our on-going policies and procedures, processes, data, and evidence systems.

The university also sees this as an opportunity to coordinate learning assessment efforts, including various requirements for student outcome measures, into an effective, comprehensive university assessment plan focused on meaningful assessment of student learning.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review Report

Our major purpose and context since the acceptance of our Proposal has remained the same; however, changes in context are noted below along with a preview of the report’s contents. The reflective essays represent significant input from the university, consistent with our commitment from the beginning to engage the community in every step of the process. This report, therefore, should be viewed as an anthology, comprised of chapters and sections contributed by a number of faculty and staff. These pieces reflect their involvement in the WASC process, often through our Campus Outcome Teams (COTs; see below) and their dedication to the goals, view and tone we set for the CSUH–WASC Planning Process. [Organization for Capacity Review] The report also reflects upon Criteria For Review (CFR) particularly important to our new mission as well as our institutional capacity. Data on CFRs, not directly addressed in the chapters, are presented in the Institutional Portfolio as [Appendix III – CFRs].

CSUH has constructed a standing web-site for its WASC accreditation reviews. It includes all the required elements from the Institutional Proposal and for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. In addition, we have special links for assessment, CSUH’s defining characteristics and other selected exhibits. [Institutional Portfolio]

I. Focused and Compelling Vision (Standard One)
This chapter describes how CSUH created its new mission, vision, and values statements through a consensus-building process, and how CSUH is reflecting on WASC’s “five (5) expectations” for diversity to enrich our multicultural learning experience. The university seeks to infuse the mission, vision, and values statements into every aspect of its educational enterprise. In our discussions, we identify many aspects of diversity that Hayward does well; however, we want to become an exemplar of a multicultural learning environment and we view our accomplishments and our challenges in that light. We are using the mission, vision, and values as the lens through which we view this process.

As part of this attention on diversity and since the acceptance of our Institutional Proposal, President Norma Rees created a new full-time position of Director of Equal Opportunity within Human Resources as an outgrowth of the position of Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Equal Opportunity. This Director handles issues related to discrimination and harassment for faculty, staff, and students, and
affirmative action for all employees, including recruitment for staff (responsibility for faculty recruitment lies with the deans and the provost).

II. **Infrastructure for Coordinated Assessment** (Standard Two)
This chapter discusses our progress towards reforming student assessment requirements and highlights our success with the General Education program. It also examines the progress we have begun to make in areas such as Degree Programs, Academic Review, and support for student learning, with a focus on student advising.

Subsequent to the acceptance of our *Institutional Proposal*, the president and the provost created the infrastructure for student learning assessment across the university by moving the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis from the administrative to the academic side of the university, merging it with the Office of Assessment and Testing to create a new *Office of Institutional Research and Assessment* (IRA) under the direction of a newly-hired Assistant Vice President. The office has begun to work with the Office of Faculty Development and the Colleges in the continuing development of effective assessment of student learning, all under the organizational leadership of the Office of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies.

III. **Capacity for Sustaining Core Resources and Functions** (Standard Three)
This chapter details how the university is leveraging its resources for student learning. The faculty section uses the *Seven Principles* to frame discussion of the composition of faculty; hiring, promotion, tenure, and retention; and support for faculty development. The remaining sections include a staff section focused on the challenges of sustaining a viable staff complement, and learning infrastructure sections that address library, instructional technology, and fiscal and physical plant issues.

Throughout this chapter, there is an emphasis on California’s budget crisis, which has worsened since the submission of our *Institutional Proposal*. The crisis has resulted in a continuing decrease in state support, creating challenging times for the university. The 2004/05 allocation for CSUH is approximately 8% below the 2003/04 budget, marking the third straight year of reduced appropriations and resulting in a decrease of over 28% since 2001/02. CSUH laid off thirteen (13) staff members to meet budget reductions, eliminated temporary positions, and re-assigned some staff. Although no tenure track faculty were laid off, the number of lecturers was decreased, resulting in reduced class offerings. As a result of these multi-year challenges, some faculty, students, and staff have expressed a tension between the unique educational opportunity offered at CSUH and the fragility of the infrastructure to sustain it. The higher education compact between California’s universities and the governor if successful, will restore some critical funding over a multi-year period.

Even under trying circumstances, new growth and opportunities are happening. On September 30, 2004, groundbreaking for the *Wayne and Gladys Valley Business and Technology Center* marked the successful completion of CSUH’s first capital campaign involving over $10M in private support. This building (the first new classroom building since 1971) will be a university center for technology-enhanced teaching, learning, and
IV. **Forward Planning for Educational Effectiveness** (Standard Four)
This chapter presents a brief history of the last twelve years of institutional planning, highlighting the university’s commitment to move from goal and objective setting to the implementation of strategies that are aligned with resources and the assessment of results. Areas of success show our capability to achieve this end and to explain how we intend to apply these strategies to academic planning. Further more, this chapter is how we are identifying and addressing our data needs, based on data gathered up to and through Summer, 2004.

V. **Conclusion**
The conclusion summarizes the strengths and limitations in our capacity for educational effectiveness and presents the institution’s plan to address our assessment priorities and outcomes in the next phase of the CSUH–WASC process.

**Summary of University Engagement for the Institutional Proposal and the Capacity and Preparatory Review**

WASC accreditation at CSUH has become a process of extensive, university-wide community engagement. In preparation for our original proposal, the university organized itself into thirty-seven (37) University Communities of Practice (UCOPs). Four hundred and fifty (450) participants contributed to the twelve (12) outcomes that became the focus of the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase. [University Engagement – Institutional Proposal] The proposal and its methodology are evidence of the university-wide goal to use the WASC accreditation process to increase our ability to create and sustain a welcoming, diverse learning community where the academic standards are rigorous; expectations for students are high; the curriculum is relevant to the changing social, cultural, and economic needs of the community and society; infrastructure and resource allocations are congruent and aligned with students’ learning needs; and there is a continuing dialogue about the quality of the environment for learning among the university community (faculty, students, and staff).

We have continued with full university engagement during the Capacity and Preparatory Review phase. Twelve Campus Outcome Teams (COTs) were organized and membership reflects a combination of volunteer faculty and administrative recommendations; and, to the degree possible, the university’s diversity.² The COTs used the indicators presented in the Institutional Proposal to guide their study. In accordance with the WASC Proposal Review Committee’s recommendation, the COTs narrowed their focus and concentrated on specific initiatives to emphasize improvement of student learning. Most of the COTs made significant progress toward their outcomes in spite of the short time-frame (twelve months)³. See the chart on completed stages of development for each COT [Progress on Outcomes].
Each COT developed a set of findings and recommendations in four (4) progress reports that formed the core of the reflective essays, and the foundation for the Educational Effectiveness phase. [COT Report Summaries]

Ongoing university-wide dialogue took place within each COT through regular meetings, and was encouraged through quarterly meetings with the president, provost, vice presidents, deans, the Academic Senate and all university communiqués. Evidence of these university-wide discussions and meetings are available on the institutional portfolio. [University Engagement – Capacity Review]. It is important to note that university-wide engagement has been sustained throughout the process, including review of the various drafts of this report.4

Appendix
This will document the institution’s response to the Commission’s previous concerns and Substantive Change Proposals.


2 Volunteers were solicited through an email invitation to all faculty and staff. Recommendations came from the president, vice presidents, deans, and the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Membership in the COTs included around 70 faculty, 35 staff and administrators, and 2 students. Many attempts to secure student representation yielded only 2. The four Colleges were represented as follows: 23 (Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences), 16 (Business and Economics), 15 (Education and Allied Studies), and 12 (Science). Diversity was represented as follows: 45 females, 60 males; European Americans (59); African Americans (20); Asian Americans (10); Latinos (8); Asian Indians (5) Membership on all COTs remained fairly steady.

3 While there are 21 months between the WASC acceptance of the proposal (March 21, 2003) and the submission of this Preparatory Report (Dec., 2004), CSUH could only engage in focused work for twelve months. To have a full array of faculty representation, meetings were suspended in summer terms when faculty are primarily unavailable.

4 The university encouraged on-going dialogue with: bi-monthly WPC meetings and regular COT meetings; three (3) All-COT meetings (May, 2003, May 2004, November 2004); four (4) Cross-COT meetings on the themes of Diversity and PT&R; six (6) editions of 'The Outcome' summarizing progress made by the COTS distributed to all faculty and staff and published in the university student newspaper; regular Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) and WPC Chair meetings with the president and provost; quarterly ALO and WPC Chair meetings with the president’s staff, the provost, the deans, and the Academic Senate’s Executive Committee to discuss oral and written reports including: summaries of COTs’ progress reports; four (4) COT progress reports, posted and summarized for all the COT members to review; COT and university-wide review and feedback on the institutional portfolio and drafts of this report; and email and targeted listening sessions with the staff, the president’s council, the provost, the deans, the Executive Committee of the Senate, and the full Academic Senate for review of this report.
Focused and Compelling Vision: Standard One

The university embraced the opportunity, presented by Standard One, to examine its institutional purposes, essential values, character, and educational objectives, and to study the needs of the students and society we serve. As a result, we created a focused and compelling mission, vision, and set of values (MVV), designed to inspire and guide CSUH. We further reflected on CSUH’s response to diversity, and its capacity to integrate and institutionalize the new mission, vision and values.

The university embraced the opportunity, presented by Standard One, to examine its institutional purposes, essential values, character, and educational objectives, and to study the needs of the students and society we serve. As a result, we created a focused and compelling mission, vision, and set of values (MVV), designed to inspire and guide CSUH. We further reflected on CSUH’s response to diversity, and its capacity to integrate and institutionalize the new mission, vision and values.

**CONSENSUS-BUILDING PROCESS FOR NEW MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES (CFR 1.1)**

Until July 1, 2004, CSUH operated with a published mission statement (adopted in 1992) that broadly described our purposes and educational objectives aligned with the mission of the CSU system. The opening phrase, “educational excellence for a diverse society” served as the motto and commitment to meet the needs of the highly diverse and growing population of Alameda and Contra Costa counties for affordable, high-quality undergraduate and graduate degree programs. [Previous Mission Statement] However, recruitment research showed that CSUH needed to present its unique educational experience to potential students in a more focused way. [Market Analysis] The listening sessions, part of the Institutional Proposal, revealed a desire for a mission statement that provides a shared intention, set of values, and sense of purposefulness, and elucidates the meanings for “diversity” and “educational excellence.”

The Mission Campus Outcome Team (COT) was charged to develop a new university mission statement that clearly places student learning and educational leadership to our constituencies as core values; promises its highly diverse student body that their degree will be recognized for educational excellence and relevance to societal needs; commits the university to an inclusive and diverse student body, faculty, administration, and staff; proclaims the quality and character of a CSUH education; and guides curricular and programmatic changes, and its service to, and partnerships with, external communities.

The Mission COT consisted of four faculty, two staff, and two administrators, who were four women, four men, three African Americans, two Latinas, one Filipino, one East Indian, and one European-American. A five-step process, aimed at building consensus, began with faculty, staff, and students ranking the outcomes they value for students and the institutional characteristics for the university. The top three preferred outcomes for students were: Ethical” (52%); “Competent” (41%); and “Broadly educated, ready to face challenges, demonstrates leadership, ready for professional world, and honors diverse perspectives” (33-35%). The top three preferred institutional characteristics were: “Puts students at its center” (56.3%); “Provides degrees recognized for academic excellence” (53.4%); and “Culturally-racially diverse faculty, staff, and student body” (39.9%). [Mission Survey]

Using these data, the Mission COT developed an initial draft of a mission, vision, and set of values. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the President’s Executive Staff, WASC COT chairs, the Deans’ Council, and the WASC Planning Committee (WPC) provided feedback. The entire community then responded to the next draft. Approximately
80% of the respondents indicated that the statements “really worked for them.” However, the Mission COT considered suggestions once again, revised its draft, and presented it to the Academic Senate. The Mission COT incorporated additional revisions, and sent out a university-wide communiqué inviting e-mail reactions. President Rees met with the Mission COT and requested some changes. On July 1, 2004, the president adopted the new mission, vision, and set of values.

CSUH’s new mission statement describes its purposes, essential values and character.

**Mission**
Provide an academically-rich, multicultural learning experience that prepares all of its students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful lifework, and to be socially responsible contributors to their communities, locally and globally.

**CSUH Values**
Learning in an academic environment that is inclusive and student-centered. We value engagement in the civic, cultural and economic life of the communities we serve—locally, regionally and globally. We value critical and creative thinking, effective communication, ethical decision-making, and multicultural competence. We value the open exchange of ideas and viewpoints.

**Vision**
CSUH strives to be known for:
Outstanding academic programs, recognized for their excellence
Curricula that foster active student participation through applied learning, research and community service
High academic standards along with services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success
A learning-centered experience where teaching is lively and engaging, and individual differences are appreciated
Dedication to open-minded inquiry, especially with regard to major social and global issues
A welcoming campus atmosphere that is responsive to the unique needs of its campus community
An inclusive campus community where students, faculty, and staff from vastly different backgrounds collaborate—creating and sustaining a vibrant learning community
An array of activities that promote students’ enjoyment and well-being
Graduates who are innovative and effective problem solvers, skilled in organizing and expressing their ideas
Engagement in and essential contributions to the civic, cultural and economic well being of its communities.

**Educational Commitments EMBEDDED IN THE NEW MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES**
(CFR 1.2)
The president, in her convocation speech (9/04), presented the new mission, vision, and values as “educational commitments.” The following commitments are intrinsic in the new mission, vision, and values statements, and in the current General Education outcomes; CSUH will discuss these commitments over the coming year and a half as part of strengthening the university’s shared understanding of its new mission, vision, and values statements.

**CSUH graduates will be able to demonstrate that they:**
1. Think critically and creatively
2. Solve problems effectively and innovatively
3. Are multi-culturally competent
4. Make ethical and socially responsible decisions
5. Communicate effectively, in writing and speaking
6. Are broadly educated about their own bodies and minds, human society, the physical world, and legacies of the human civilizations
7. Can reason quantitatively
8. Can demonstrate information literacy
9. Understand the nature of open minded inquiry and manifest it especially with regard to major social and global issues
10. Collaborate with others from vastly different backgrounds
11. Engage in the civic, cultural and economic life of their communities, locally and globally

The CSUH Campus Climate will:
1. Strive to prepare all of its students to realize their goals
2. Be known for services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success
3. Be composed of students, faculty and staff from vastly different backgrounds
4. Be an inclusive multicultural educational environment
5. Be responsive to students’ unique needs
6. Include an array of activities that promote students’ enjoyment and well-being
7. Be an intentional and multicultural learning community

The Faculty, through their curricula, teaching, and course-related activities will:
1. Offer an academically-rich multicultural learning experience
2. Set and communicate high academic standards and expectations and provide the academic experiences needed to reach those standards and expectations
3. Intellectually engage students with active participation through applied learning, research and/or community service

These educational commitments, by-in-large, commit us to pursue and evaluate even more vigorously what we already do. For example, President Rees is dedicated, and has been since her arrival on campus in 1990, to building relationships and contributing to the communities CSUH serves. Community needs are often identified through studies commissioned by community agencies or requests from regional leaders, or studies done by faculty. Some of the recent programs and partnerships we’ve established are in the areas of Hospitality Management, Small business Management, Social Work, capacity-building for community-based organizations, and San Francisco Bay-Delta research and education. The Contra Costa Campus recently was recognized by the Contra Costa Economic Partnership as the “Contra Costa County Higher Education Partner of the Year” for it leadership in developing the Health and Bioscience Collaborative and the Environmental Science Collaborative.

CSUH’S RESPONSE TO DIVERSITY (CFR 1.5)
CSUH’s Institutional Proposal highlighted the diversity in our student body. It also reported that a number of faculty and staff, primarily those of color, are “disheartened, and frustrated with the fact that the racial, cultural, and gender composition of the faculty and its multiple ramifications has not come close to catching up with changes in student diversity.”

Representatives from each of the CSUH-WASC Outcome teams met twice to consider the topic of diversity. They strongly recommended that initially we focus on cultural, racial, gender, socio-economic class, and sexual orientation for assessing CSUH’s capacity to fulfill its commitment to a “multicultural learning experience.” Throughout the rest of this document, when we use “diverse” or “diversity,” we mean these aspects of the terms.

WASC’s five “Expectations for Institutional Review and Presentation” will frame this review.
With the new mission, vision, and values statements, the university is making a public commitment to become an exemplar of a multicultural learning experience for students which features: a diversified faculty, staff, and student-body who are multi-culturally competent; curricular and co-curricular opportunities that teach multicultural perspectives and skills; and a climate characterized by respect, inclusion, and academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students from all backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives who collaborate to create and sustain a vibrant learning community. The collaborative and consensus-building process means that the CSUH community agrees to emulate, share, teach, and support the core values of learning; and to engage in civic, cultural, and economic life, critical and creative thinking, effective communication, ethical decision-making, multicultural competence, and an open exchange of ideas and viewpoints. Such a vision begins with a diversified student body, faculty, and staff.

Overall, CSUH is more diversified than the CSU averages in most categories, but we want to make even more significant progress.

As illustrated in the table below, CSUH enjoys one of the most diverse student bodies of the CSUs, with 50% students of color, (21.6% reporting “Unknown or Other”) and 63% female. We compare favorably with the CSU figures for all ethnic groups except Native American and Latino/Hispanic, yet our numbers are sufficient to place CSUH in the top 100 institutions in the U.S. for awarding degrees to Hispanic students. Of the student body, 9.5% is comprised of international students, the highest in the CSU. [Diversity Comparisons].

We are underrepresented in terms of a proportional comparison to our students. We are aware that some departments are models for recruiting and retaining women and faculty of color, while others are less successful. Faculty diversity is extremely important to CSUH because we want to exemplify an academically-rich multicultural learning experience with programs recognized for their educational excellence. To encourage a diverse faculty, the Academic Senate elects an Affirmative Action Liaison Officer (AALO) to assist recruitment and selection committees in attracting a diverse applicant pool for all tenure track searches. A Faculty Equity and Diversity Committee, (FDEC) appointed by the Academic Senate, is responsible for analyzing faculty diversity data and making recommendations to the Senate annually. The FDEC is developing a survey on faculty attitudes and experiences with race, culture, and gender. The Provost’s Office holds an annual required workshop for all members of tenure track search committees, and there is a clear set of policies and procedures that seek to ensure equity and diversity in all searches. [CSUH Policies – Faculty Searches] The College of Education and Allied Studies has an ongoing agenda of social justice and diversity that is central to their strategic plan. The dean in the College of Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences is offering symposia on ways to increase the numbers of diverse faculty who can further our mission to create a “multicultural learning experience” and model multicultural competence. These efforts and others are beginning to produce results.
Our efforts have placed us ahead of the CSU faculty averages for ethnic and gender diversity in all areas except Mexican American/Latino faculty. In addition, we are in the top five of all CSUs with the highest percentages of faculty of color.

### CSUH and CSU System Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CSUH full-time faculty</th>
<th>CSU full-time faculty</th>
<th>CSUH students (headcount)</th>
<th>CSU students (headcount)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>142 (42.6%)</td>
<td>4,754 (40.7%)</td>
<td>8,504 (63.2%)</td>
<td>241,870 (59.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>191 (57.4%)</td>
<td>6,920 (59.3%)</td>
<td>4,951 (36.8%)</td>
<td>167,076 (40.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>24 (7.2%)</td>
<td>449 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1,288 (10.6%)</td>
<td>22,942 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>73 (0.6%)</td>
<td>78 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3,064 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, Pacific Islanders, and Filipino</td>
<td>52 (15.6%)</td>
<td>1,581 (13.5%)</td>
<td>3,317 (27.2%)</td>
<td>67,529 (17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>23 (6.9%)</td>
<td>882 (7.6%)</td>
<td>1,444 (11.9%)</td>
<td>83,111 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>232 (69.7%)</td>
<td>8,637 (74.0%)</td>
<td>3,426 (28.1%)</td>
<td>153,383 (39.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>52 (0.4%)</td>
<td>2,630 (21.6%)</td>
<td>57,677 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Total</td>
<td>333 (100%)</td>
<td>11,674 (100%)</td>
<td>12,183 (100%)</td>
<td>387,706 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>Non-resident faculty</td>
<td>Included above</td>
<td>1,272 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,240 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>11,674</td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>408,946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Fall 2001 to Fall 2003, the total number of minority tenure/tenure track faculty increased by only 1 from 96 (27.1%) to 97 (27.8%). While the number of Hispanic tenure/tenure track faculty increased by 5, the African American faculty decreased by 2. During this same period we lost 2 Asian American faculty. In sum, the ratio of white to non-white students is still approximately 1:2 at CSUH while the ratio for faculty is approximately 2:1. The gender match is somewhat better, but there are still proportionately far more female students than female faculty. Women faculty increased by 1 from 132 (37.2%) in Fall 2001 to 133 (38.2%) in Fall 2003. In 2001, of the 30 faculty members we hired 15 (50%) were minority. In 2002 we hired 17 faculty, 5 (29.4%) of whom were minorities. And in 2003, of the 19 faculty hired, 7 (36.8%) were minority. Clearly, we’ve been able to attract and hire diverse faculty. Unfortunately we’ve lost diverse faculty, to retirements and separations at almost the same rate. The president has authorized 30 new tenure track searches for 2004/2005 with an expressed call to maximize attempts to create diverse pools of applicants.

Based on disaggregated data by gender and ethnicity the IPEDs categories clearly shows the areas where CSUH is more and less diverse. [Staff Diversity] Overall in the “executive/administrative and managerial” ranks, Whites comprise almost two-thirds (63%) of the executives as do the males. In two categories, “technical” and “other professional”, Whites make up more than 50% of the employees with 12-16% more males than females. In both the “clerical” and “skilled crafts” areas Whites drop below 50% and the gender distribution is lopsided with 89% males in “skilled crafts” and 92% females in the “clerical/secretarial” ranks. In the “service/maintenance” category, Hispanics make up 41%, with a total of 75% people of color and 78% males. It total, staff at CSUH consists of 58% female and 42% male, 15.1% African-American, 17.8% Asian, 16.9% Hispanic, 48.7%
Caucasian, .6% American Indian, and .5% International. Over the five-year period from Fall 1999 to Fall 2003, African-American representation grew by 18.4%, Asian by 24.8%, Hispanic by 15.3%, and female by 3%. The top administration in Academic Affairs, namely four college deans, the university librarian, and the deputy provost are all minorities.

The new Mission, Vision, and Values statements require students to have multicultural competence; open-minded inquiry, especially in areas of major social and global issues; and socially responsible contributions to communities. GE program objectives include developing students’ awareness of issues related to diversity, respect for the knowledge and experiences of a diverse population, and the ability to work well with those who are different from them. The General Studies courses within the freshmen learning communities have a curriculum specific to those objectives. The assessment data of freshmen learning indicates that our students experience, learn, and appreciate far more about human diversity than their national comparison group. In the Spring freshman General Studies course, students may complete ten hours of community service with the objective of developing the skills, knowledge, and competencies necessary for active community participation and citizenship. [G.E. Report 1995-2002]

Humanities and social science learning outcomes also support the mission, vision, and values statements. Humanities learning outcomes require that students understand the effect of cultural and intellectual contexts on arts and literature. Social Science learning outcomes focus on developing students’ abilities to describe how human diversity frames and constrains our understanding of human behavior and to apply that knowledge to arguments made about contemporary issues including class, crime, discrimination, education, gender, immigration, poverty, and race. [Humanities – Social Science G.E. Outcomes]

The CSU requires that at least one course specifically address the contributions of cultural groups and women to U.S. society. At CSUH, the learning outcomes for this course require analysis of dominant and group relations within the U.S., knowledge of the history and experiences of the cultural and sexual groups, and of the origins and functions of discrimination, exploitation, and oppression of the groups. [Cultural Groups – Women’s G.E. Outcomes]

A search for the terms cultural perspectives, race, gender, sexual orientation, and social justice, as they apply in the U.S. revealed that 7 degree programs included 1 or more of these terms in student learning outcomes. Five-degree programs included some aspect of international diversity. Many other programs may well have indicators that address some aspect of cultural diversity. Most programs have yet to collect data on these outcomes.

Clearly, CSUH has a rich opportunity to decide what knowledge, skills, and dispositions are required to become multi-culturally competent and to coordinate the roles of general education and disciplinary majors to provide opportunities for students to practice and master the outcomes. The Campus Climate COT has recommended that the university inquire seriously into what it will take to educate both the minority and dominant groups so
that they can contribute to lessening the impact of racism, sexism, homophobia, and other forms of inequality.

The gift of student diversity comes with the responsibility to learn about the challenges that each group experiences at CSUH so that the university can, as its new mission promises, prepare all students to realize their goals. To enhance the intellectual, professional, personal, and leadership development of its highly diverse student body, CSUH offers a rich array of support services and opportunities for students from all cultures and orientations. [Student Life]. Co-curricular activities, such as clubs, organizations, multicultural events, and speakers’ forums, serve to expose students to diverse ideas, cultures, and worldviews. They encourage and facilitate positive interaction among ethnic groups and help students from all cultures develop a sense of belonging and connectedness to the university. Even so, we lack knowledge about the degree of student participation in these activities and their effectiveness. For example, we were troubled last Spring, by the two racial incidents on campus. While the university responded immediately by conducting forums and workshops with all parties, we want to understand how to be more effective.

To make diversity integral to its plans for institutional improvement, the Campus Climate, Faculty, Community Connections, Student Services, and General Education COTs all speak to the need to assess the strengths and weaknesses of CSUH’s efforts. They all call for a comprehensive assessment of the campus climate and support services, and to disaggregate all data for race, ethnicity, gender, and class in order to know the ways in which we foster the intellectual and personal development of all our students. Data collection needs to be multifaceted in the curriculum, the faculty, the co-curriculum, and the support and services for student learning. There has not been a coordinated -wide assessment of campus climate at CSUH since 1994, and the outcomes of that effort—part of a system-wide initiative to improve sensitivity and responsiveness on all CSU campuses to diversity issues—have been lost. A priority for the next phase is to assess the educational effectiveness of our diversity efforts, and to plan improvements by using these data. [Campus Climate COT Report]

**CAPACITY TO INTEGRATE AND INSTITUTIONALIZE THE NEW MISSION, VISION, AND VALUES (CFR 1.3)**

CSUH possesses the necessary components to integrate and institutionalize the new mission, vision, and values statements throughout its educational goals and evidence systems. It has a clear organizational structure with four vice presidential areas, four colleges, and an auxiliary foundation [Organizational Chart]. The CSU holds CSUH leadership at all levels accountable by reporting requirements [Appendix III – CFRs] and internal management practices, including yearly performance evaluations. An elected committee of the Academic Senate reviews all top-level managers every five years. Moreover, CSUH is now infused with the energy of an interim provost, a new vice president for student services, two new college deans, and a new dean at the Contra Costa Campus since the Institutional Proposal.

We will know that the new mission, vision, and values statements are authentic when the executive and faculty leadership consistently communicate and use as criteria the principles and commitments embedded in those statements; determine the priorities, definitions, indicators, and measures for key commitments; measure progress toward meeting the
commitments; use agreed upon disaggregated data; and ensure that the measurable results of progress are used as active guides for all decision-making, resource allocations, hiring, retention, and services as the law and applicable collective bargaining agreements allow.


2 Currently CSUH doesn’t request data on sexual orientation, or detailed information on socio-economic class, and cultural issues.

3 WASC Handbook of Accreditation, 2001, pp 74-75.

4 Six COTs (Campus Climate, Student Services, Faculty, Technology, Library, and Business Processes) have reviewed mission statements (see COT reports). [COT Report Summaries] Proposed new or revised mission statements elaborate and align with the university’s new set of statements. They will be presented to the university via electronic feedback forms, revised accordingly, and given to the President for final approval by January 2005. Once accepted, these statements, along with corresponding student learning outcomes from all degree programs (including general education), will be linked to relevant university documents. (CFR 1.1)

5 Throughout this document discussions of diversity, including recruitment, retention, best practices, and the like are in compliance with Proposition 209.

6 Sources: Fall 2003 profile of CSU Employees, CIRS L05 Data File for IPEDS Reporting, and CSU ERSS Statistical Extract. Full-time employees include tenured, probationary and lecturer faculty. Percent ethnicity is based on total domestic students. Domestic includes U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizen immigrants and refugees. International includes all other non-U.S. citizens. Asian/Pacific Islander includes the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian Subcontinent, and Pacific Islands, including China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, American Samoa, India, and Vietnam.

7 Programs dealing with U.S. diversity are found in Criminal Justice, Ethnic Studies, Liberal Studies, Educational Leadership, Social Work, Health Sciences, and Nursing. Programs with international perspectives on diversity are Anthropology, French, Spanish, International Studies, and Latin American Studies.

8 In the Spring, 2004, the two racial incidents involved one fraternity and one sorority. In one case a flyer, promoting a dance in the name of a fraternity on campus included the phrase “no black people allowed.” The fraternity denied any responsibility. An investigation pursued. A campus wide forum and dialogue session was held facilitated by two faculty. The second incident involved a sorority event on campus. Members of the sorority were preparing for the entertainment, which included blackface performers. When senior level administrators, who were in attendance saw what was transpiring, they asked the sorority members to forego that particular act, which they did. The sorority members attended a workshop on the history of blackface in America, facilitated by a faculty member.
Infrastructure for Coordinated Assessment: Standard Two

In this chapter, we have chosen to focus on our capacity to have a “coordinated” assessment process for student learning. We offer our notable successes and the areas identified for improvement by the Campus Outcome Teams in the areas of General Education, degree programs, curriculum review process, and support for student success, paying particular attention to advising and retention. We link these to our capacity to implement our new mission, vision, and values.

Assessment of Student Learning (CFR 2.2, 2.4, 2.7)

Faculty and academic administrator discussions during the WASC proposal development process identified two dominant needs required to address assessment activities. The first calls for coordinating student-learning assessment to eliminate unnecessary duplication of reporting activities (e.g., 5 Year Program Reviews, CSU Accountability Reports, WASC Accreditation, specialized accreditation, tenure track requests) while recognizing the different purposes, audiences, and/or criteria for review and evaluation of these reports. Second, these reports need to be used in meaningful, explicit, and transparent ways to make programmatic decisions. The multiple reports, which departments have had to prepare, have resulted in increasing frustration and cynicism among the faculty, who see few results from hours of labor. Some faculty see learning assessment as one more unfunded mandate that is intrusive, threatening to academic freedom, and that presages loss of institutional autonomy. In addition to these two areas, another concern is the need to coordinate the assessment of student learning across our multiple campuses.

Through the WASC Campus Outcome Team discussions, CSUH has articulated three purposes for coordinating assessment of student learning outcomes and integrating the results into program and curricular review.

1. **Accountability**: To demonstrate to students, parents, Board of Trustees, WASC, and the publics it serves that CSUH is providing quality education;
2. **Program Improvement**: To provide program faculty, staff, and administrators with timely information and feedback that ensures a process by which there is an institutional commitment for quality program improvement; and
3. **Program and Resource Alignment**: To provide the means to ensure that CSUH offers the appropriate array of academic programs and that institutional resources align effectively with the academic programs’ needs.

General Education (CFR 2.2)

CSUH’s General Education (GE) program aims to provide students with an academically rich, multicultural educational experience, consistent with our new Mission Statement. The 1995 WASC accreditation report offered a critique that focused on the smorgasbord of courses resulting in a lack of curricular coherence and no clear purpose for general education. The university made dramatic changes in the lower division GE component. The new program, begun in fall 1998, features yearlong general education learning communities (aka “Clusters”) for freshmen students. The Clusters are comprised of thematically integrated courses in Natural Sciences, Humanities, and/or Social Science with thematic links connecting communication,
composition, information literacy courses, and a freshman seminar in each learning community. These clusters give students a peer community to support learning, and faculty and social connections essential for student retention and academic success that are often missing on a commuter campus.²

The GE program recently underwent a 5-year program review that took two-years (2001 to 2003). Many constituencies and an outside reviewer were consulted. Reactions varied widely. The university Committee on Instruction and Curriculum (CIC) recommended several changes, which were approved by the Academic Senate. These changes included the elimination of the mandatory sophomore cluster, a reduction from 3 to 2 units in general studies, and an increase from 1 to 2 units in information literacy.

The Clusters have been the focus of the most intensive and consistent assessment effort on this university and serve as a model for degree programs. Assessment, mostly indirect measures of program outcomes for the first six years, began as CSUH offered its first freshman learning community clusters in fall 1998. We can now document that CSUH students who have participated in the learning community program, when compared to freshman students who entered before 1998, stay in school longer and perform better on the University Writing Skills Test than other first-time test takers. Learning community students report significant interaction with and learning from those who are different from them in culture, race, religion, and other areas. The impact reported by CSUH students is above levels reported by students in our national comparison group [G.E. Assessment Report 1995-2002]. Analysis of assessment data has led to many changes, most in the freshman seminar course (General Studies 1010, 1011, 1012, 1013).

More direct and authentic assessment is now possible with approval of a GE mission statement, passed by the Academic Senate on June 3, 2003, and approved learning outcomes, passed by the Academic Senate in winter 2004 and fall 2004 for most GE requirements [G.E. Mission/Outcomes Senate Approval]. The mission statement expresses the goal that graduates make measurable progress toward becoming educated persons in a diverse society. The learning outcomes describe expectations for entry-level and upper division students, and allow CSUH to move from mostly standardized measures of students’ perceptions of their learning and experiences to more authentic and direct measures of student learning through embedded assessment.

Four freshman learning community clusters are currently designing embedded assessment strategies. Faculty teams will analyze the data during summer 2005. All courses approved for the 2004-09 GE program are expected to be engaged in directly assessing student acquisition of GE learning outcomes through embedded strategies by the end of the 2006-07 academic year. GE’s assessment plan includes course-embedded assessments, student evaluations, University Writing Skills pre- and post-test data, retention and graduation figures, student grades, and standardized assessments of student expectations and experiences for comparison to a national data set.

In the freshmen learning communities right now, the richest part of multicultural learning comes from the interactions of students. The freshman class is the most diverse class in an already diverse student body. However, the faculty who teach in freshman learning communities do not reflect the class’ diversity, except in gender. Two learning community themes deal with issues
directly related to multicultural issues: Viewing Diversity (social science), with a focus on a culturally and racially diverse world and Gender in the Arts, Literature, and Society (humanities). These two learning communities are among those that fill most quickly. To meet student interest in themes about human diversity, the GE Coordinator is meeting with faculty who are interested in developing new learning communities with themes that make the multicultural nature of our communities, state, and nation and/or the experience of racism, sexism, and homophobia a focus of the learning. Such themes have the potential to support deep inquiry into and difficult dialogues about the experiences and issues that arise daily and offer students’ personally meaningful and supportive learning. Two General Education Program goals [G.E. Outcomes – Multicultural Competency] address multicultural competency; General Studies, Humanities, Social Science, and Cultural Groups and Women’s learning outcomes support these goals.

The Office of General Education sits in a difficult position vis-à-vis academic departments that have responsibility for courses and faculty teaching courses that carry GE credit. Assessment data may or may not have an effect on who is teaching what content for general education. Frequent and late changes in teaching assignments in freshman learning communities endanger thematic integration and collaboration—essential characteristics of learning communities. More lecturers teach in freshman learning communities than is ideal to create student-faculty connections that continue beyond the first year. Retention, tenure, and promotion practices seemingly reward faculty for teaching major and not general education courses. Some believe that the university currently provides limited recognition for the additional work required to teach in thematically integrated and collaboratively taught learning communities. The General Education COT concluded that it would be ideal if all department chairs and faculty shared the vision of a dynamic and evolving learning community program that engages, challenges, and supports freshmen learning.

**Degree Programs (CFR 2.2)**
During the past seven years, CSUH has increased its capacity to integrate and institutionalize assessment of student learning. To date all degree programs have identified student learning outcomes and almost all degree programs, including graduate programs, have in place mission and goal statements, indicators, and identification of entry and exit courses where the assessment can be included. [Degree Program Outcomes] Progress on the actual collection and use of assessment data have been hindered by a lack of adequate resources. All academic programs need to measure the outcome indicators and to use these results for program improvement.

The following chronology demonstrates what we have accomplished as well as what is needed to coordinate and actualize efforts:

**1998:** University Goals and Objectives [University Goals & Objectives 1998-2002] require assessment plans at the department level and the Office of Faculty Development launches an “Assessment Plan Competition” with monetary awards.

**2000:** the CSUH–WASC 2000 Five-Year Report using the University Goals and Objectives and the CSU Accountability Initiative as organizing criteria finds almost all programs in the “discussion phase.” An overly ambitious timeline is set for all disciplines to have completed
assessment plans and begin collecting data. A CSUH Assessment Council is convened. [CSUH-WASC 2000 Five Year Report: volume 1 / volume 2]

2001: the CSUH Faculty Senate adopts new Policies and Procedures for Five Year Reviews and Plans that require programs to include the “Outcomes Assessment” document and to summarize what has been learned from this information, what steps the program has taken in response, and what further steps should be taken." [5-Year Program Review Policy on Outcomes]. The CSUH Assessment Council initiates a joint statement between the Academic Senate and the provost that agrees to a research and development phase for a five-year period (2001-2006). [Firewall Statement]

2004: the Assessment Officer catalogues all available program-level assessment information, now part of the Institutional Portfolio that includes the most current three to five student learning outcomes from each degree program. These outcomes also will be listed in the 2006/08 University Catalog.

The provost and college deans now require assessment data in each program’s next five-year review report. This decision ties assessment of student learning, specialized accreditation, WASC, and CSU Accountability requirements into program review. This should make the process more meaningful for faculty. During 2004-05 and 2005-06, almost half of all degree programs (21 out of 52) will complete their five-year review process. Additionally, the provost, deans, and the Offices of Faculty Development and Institutional Research and Assessment are coordinating support for the faculty as they measure and use assessment results. In fact, CSU and CSUH policies require that each department conduct assessment of student learning outcomes and describe the use of their results no later than their next scheduled five-year academic review.

Student learning outcomes for master’s degrees stress independent research skills, mastery of knowledge at an appropriate level, and mastery of professional abilities (sometimes as the result of internships or other relevant outside classroom activities) [Graduate Program Outcomes]. Capstone requirements foster research and critical thinking competencies of students, especially in the graduate programs. Every graduate degree requires a thesis, project, or comprehensive examination where the student must demonstrate competency in research, analytical thinking, and mastery of professional knowledge or skills in the case of the creative arts. Approximately two-thirds (32/48) of the undergraduate degree programs have a capstone or senior seminar course where assessment of research ability occurs.

While the student evaluation form asks students to what degree the course met the stated course goals, the current requirements for syllabi do not call for explicit inclusion of course and program learning outcomes. Such a recommendation is expected to come before the Academic Senate for consideration in the 2004-2005 academic year.

Curricular Approval and Program Review (CFR 2.4, 2.7)
CSUH has long-standing, well-established curricular approval and program review processes and is on its way to integrating its use of student learning results with those processes. The Committee on Instruction and Curriculum, (CIC), a standing committee of the Academic Senate with several subcommittees (General Education, Writing Skills, Critical Thinking, Technology
and Instruction, Graduate Programs, Cultural Groups/Women, Lifelong Understanding, and Basic Skills Requirement Appeals) has responsibility for approval of new programs and any curricula that affect students across the university’s colleges. Requests for new degree programs also go to another Senate standing committee, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resources (CAPR). Curricular proposals originate in the department and college-level curriculum committees review them for approval. CIC and the Academic Senate review curricular proposals involving more than one college, all proposed new programs and new options. Thus, the institution’s faculty takes collective responsibility for establishing, reviewing, fostering, and demonstrating the attainment of academic standards befitting the established expectations. New degree programs must also be approved by the CSU Chancellor’s Office.

Departments prepare their five-year academic reviews reports and CAPR reviews them. These reviews must describe the program’s use of learning outcomes. The Academic Senate takes action on CAPR’s recommendations that can include continuation with no change, continuation with modifications, or program discontinuance. The institution’s expectations for student learning as articulated by these committees are widely shared among its members through the actions of the Academic Senate, college, and department level discussions, and publications such as the University Catalog. All programs offered by the institution are subject to review as cited above, including analyses of the achievement of program learning objectives and outcomes. Each program review includes at least one outside reviewer. Where external professional accreditation is involved, a team of external reviewers report on the program. Academic review and professional accreditation self-studies include analysis of the assessment of educational objectives and results of license examinations and placement tests where appropriate.

The Academic Senate passed recommendations based upon findings of the Academic Standards Subcommittee [Academic Standards Report] to encourage departments and faculty to establish policies (if they have not already done so) on grading standards, academic honesty, course requirements (outcomes-based), completion of course assignments, required work outside of classroom meetings (guideline is 2 hours of study per academic unit), standards for classroom behavior and participation, and use of the Internet for classroom assignments. Departments are to urge faculty to report these policies on course syllabi. Departments and programs are to collect data on academic standards, including department GPAs, for their five-year reviews, insure that their assessment plans address the implementation of academic standards policies, and communicate their standards to area high schools and community colleges.

The Academic Review COT examined CSUH and other CSUs’ policies and procedures and interviewed many of the present and past administrators including deans, associate deans, program chairs, faculty and staff from all four colleges. [Academic Review COT Recommendation] The COT carefully examined the results in light of the three primary functions of academic program review stated above and found that despite the requirement for an assessment plan in the five-year reviews, departments have work to do to insure a systematic, comprehensive, and embedded program of assessment of student outcomes. The assessment reports submitted to date are not sufficient to determine the quality and effectiveness of most academic programs at CSUH. CSUH must identify what data are most useful and timely for academic review. The COT recommended significantly more involvement of college administrators in preparation of and response to program review documents. Their
recommendation was that upon Senate approval of CAPR recommendations, that the provost, department chair, and dean should meet, discuss and document any implementation and resource agreements, to the extent possible, covering the next five years. Annual reports are recommended to record the Program’s activities and progress in implementing the agreements in light of resources received. CAPR does not review the General Education program. Currently, CIC conducts GE Program review and recommends program revisions to the Academic Senate although it has no established procedures or standards for assessing program effectiveness. The GE COT recommended the GE Program undergo regular academic program review. CAPR will consider the recommendation during the 2004-2005 academic year.

**SUPPORT FOR STUDENT SUCCESS**

CSUH believes that academic learning and student development should be integrated and transformative, not just a matter of in-class instruction. Our mission promises to prepare students to realize their goals, pursue meaningful life work, and be socially responsible contributors to their communities. Our particular challenge is to provide student services that are culturally relevant for our student body from vastly different backgrounds. Our two primary concerns are the effectiveness of our advising and retention. Currently, the Executive Director of Student Retention and Advising Services is analyzing these issues. She has drafted a University Retention Action Plan that offers recommendations for improving the retention, persistence to graduation, and graduation of CSUH undergraduate students. Key University personnel are reviewing the draft. [Appendix III (CFRs 2.10-2.14)]

While the university values the role student services play in student learning and development, budget reductions have had a serious impact on student services and co-curricular activities across the university. Staff reductions due to layoffs and reassignments have affected the quantity and timeliness of services. The university has reduced the Division of Students Affairs’ budget by over a million dollars during the past three years. Adequate funding levels for student services are critical to the well-being of students and the university. Inaccessible and inadequate services could have a negative effect on student persistence and students’ progression toward the completion of their degree.

Across the university, offices and departments are experiencing increased demand for their services. For example, the Student Center for Academic Achievement experienced a 109% growth in Center usage since the fall of 2001, a 65% increase since fall of 2002, and a 30% increase overall in 2003-2004. Preliminary figures show a significant increase in Center usage in fall 2004 when compared to fall 2003. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) provides intensive advising, supplemental instruction, and other support services to an ethnically diverse population of low-income first generation undergraduate students. For the Fall, 2004 term an administrative support assistant, whose position has been cut due to budget reductions, processed over 4200 applications to the program. The loss of this position means that existing staff will absorb that function and reduce their student appointment hours. Budget reductions has also affected the Summer Bridge Program that provides developmental and supplemental instruction during the summer to students admitted to the university with remedial needs. The number of Summer Bridge
Participants has been reduced from a high of 74 during the Summer of 1998 to a low of 40 during the Summer of 2004.

Until a few years ago, the University Advisement Center focused its time and services on students who had not declared a major, approximately 800 students per term. The UAC expanded its scope due to the burgeoning need for general education advising by entering transfers, students who were on academic probation or subject to disqualification, and graduating seniors who needed to know if they had deficiencies in their coursework that would preclude their graduation. As a result of adding these populations, the University Advisement Center worked with over 6,000 students during the 2003-2004 academic year. Budget reductions and reassignment of a full-time adviser led the University Advisement Center to reduce its hours of operation, restructure its service delivery to include a greater number of “group” advising sessions and on-line advising “chats”, and enter into intra-division and cross-division collaborations and sharing of resources. Even with these changes and new partnerships, UAC staff will be hard pressed to provide the desired level of service to all students who seek their assistance this year.

However, even during these fiscally stringent times, new initiatives throughout the university are intentionally promoting student success by providing students the academic, social, and co-curricular experiences that will make them successful students, responsible citizens, effective leaders, and productive employees. New programs and services tailored to the freshman year are being implemented to address the information, academic, housing, and service needs of the growing number of first-time freshmen.

[New Initiatives] CSUH hired a Freshman-Year Experiences Coordinator to work with Student Life and Residence Life staff to develop activities and programs.

The Division of Student Affairs has set the foundation for strategic planning, program assessment, and continuous improvement in student services at a divisional level. The Division is engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process and is implementing a singular database and tracking system for all of its units. These major efforts will provide structures for informed planning and systems for capturing benchmark and longitudinal data to evaluate the effectiveness of student services within the division; identify utilization trends by student categories and units; determine resource allocation priorities; administer utilization and student satisfaction surveys; and identify programs and strategies that improve student retention and graduation. However, since all segments of the university are engaged in the delivery of services to students, the responsibility for assessment of student services crosses all divisions. Systematic and consistent assessment of student services throughout the university is critical to measuring their effectiveness, establishing institutional priorities, and allocating university resources appropriately.

[Student Affairs Strategic Plan]

Retention and Graduation Rates
One measure of institutional performance and the effectiveness of student services is the degree to which we are successful at retaining (retention) students through to fulfillment of their educational goals (graduation). Student retention and graduation rates are important to the university for a variety of reasons. Of greatest importance is the
university’s commitment to student learning and success as defined in the university’s mission and values. CSUH strives to provide the best educational experience possible for students, and for ensuring that each student admitted to the university has the opportunity to achieve her or his educational goals, especially those students whose retention and graduation are well below those of others, e.g. undergraduate African American male and female and Latino male students.

One-Year Retention of First-Time Full-Time Freshmen: The University has been successful at improving the retention of its first-time freshmen over the past several years. The one year retention of first–time freshmen has increased from 78.5% (Fall 1997 to Fall 1998) to 81.6% (Fall 2002 to Fall 2003). Implementation of freshmen learning communities, adherence to established remediation policies, increased student services, and a significant decrease in the admission of students who do not meet published admission criteria may help explain this 3.1% increase.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>RETENTION RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-Year Retention Rate Comparisons by Ethnicity and Gender: A preliminary CSUH analysis of first-time freshmen one-year retention rates by ethnicity and gender for students entering the university in the Fall of 2002 shows White students achieving the highest one-year retention rate (86.1%) followed by Asians (85.7%), Latinos (81.5%), and African Americans (67.8%). The disaggregated data by sex reveals low retention rates for African American males (63%), African American females (67%) and Latino males (67%).

Two-Year Retention Rate Comparisons – Regularly Admitted First-Time Freshmen Disaggregated by Ethnicity: Two-year retention rate comparisons by ethnicity for Fall 2000 to fall 2002 as compared to fall 1997 to fall 1999 show improvement for all groups. Asians students had the highest persistence rates (71% to 72%) and the least improvement. White students showed the greatest improvement (59% to 70%). African American and Hispanic students’ persistence improved equally (61% to 67%). The overall two-year retention of regularly admitted CSUH students rose from 65% (1997-1999) to 69% (2000-2003).

CSU System Comparisons – Retention and Graduation Rates
First-Time Full-time Freshmen – CSUH’s one-year retention rate for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen entering the CSU in the Fall 2002 was 81.6% and above the systemwide average of 79.8%. CSUH’s six-year graduation rates for First-Time Full-Time Freshmen
entering the CSU in the Fall 1997 was 43.6%, just slightly below the systemwide average of 43.7%.  

**Undergraduate Transfers:** The one-year retention rate (fall 2002 to fall 2003) and three-year graduation rate (2000 to 2002) of California Community College transfers at CSUH (81.3%) is nearly three percentage points lower than the systemwide average (84%). CSUH’s three-year graduation rate of 57% is 7.4 percentage points higher than the systemwide average of 49.6%. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>First-Time Full-Time Freshmen</strong></th>
<th><strong>CCC Transfers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Year Retention</td>
<td>6-Year Graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Hayward</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Comparisons – Retention and Graduation Rates:** CSUH’s one-year retention and six-year graduation rates for first-time freshmen exceed the national average when compared to similar institutions across the country. The average one-year retention rate for first-time freshmen at 505 public four-year institutions located across the country is 71.9% for 2001-2002 while CSUH’s is 81%. The six-year graduation rate for first-time freshmen that attended public four-year non-doctorate granting institutions (Fall 95 to Spring 2001) is 40.3% while CSUH’s is 43.6%.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>First-Time Freshmen</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Year Retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Hayward</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-Year Institutions (505)</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Retention and Graduation of Students in Academic Jeopardy:** A CSUH study on six-year retention for the Fall 1996 first-time freshmen class shows that almost all students who do not continue into their second fall have dropped out by the end of the sixth year. Students who continue to their second fall, but are on academic probation, have twice the dropout rate after six years than those who continue in good academic standing. Further, two out of three students who continue to their second fall with grade point averages at or above 2.00 have graduated or are still enrolled at the end of six years. This study underscores the need for early identification of students who are in academic jeopardy and immediate intervention in the form of information and support services such as advising, mentoring and learning assistance.

**Need for Increased Faculty Diversity:** Retention literature supports the positive impact faculty of color have on the retention of students of color. Students of color are more likely to use advising and other retention services when faculty are of similar ethnicity. At CSUH, the ratio of students of color to faculty of color is 2:1. Because diversity on university committees, strategic planning activities, curriculum development, faculty
advising, etc. is important to the university, faculty of color are often asked to go beyond the degree of university service expected of faculty in general. Needless to say, this situation may place additional responsibilities on faculty of color.

New Technologies: Implementation of new technologies (imaging, degree audit and call management system) promise to improve the timeliness and reliability of information flowing to students. However, technological processes have been slow due to temporary snags, layoffs, and reassignments due to budget crises. The community looks forward to the not too distant future when these technologies enhance our ability to serve students more effectively and efficiently, provide more timely admissions decisions, make information readily accessible to students, and provide faculty and staff with additional tools in the delivery of student support services.

Advising: Research in the field of retention highlights the critical role effective advising plays in a student’s decision to persist to graduation. Effective advising is especially helpful for students having difficulty acclimating to the university environment and students in academic jeopardy. At CSUH, there are inherent challenges in the university’s advising infrastructure that affect service delivery, student success, and the flow and consistency/accuracy of information. These challenges include: 1) the PTR process that may not assign the level of importance to advising that this function requires; 2) the distributive nature of advising; and 3) three consecutive years of budget reductions that resulted in staff reassignments, cuts in professional development opportunities, and reductions in hours of operation.

As detailed in the conclusion, we will further address advising and retention in the Educational Effectiveness phase.

---

1 Review of the program after 6 years resulted in the elimination of sophomore clusters in favor of more freedom of choice for second year students. Continued assessment will determine the impact of this decision on student learning and on progress toward graduation. When almost all lower division general education requirements were met only in learning communities, assessment data indicated a larger number of students completed lower division general education in two years than students before Fall 1998. The question now on the table is whether students, with more freedom of choice, will complete their lower-division requirements before attaining upper division status.


3 Prior to Fall 1998, CSU students with remedial needs were not required to start developmental classes upon matriculation nor to complete them in a timely manner. Starting Fall 1998, the same quarter the freshman learning communities began, CSU policy required all students with remedial needs to begin remedial coursework their first quarter and reach baccalaureate level competence within one year. Students who failed to reach college level competence within one year (or at CSUH within a maximum of six quarters) are required to complete their developmental work elsewhere. They are free to return to CSUH upon satisfaction of remedial requirements.

4 Source: Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange

5 Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange
6 Source: Consortium for Student Retention and Data Exchange.


Capacity for Sustaining Core Resources and Functions:
Standard Three

Cal State Hayward sustains and supports its mission to provide an academically-rich, multicultural learning experience through its commitment to faculty, students, and staff. This chapter reflects on the university’s capacity to sustain this inclusive, learning-centered environment during difficult budget times as it discusses CSUH’s core resources: faculty, staff, information resources in the form of its library and instructional technology, and fiscal and physical resources.

Faculty (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)

The Faculty COT, in response to standard three, inquired into three questions. To what extent: 1) does the current ratio of tenured/tenure-track faculty to lecturers affect student learning? 2) does the current diversity of our tenured/tenure-track faculty and lecturers affect student learning? And 3) do the current systems for tenure/tenure-track faculty and lecturers’ workload, expectations, evaluation, and reward affect student learning? The Faculty COT used Chickering and Gamson’s Seven Principles of Good Practice in Undergraduate Education to envision the characteristics for a faculty learning community and to frame their responses to the three questions. These seven principles propose that student learning takes place in an environment that encourages student-faculty contact; encourages cooperation among students; encourages active learning; gives prompt feedback; emphasizes time on task; communicates high expectations; and respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

One goal for our university-wide WASC process is that “There is an ongoing dialogue about the quality of and community for learning among faculty, students, and staff.” The Faculty COT’s conversations revealed how much faculty want and need dialogues about teaching and learning within their own departments and across disciplines on campus. This recognition led to the following definition of a faculty learning community:

“A faculty learning community respects, encourages, and rewards the diverse intellectual talents of our faculty; provides regular opportunities for active learning among faculty; focuses on how faculty expertise can enhance student and faculty learning; supports pedagogical, scholarly, and creative collaboration among faculty; invites faculty to visit and contribute to one another’s classrooms; respects faculty diversity; and rewards diverse scholarship and creative activity that improve our understanding of teaching and learning.”

The ideas embodied in the Seven Principles and in the faculty learning community will be more widely discussed in the university and through faculty governance during the Educational Effectiveness phase.

Tenure/Tenure Track vs. Part-Time Faculty (CFR 3.2)

Adequate faculty resources are central to the educational mission of the university. Faculty staffing at CSUH, which is tied to state support and student enrollment, is declining due to several years of state budget cuts. Some programs (especially those in high demand) have
difficulty offering enough sections to serve the students. Over the past five years, the number of full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF), both tenure track and lecturers, declined from 522.6 in Fall 1999 to 509.7 in Fall 2003 (-2%). Tenure/tenure track faculty FTEF declined from 346.1 in Fall 1999 to 329.3 in Fall 2003 (-5%). Lecturer FTEF increased slightly from 176.5 in Fall 1999 to 180.4 in Fall 2003 (+2%). During this same period, the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) increased by 7%, which means that our student-faculty ratio (SFR) has been increasing.

In Fall 1997, the ratio of FTEF was 69% tenure track to 31% part-time lecturers. By Fall 2003, the university-wide ratio had declined to 65% tenure track to 35% part-time, which puts CSUH about in the middle of CSU institutions. In Fall 2001, the CSU System average was 64% tenure track to 36% part-time faculty. The growth in part-time lecturers is a serious concern. Tenured/tenure track faculty are considered better able to implement the seven principles than lecturers who are compensated only for classroom teaching and office hours. Further, lecturers are not expected to serve on department, college, or university committees, or to assist with meeting the ever-increasing demands for assessment and accountability. As a result, the Faculty COT concluded that tenure and tenure-track faculty might be overburdened with insufficient time and energy to carry out the many tasks they would like to perform to enhance student learning and campus climate.

The full-time to part-time issue has gained much attention in the state. In September 2001, the Legislature adopted a resolution (ACR 73), which urged the Board of Trustees to raise the percentage of tenure-track faculty to at least 75%. In July 2002, the CSU Chancellor’s Office developed a plan to achieve this goal. However, the Legislature has not appropriated funds for the plan.

Declining state support, and lack of additional funds to support the goals of ACR 73 have created a difficult situation for the university. CSUH is trying to achieve its goal of increasing enrollment to take advantage of enrollment growth dollars. The interim provost recognizes the need to rebuild the permanent faculty. As a result, the president recently authorized 30 tenure track searches for 2004/05, with the understanding that the current student faculty ratio (SFR) would not be reduced in the immediate future.

Diversity of Faculty (CFR 3.2)
The seventh of the Seven Principles states that good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning. This places the responsibility on faculty to be multi-culturally competent. Recent research further documents the benefits of a diverse faculty in particular to student learning. The thirty (30) new faculty recruitments will provide the university with an opportunity to impact the diversity of its faculty.

Recruitment, Workload, Expectations, Evaluation, and Reward (CFR 3.3)
Recruitment: From Fall 2001, through Fall 2003, the recruiting success rate for CSUH was 72.2%, which was slightly higher than the CSU System rate of 70.2%. [Faculty Recruitment Data] Primarily a teaching institution, CSUH uses recruitment, incentive, and evaluation processes to focus on instructional competency. Most candidates invited for an on-campus interview for faculty positions are required to give a lecture (often in front of a
class) as part of their interview process. The Faculty COT, comprised of members with extensive experience on search committees and newer faculty who were recently applicants, noted that search committees have little or no guidance about how to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of applicants. The committees look closely at candidate materials that document their teaching ability, usually syllabi, assignments, and teaching evaluations. Workshops held by the Provost’s Office for Departmental Search Committees (CFR 3.3.) emphasize the recruitment of a diverse pool. The Faculty, Student Services, Instructional Technology, and Campus Climate COTs all recommend that criteria for hiring include evidence of the seven principles.

*Promotion, Tenure, and Retention:* The issue of retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty is the locus of much faculty anxiety. Although CSUH tenures over 90% of its probationary faculty, the felt anxieties reflect two converging sources of faculty stress: alignment of the criteria for retention, promotion, and tenure with CSUH priorities, and the heavy teaching requirements in the CSU system. A number of COTs (Mission, Faculty, GE, Student Services, Campus Climate, and Community Connections) devoted significant discussion to the CSUH *Promotion, Tenure, and Retention* (PTR) document. Two all-COT meetings focused on which criteria are given primacy, what counts as evidence for performance, and what activities are secondary for PTR though required of faculty.

As background, the CSUH Academic Senate’s promotion, tenure, and retention document describes the criteria for evaluation of full-time faculty [PTR Document]. The PTR document puts the highest emphasis on teaching effectiveness and presents a wide variety of ways to document scholarly activity, the second criterion. University service and community involvement are the other two criteria for faculty evaluation. PTR committees examine peer reviews and other evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction. CSUH has recruitment criteria and evaluation processes for part-time faculty. [Recruitment Processes: Part-time Faculty] All full-time faculty must have students evaluate at least two courses per year.

A typical CSU workload consists of 12 weighted teaching units (WTUs) or 3 courses per quarter. Faculty salaries are based on 15 WTUs per quarter leaving three WTUs for scholarly and creative activities, committee assignments, and community involvement. Faculty concern that their heavy teaching load limits their ability to conduct research, to interact with students, or to serve their communities is widespread across the CSU. A 2001 system-wide survey on workload found that faculty reported working an average of 50 hours per week while expressing a desire for fewer administrative and teaching responsibilities and more time for scholarly and creative activities. Thirty-nine percent of CSUH’s 50 respondents reported they had received some assigned time (release from teaching) for scholarly or administrative work. This strategy to balance teaching with scholarship, advising, and service, however, has declined in use due to the budget crisis and a desire to put more tenure-track faculty in the classroom.

The all-COT discussions about promotion, tenure, and retention produced no significant disagreement with the criteria listed in the PTR document. However, discussants argued passionately for explicit ways to honor the work required of faculty but perhaps minimally
rewarded in the PTR process, for example, student advising and community service. They expressed distress that review committees look to student evaluations as the primary indicator of effective teaching and a desire that they balance student evaluations with evidence of sound pedagogy, e.g., strong syllabi and assignments, and high and fair standards for achievement, peer evaluations. The participants called for the document to align more effectively with CSUH’s new mission, vision, and values and developed five major recommendations for revisions in the PTR document: 1) reward faculty engagement with the Seven Principles; 2) recognize faculty for integrating technology and online instruction; 3) count community service as service to the university; 4) reward faculty who teach in freshman learning communities and other general education courses; and 5) discuss the value the scholarship of teaching as both research and creative activity. Some faculty, who reviewed a draft of this report, saw no need for such an examination. However, the recommendation remains that CSUH open a research inquiry into the PTR process in collaboration with the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) of the Academic Senate. Any subsequent recommendations will go before faculty governance.

Support For Faculty Development (CFR 2.8, 2.9, 3.4)
The Office of Faculty Development and the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching (FCET) is a central location for organizing and coordinating faculty activities related to improved teaching methodology, and for university-wide discussion of student learning. FCET services are directed toward creating a faculty learning community where regular opportunities for active learning are provided to faculty, methods for enhancing student learning are discussed and analyzed by diverse groups of faculty, new and untenured faculty are provided with effective mentoring, and the scholarship of learning is supported.

FCET maintains a weekly workshop program for faculty during the academic year, featuring both technological and pedagogical learning opportunities. Programs emphasize increasing student engagement, assessing student outcomes, using classroom technology, and designing interdisciplinary courses. [FCET Schedule]

The FCET has taken the lead in attempts to organize an effective faculty learning community. In response to faculty feedback, Center personnel consistently update their offerings and develop new programs to meet changing faculty needs. In addition, each college has its own methods for renewing teaching and scholarship. These efforts to improve teaching effectiveness are welcome and reasonably effective, and we want to maximize their full potential. While the offerings are attractive, attendance is less than desired. The Faculty COT reported that faculty attribute lack of attendance to increased workload and decreased numbers of tenure-track faculty.

The Office of Faculty Research and Sponsored Programs supports faculty to find research opportunities and to develop and submit research proposals. CSUH received $9.1 million in 2002/03 in external funds for research, up from $8.3 million received in 1998/99. Over the past five years, 484 faculty research proposals have been submitted to external sources and 379 (78.3%) have been funded. Faculty research and creative activity at CSUH is also supported through Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity (RSCA) grants and college initiatives. CSUH received $78,502 from the CSU Chancellor’s Office in 2004/05 to
support research, scholarship, and creative activity. Despite the budget crisis, this allocation was not cut from the 2003/04 figure. Colleges also support research, scholarship, and creative activity through assigned time and other means, which releases faculty from teaching responsibilities.

**Staff (CFR 3.1, 3.3)**

Staff play a critical role in the attainment of the university’s mission. Many of the issues for faculty, such as adequacy of numbers, policies, and development, are also applicable to staff. The beginning of the 2004/05 academic year was difficult for staff due to the state budget cut. Thirteen (13) staff employees were laid off. While this number was down from the 63 originally proposed, many staff were reassigned or chose to leave under the threat of layoff. However, before the staff layoffs, the number of FTE staff actually grew from 762.3 in Fall 1999 to 783.6 in Fall 2003. Executive/Managerial staff declined from 54.2 in Fall 1999 to 51.7 in Fall 2003. The biggest growth in staff was in the Professional category, which grew from 246.8 in Fall 1999 to 295.3 in Fall 2003.

Although the combination of layoffs, reduction in temporary positions, reassignments, retirements, and resignations have resulted in service reductions across the university, every effort has been made to lessen the impact on students and on instruction. One example is the Learning Commons, a joint Library-Media and Technology Services effort that will open in the library building in Winter 2005 to give students access to an initial seventy-five (75) computer workstations and service from both library and instructional technology staff. Regardless, faculty and staff concerns regarding the sustainability of basic infrastructure needs and the potential for future budget reductions have had a negative impact on morale.

Staff recruitment, evaluation, workload, and incentives must follow the guidelines and regulations of the CSU System and the provisions in the collective bargaining agreements with the eight unions that represent CSUH employees in eleven (11) bargaining units, [Collective Bargaining Agreements]. The human resource policies, the position classification system, and the salary schedules of the CSU System are on the CSU website [CSU Human Resource Policies]. The Human Resources department at CSUH provides directions and a checklist of actions that must accompany hiring requests. The university’s Equal Employment Opportunity Officer must approve all staff appointments.

**Information Resources (CFR 3.6, 3.7)**

Information resources and the related infrastructure are well used at CSUH; however, the teaching and learning process pressures the university to offer ever-increasing levels of high quality information resources and attendant services. This has resulted in such initiatives as the implementation of Blackboard and the Learning Commons. As a result, the maintenance, funding, and expansion of information resources are a constant struggle and keeping up with demand is a continuous challenge.

**Library (CFR 3.6)**

The library reviewed its mission as part of its planning process and chose to retain its existing statement, which reflects core library values – commitment to collections and service, information access, information competency, and a physical place that fosters
learning and collaboration. The library then identified action items related to its mission and goals [CSUH Library Mission Statement] and is now in the implementation phase.

In addition to local collections and services, the library web page is a gateway to electronic information and services [CSUH Library Services]. Despite the decrease in funds for materials ($1.36M in 2001/2002; $984,000 in 2004/2005), the library finds creative ways to provide information resources. CSU consortial and centrally-funded electronic licensing agreements are considered a “best practice” model for libraries. Resource sharing is enhanced through LINK+, a multi-library consortium that allows users to request materials directly from member libraries, and interlibrary loan. Library services supplement traditional in-person and telephone service with e-mail and web-chat, which are growing in popularity. For a few hours of CSUH librarian participation in the 24/7™ service, faculty, students, and staff can access web-chat help round the clock seven days a week from librarians nation-wide. If the budget decline continues, however, it will be increasingly difficult for the library to provide the desired level of resources and services needed for teaching and research.

Because of the university’s recognition of the need for information competency across the curriculum, library faculty members teach Introduction to Information Literacy, a two-unit required course that is thematically linked to the General Education Core curriculum. This endeavor is part of the CSU-wide mandate that the library be responsible for information competency, a mandate that this university has embraced and which is one of its strengths.

Staffing is key to helping students to be information competent. Data on the Institutional Portfolio confirms the library’s serious understaffing as compared to its benchmarks, namely the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Standards for Libraries in Higher Education [ACRL Standards] and six peer institutions selected from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Academic Library Statistics Program website [NCES Comparisons] for their comparable student population size and total expenditures.

**Instructional Technology (CFR 3.7)**

The Instructional Technology (IT) COT researched ways to evaluate the effectiveness of educational technologies. The committee benchmarks technological infrastructure, budget, and coordination easily, but finds it difficult to assess the effectiveness of technology in affecting learning outcomes. Current studies show that, in addition to the motivation and preparedness of the student, the quality of instructional design and the talent of the faculty are key elements in affecting learning outcomes regardless of whether technology is involved in the delivery. It is also difficult to separate out the effect of today’s multi-technology environment in the assessment of technology’s impact on the teaching and learning experience. Still, CSUH wants to learn how to identify appropriate technologies to support student-centered learning and hopes to understand the relationship between in-class and online activities.

The IT COT is aligning its new mission with the *Seven Principles* and other criteria. The team believes that CSUH should provide access to appropriate and current instructional technology; professional development and training to ensure the technological competency
and currency of faculty; and educational technology supported by professional development and on-going technical assistance.

CSUH is using instructional technology to develop web services and applications to create a cyber-infrastructure to sustain scalable information resources and educational services and to foster a learning community that uses technology to create a sense of community. There is also significant classroom instructional support. The Blackboard (Bb) system is populated automatically with all sections of all courses each quarter. In the beginning of Fall 2004, 11,338 of the 12,722 enrolled students activated and used their Bb accounts. A pilot ePortfolio system is underway in the GE program and a pilot Content Management file sharing system is underway for the same students and all faculty. Selected other highlights include: over 70 smart classrooms; video equipment in every classroom and lab; and the new Learning Commons. Prior to this new facility, there were no open access computer labs available that were not also used for scheduled classes. The library also supplies approximately 100 wireless laptops for student use in the library.

Although CSUH instructional technology budgets have remained relatively flat over the past decade, the university compared favorably with instructional technology spending in the CSU until recent budget cuts (an additional 15% in 2004/05), but less favorably with national averages. [Instructional Technology Comparisons] Due to the recent state budget crisis, however, several technology-related initiatives were cut and will not be restored in 2004/05. IT staffing across the university is down by 17%. [CSUH Technology Staff Data] All technology plans are discussed in the University Instructional Technology (UIT) committee, which includes faculty and administrative representation. Colleges have Technology Coordinators, who meet regularly with central university IT staff. Two of the four colleges also have active technology advisory committees. A CSU system-funded multi-million dollar computing infrastructure upgrade is scheduled to be completed in 2004/05.

**FISCAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES (CFR 3.5)**

CSUH has experienced a decline in state support. There is hope that funding stability and adequacy of dollars will return, but the political process that funds the CSU is never certain. It is against this backdrop of fiscal challenge that Hayward is confronting the capacity to sustain its fiscal and physical infrastructure.

The ability of the University to provide a safe, secure learning environment for its students is more in jeopardy today than at any other time in the last thirty years. The deferred maintenance requirements of the physical structures and the underground infrastructure of Hayward’s utilities systems have been steadily increasing. The staff needed to address this area have also been steadily decreasing. The gross square footage of the physical structures of the university continues to grow without the concomitant funding needed to sustain it. All of this is brought about because budget cuts have been disproportionately sustained in the physical facilities and administrative portions of its operating budget. It should also be recognized that these same type of cuts (though to a lesser degree) occurred in the early 1990s and the deficit created by them has never been corrected and continues to grow.
In these difficult budget times, the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), comprised of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, is of particular importance, regularly advising the president on budgetary matters. The Committee on Budget and Resource Allocation (COBRA), a subcommittee of the Academic Senate, was formed within the last year to assist in helping faculty to understand and to provide input on budgetary issues. COBRA makes recommendations regarding: budgetary processes, priorities, and policies that help the university to achieve its long-term academic goals in the light of changing conditions; principles and procedures governing the development, improvement, and use of university financial resources; principles and procedures governing the development, improvement, and use of university facilities; and the allocation of instructionally related resources.

In 2004, President Rees charged a new committee with improving the operational management of budgets at the university. The Committee on Reporting, Utilization, and Monitoring of Budget Systems (CRUMBS) is comprised of personnel with budgetary and financial oversight responsibility for substantial areas of fiscal operation, such as a college or a major administrative department.

Our primary institutional purpose is to provide bachelor’s and master’s education to our students. In line with this objective, 82.2% of the university’s budget in 2004/05 is allocated to the Academic Affairs unit. Of this amount, approximately 65% is spent directly on instruction. Faced with a budget cut of nearly 8% for 2004/05, the faculty budget committee, COBRA, and university administration agreed that protecting instruction was the first priority, with the knowledge that there would be grave consequences to the rest of the university, including reduced services in the library, technology, physical plant, and all other areas. Thus, non-college units experienced higher percentages of budget cuts than did college units (approximately 15% compared to 8%). Even with the protection of instruction to the extent possible, the Division of Academic Affairs had to reduce its operating budget in 2004-05 by over $5M, which has meant fewer classes and larger class sizes. Instructors have taken on more students, more advising, and more university service. The only adequate solution to these problems is sufficient funding to the CSU.

CSUH is subject to regular annual financial audits by independent, external auditors for the main campus and its four officially recognized auxiliaries. The university undergoes regular internal financial compliance audits by the Office of the Auditor for the Board of Trustees of the CSU as well as special subject area compliance audits. Audited financial statements and CSU internal audit reports are available for the community to review. (CFR 3.5) As a CSU institution, Cal State Hayward is not allowed to have deficits. CSUH budgeting practices include maintaining reserves at modest levels for contingency funding.

**SUMMARY ~ SUSTAINABILITY IN DIFFICULT TIMES**

Given three years of serious budget cuts, the university community is concerned with protecting and sustaining the infrastructure that supports teaching and learning. The cuts have had a long-term effect. Administration and faculty have worked together to mitigate the impact of these cuts on instruction and on students; however, the university is teaching more students with fewer faculty, a trend that everyone recognizes cannot continue forever. Thus, discussions are underway to rebuild the faculty and other key service areas once the
budget improves and/or the university receives enrollment growth dollars. Improvement of the tenure/tenure track vs. lecturer ratio is a high priority, as is replacing staff lost to layoffs in certain divisions of the university. Several faculty committees, notably COBRA, enable faculty to gain greater knowledge of and voice in the university’s budgeting process.

Dealing effectively with the university’s budget challenges will require the talent and cooperation of the entire university community. Fortunately, the university not only has that talent, but also a renewed sense of energy and commitment as evidenced by the new mission, vision, and values statements and the work of the COTs and their deep reflection on how to foster and support student learning and strengthen the students’ multicultural educational experience in times of fiscal constraint.

1 See, for example, “The Dynamics of Race in Higher Education: An Examination of the Evidence” or the American Council on Education’s Study “On the Importance of Diversity on Higher Education.”

2 Faculty reviewed for retention, tenure, or promotion submit a dossier that documents their achievements in all areas. PT&R decisions result from departmental PTR Committee, Department Chair, College PTR Committee, College Dean, and university PTR Committee recommendations with the president making the final decision. The university PTR policies must be in alignment with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the Chancellor’s Office. The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the Board of Trustees of the CSU governs the use of student evaluations of instruction [Collective Bargaining Agreements].

3 The State-wide Academic Senate of the CSU conducted the survey. Fifty-one professors from CSUH participated in the survey. Across the system, 52.4% of the faculty reported receiving assigned time. [CSU Faculty Workload Survey]

4 For example, the College of Education and Allied Studies faculty meets regularly to discuss research as well as teaching and learning. Issues such as diversity among the faculty are also discussed and debated in this forum. In the College of Science, faculty are encouraged to become involved in programs that foster student learning, often through participation in research activities. Examples are the federally funded Research Initiative for Student Education (RISE) Program and the Schering-Plough Foundation Student Laboratory Assistantship Program. In the College of Arts, Letters and Sciences, the English department has established a learning community for lecturers with an active listserv for discussions of writing instruction and weekly workshops that discuss strategies to enhance student learning.

5 Russell, T. (1999) extensive literature review demonstrates the predominance of “no significance” in studies that have tried to evaluate the effectiveness of technology separate from instruction. http://teleeducation.nb.ca/nosignificantdifference/
http://teleeducation.nb.ca/significantdifference/

However Twigg and others have shown that technology can make a significant difference when the course or program has been re-designed using best pedagogical practices.
http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd2Less.html
http://www.center.rpi.edu/R2R/R2R_ProjDesc.html
http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd2Less.html http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/rd2award.html
http://www.center.rpi.edu/PewGrant/Rd2Less.html
6 These include: flexibility of learning anytime and any place; increased opportunities for individualization, group activities, cooperative activities, and varied learning techniques; the opportunity for students to work on problem solving with group members to achieve shared goals and develop understanding and skills with leadership, interdependence, individual and group responsibilities, and group processes; and the opportunity to use technology as an integral component of the regular program so that students will be prepared for opportunities and problems they will meet in their respective communities.
Forward Planning for Educational Effectiveness:
Standard Four

President Rees, in the Institutional Proposal, commits “to improve the campus planning process, and to re-energize and reorganize planning around educational effectiveness and on-going dialogue about learning.” As the university community reflected upon the call in Standard Four to “create an organization committed to learning and improvement,” several issues emerged.

Campus planning efforts have not been well coordinated and there has been a history of “start-and-stop planning.” The university has several units that have engaged in effective strategic planning but the connection of these unit plans to an overall university-wide plan is not clear. The university needs to look at how departmental and college planning and planning efforts in administrative units are tied together. Thus, a challenge for CSUH is to integrate and institutionalize university planning.

The last major university planning effort resulted in a set of University Goals and Objectives (the de facto university plan). These Goals and Objectives were to last until 2002. Because of the close proximity to the WASC accreditation process, the president decided that it would be better to use the current accreditation process with the 12 COTs as the foundation for a new university plan. The new University Mission, Vision, and Values statements have created an excellent opportunity for us to develop unit plans and an overall plan that is integrated with the new statements.

As mentioned throughout this Report, faculty and staff of color need to be heard. There needs to be an effective mechanism for including them in the planning process. One possible way of doing this would be to ensure that all university plans seriously address the commitment in the mission for the creation of an “academically-rich multicultural experience.”

It is also critically important to tie university planning to resources. Plans without the resources needed to make them effective are meaningless. The university’s Strategic Enrollment Management Plan included a Freshmen Initiative, the purpose of which was to increase the size of our freshmen class (one of the smallest in the CSU). We wanted to increase our entering freshmen class for numerous reasons, e.g. because freshmen generate more FTE over the course of their academic careers, are more active in campus life, take more General Education courses, and are more loyal alumni than transfer students. The Freshmen Initiative was accompanied by a commitment of resources, so the university has a successful experience tying resources to planning initiatives. The connection between plans and the resources to enact the plans needs to continue and expand.

Brief History of University Planning Efforts

During the past twelve years, CSUH has engaged in several planning efforts that, in their initial stages, involved faculty and the CSUH community. The goals in all of these efforts were essentially the same, namely to improve planning and assessment, a sense of campus community, student learning, and community service. This chronology illustrates the need for CSUH to focus on actualizing, integrating, and institutionalizing its planning initiatives.
1992/93. A university mission is revised by a campus-wide committee and accepted by President Rees.

1994/95. A “University-Wide Plan” is submitted to the Academic Senate by CAPR, setting forth planning principles and recommendations for improvement.

1994/95. The university participates in the PEW Roundtable Project, focusing on three planning themes related to a learning environment.

1995/96. President Rees proposes a process to develop planning priorities through the work of existing faculty governance and other university structures.

Spring 1995. CAPR presents a report, accepted by the Senate, to prioritize university academic programs for the purpose of allocating new faculty positions and other resources.

Spring 1995. The Futures Committee, a subcommittee of CAPR, addresses several questions related to planning, programs, and structures.

1997/98. Efforts and discussions culminate in the establishment of the Committee on University Goals and the publication of the University Goals and Objectives with seven goals and accompanying measurable objectives.

2000. WASC Five Year Interim Report details the progress towards accomplishing the University Goals and Objectives. [CSUH-WASC 2000 Five Year Report: volume 1 / volume 2]

2002/03: The president announces that instead of starting a separate planning process to revise the University Goals and Objectives, which expired in 2002, the WASC accreditation process should act as the starting point for a new university forward planning process.

Fall 2004. The president addresses the university, formally unveils the new mission, vision, and values statement and re-iterates her support to plan and implement changes in order to improve our multicultural learning environment. Various parts of the university begin strategic planning for their units, e.g., instructional colleges, the Contra Costa campus, the Oakland Center, student services, the library, and instructional technology. In addition, the interim provost has begun a visioning process for Academic Affairs. The first step in this process was the establishment of a task force to look into a reorganization of several units and functions in Academic Affairs to see if better services would be provided to faculty under an alternative organizational delivery system. [Academic Affairs Task Force (memo from Provost)]

Two recent initiatives illustrate that CSUH is capable of planning and assessing results: The Strategic Enrollment Management process led by Enrollment Services, and the fund raising efforts of University Advancement.

**STRATEGIC PLANNING: TWO CASE STUDIES (CFRs 4.1,4.2,4.3)**

The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process sets the plans, goals, and objectives for enrollment management at the university. Involving representation from all areas of the university, the process sets the example of having key personnel involved and responsible for meeting goals, setting measurable achievement indicators, and linking budget
allocations to implementation. A key accomplishment of the current plan is the Freshman Initiative (mentioned above) that resulted in a 25.9% increase in the size of the 2004 first time freshman class. Together, they demonstrate that CSUH can use evidence to identify CSUH’s strengths, weaknesses, obstacles, and opportunities; focus on and respond to enrollment issues; design action plans; achieve and measure stated objectives in a timely and focused manner; and use results to inform future planning. University leadership also used data from the SEM planning process and studies by outside consultants to improve student advising and the university image. This resulted in the appointment of an Executive Director of Student Retention and Advisement and a new university marketing campaign, among other changes. [SEM Report]

University Advancement recently developed a fund-raising plan using a university-wide participatory process to set fund-raising priorities. University Advancement solicited fund raising proposals from all segments of the university community including the WASC COTs. They received 117 proposals. These proposals were reviewed by a committee of faculty and staff and then by the CSU Educational Foundation, the board that advised the university on its fund-raising plans. The proposals, along with the reviews, were sent to the president who organized them into the following four priorities: scholarships, math and science education and research, upgrades in technology and facilities, and the University’s Leadership Fund. The fund raising plan includes measurable objectives and assessment of results [University Advancement Plan]. It is significant to note that the university just successfully completed its first capital building campaign, which exceeded its $10 million goal.

The success of these two efforts demonstrates that the university is capable of engaging in successful strategic planning and follow-through. (4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

**STRATEGIC CHANGES IN OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT (CFR 4.5)**

CSUH recently reorganized its institutional research capacity. This function was moved to Academic Affairs and integrated with assessment to create the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (IRA). A new Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Assessment, who also serves as the university’s Quality Improvement (QI) Coordinator, was hired. She is reorganizing the university’s institutional research capacity based upon feedback from the Institutional Portfolio COT, which suggested that the Institutional Portfolio not only serve the purpose of WASC accreditation, but also it would be the new institutional research site for the university. These improvements are now underway and will be completed by the time of the Educational Effectiveness review. Although many units experienced budget cuts this past year, the university added resources to IRA because of its commitment to improve capacity in this area.

Currently, IRA has sufficient staff and the capability to meet CSU and IPEDS reporting requirements and complete special analytical reports as requested. It will begin publishing a printed “Fact Book” in 2005. IRA is converting to a SAS database to make data inquiries more efficient. This office works with all units in the university to gather and analyze data, identify needs and preferences of students, and provide the appropriate programs and
services related to admissions, financial aid, registration, advising, career counseling, technology, and library and information services.

**CAPACITY TO INTEGRATE AND INSTITUTIONALIZE IMPROVED PLANNING (CFRs 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)**

Each of the 12 COTs has studied their respective areas and made specific recommendations that provide valuable insight into what must be done to know that we are accomplishing our educational purposes and to identify how we can improve.

CSUH has the capacity to know the quality of its academic programs through the assessment of student learning outcomes and refined integration throughout the curriculum and program review process. As developed in chapter two, the university has a detailed process for curriculum and program approval, periodic review, on-going evaluation, and data collection. CSUH is moving into the use of evidence to improve programs. As with all other CSU campuses, CSUH participates in and meets the expectations of the Chancellor’s Office Accountability Reporting requirements, which include an update of the assessment of student learning outcomes and physical plant utilization. (CFR 4.5) [Appendix III – CFR 4.5].

As discussed earlier, most degree programs have indicators for their student learning outcomes and specified points in the program where these indicators will be measured. The faculty is beginning to accept that they will be required to use the results of the measurement of these indicators for program improvement (CFR 4.6, 4.7.)

The university involves stakeholders in the assessment of the effectiveness of educational programs, primarily through advisory boards. Sixteen of the university’s degree programs have advisory boards comprised of industry and community leaders (often alumni) who provide input on what graduates need to know to succeed in the field, curriculum design, and feedback on the quality of CSUH graduates. A recent CSU survey of CSUH-educated teachers, which asked principals to rate the quality of those with a CSUH teacher credential, provided useful assessment data. [CSU Special Report – Teacher Presentation] (CFR 4.8)

CSUH has the capacity to know the level of effectiveness of its support for student learning and to make improvements based on those data. As noted earlier, the Student Affairs Division, the Library, and Instructional Technology have successfully developed strategic plans. The Contra Costa Campus is currently in a strategic planning process. In addition, many COTs (Student Services, Instructional Technology, Campus Climate, and Faculty) found that direct support for student learning and retention is distributed throughout the university, including advising from faculty, departmental staff, student services staff, DegreeWorks, student life, the lower division general education classes and more. Some members of these COTs, however, feel that this distributed, multi-point model is uncoordinated, making priorities and indicators difficult to establish and measure reliably. Assessment of the effectiveness of CSUH’s advising model is needed.

In summary, CSUH has the capacity to use its research and data collection to establish priorities for student and organizational learning; to implement actions at different levels of
the institution; and to evaluate the evidence and revise its purposes, structures, and approaches to improve learning. What is needed now is to connect and integrate the processes in place. The concluding essay presents the goals and organization for the educational effectiveness review, detailing how CSUH intends to improve student learning by more effective use of its institutional capacity, and to move forward with a coordinated and integrated university-wide plan that includes all units and campuses.
Conclusion

The university undertook a comprehensive examination of its institutional capacity through an extensive engagement process involving 12 Campus Outcome teams (COTs). This comprehensive examination documented that CSUH functions with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures and processes to fulfill its purposes necessary to meet the Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity. This examination also enabled us to take a critical look at our strengths and limitations as required by WASC and to organize for the educational effectiveness review in such a way as to address the major challenges we face.

SUMMARY OF CSUH’S COMMITMENT TO CAPACITY ~ REFLECTIVE VIEW OF STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

Strengths ~ Achievements
Through a widespread process of university consultation, the Mission COT led the university to the acceptance of new mission, vision, and values statements. As a result, we now have a set of guiding principles and commitments that particularize CSUH’s institutional purposes, essential values, character, and educational objectives. Our response to diversity is appropriate, multifaceted, and strong by many criteria. Based on the available data, our faculty diversity is higher than the CSU averages in all categories except Mexican American/Latino faculty. We offer a wide array of co-curricular learning experiences and activities that focus on multicultural awareness and ethnic-specific support. The General Education outcomes emphasize the understanding and respect for the knowledge and experiences of diverse populations and the ability to work well with those who are different. We enjoy a richly diverse student body, one of the most diverse in the CSU, which, when surveyed recently by the Princeton Review, felt so positive about the university that the Review awarded us “Best in the West” distinction. (Standard 1)

Our successful re-invention of the General Education Program has received national recognition. We moved from a cafeteria approach to one of mandatory freshman learning communities (clusters) with developmental English courses linked to the clusters. Student retention and achievement improved after the implementation of the GE program. All of our degree programs have identified student-learning outcomes; most have described indicators and developed assessment plans, and identified entry and exit measurement points. One of our strengths is that 17 of our degrees and credential programs have received professional accreditation. Our current Academic Review process for degree programs requires them to have demonstrated that they have developed an assessment plan. By 2006, almost half of the degree programs will have used collected assessment data to make recommendations for program improvement. Opportunities for advising are many and distributed throughout the university. This includes faculty advising, GE advising, and student service advising. A rich variety of programs and services exist on the campuses, offering students opportunities for academic, professional, personal, and leadership development outside the classroom. (Standard 2)

The university is fortunate to have a dedicated faculty who are committed to teaching a diverse student body, conducting ever-increasing amounts of scholarly research, participating
in service to the university, and engaging in community service, all while carrying the high teaching load of 12 WTUs per quarter. Our Department Chairs assume onerous responsibilities and their support is absolutely essential for systemic change in the university. We enjoy high levels of collegiality among the colleges, and between the faculty and administration. The university has a strong library that adheres to ACRL standards. It provides information resources to the Hayward and Contra Costa campuses, and to Continuing and International Education. (Standard 3)

CSUH has a strong instructional technology infrastructure with a wide variety of services available to students, including Blackboard for every course at the university. A major upgrade of the university network is nearing completion. We have an active Faculty Development Center for Excellence in Teaching, which also supports the effective use of instructional technology. (Standard 3)

The Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) process, led by Enrollment Services, and the fund-raising efforts of University Advancement illustrate that CSUH is capable of effective planning, implementation, and assessment of results. The university has recently reorganized and re-energized its institutional research capability. The Institutional Portfolio, required by WASC, was purposely developed to act as the new system for managing information for the university. As a result, the university has expanded its capacity to provide data to faculty, administrative, and staff decision-makers. (Standard 4)

Limitations– Challenges
The University confronts limitations and constraints that are both internally generated and externally imposed. The multi-year budget cuts to the CSU, as a result of the state budget crisis, is an external constraint that has impacted CSUH. We have fewer people and resources to accomplish our mission. Our students are limited by the reduction in course offerings and the increasing fees. Staff and resources in the library, instructional technology, student services, and nearly every part of the university have been cut, resulting in reduced levels of service (Standard 3). Within the university, this comprehensive examination has revealed the need for greater integration and institutionalization of our accomplishments. This is most noticeable in six areas: assessment of academic quality; campus climate; support for student services; support for a faculty learning community; a culture of evidence; and coordinated, university-wide planning.

Assessment of Academic Quality. Progress on collecting assessment data and using the data to improve learning in degree programs and in GE has been slow due to initial doubts about the need for assessment, the view that assessment is one of a number of unfunded tasks faculty are being asked to assume, and inadequate funding for assessment efforts. In the past, the 5-year review process only required assessment plans. The review process itself needs to be communicated to others vis-à-vis its relationship to university and college level planning. There are many hopeful signs on the horizon that both assessment of degree programs and GE will now move forward, and recommendations will be sent to the Senate to align the program review process with forward planning (Standard 2). While CSUH documents its technology resources, services, and levels of use by faculty and students, we do not know the extent to which faculty are using appropriate technologies effectively for the course objectives and
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overall design of their courses. Another area needing attention is now highlighted in our new mission statement, which commits us to prepare students to be socially responsible contributors to their communities. Many faculty work toward that outcome; however, we have not yet begun to assess our effectiveness in this area.

*Campus Climate.* CSUH has not done a comprehensive campus climate study that includes faculty, students, and staff since 1994. The results of that study were not used in the planning or implementation of new programs. We have a Faculty Diversity and Equity Committee (FDEC) and a Faculty Affirmative Action Liaison Officer (AALO), but the record shows little discussion or follow-through on their annual recommendations to the Academic Senate. We regularly collect student data, as part of other studies that impact campus climate, but the results are not effectively shared with the faculty nor is there an institutionalized process for due consideration of the results by faculty, staff, and students. Campus Climate has, by and large, been considered the responsibility of student services. CSUH recognizes the need to institutionalize a comprehensive campus climate study in order to assess our progress towards becoming a "multicultural learning environment" and to implement strategies for improvement based on those data. (Standard 1, 4)

*Support for Student Success.* The university’s distributed advising infrastructure needs a comprehensive evaluation to determine its current levels of effectiveness. We do not know which advising opportunities are effective, nor at what level of effectiveness, nor for which populations. While we keep good retention data and disaggregate it by ethnicity, discipline, gender and other factors, it’s not easily available. Also, we are still in the early stages of learning how best to coordinate efforts between student services and academic affairs in order to improve retention for all of our students, especially those at risk, e.g. African American, Hispanic, and transfer students. (Standard 2)

*Faculty Learning Community.* The percent of tenure/tenure track faculty at the university has been declining, which has placed an added burden on the permanent full-time faculty to advise students, engage in scholarship, and participate in university governance and university and/or community initiatives. The administration is moving forward to re-balance the tenure-track/lecturer ratio. The PTR document has not received a substantive review for decades. All COTs endorsed the need to investigate how faculty experience the PTR process and to study ways to better align the criteria for PTR with CSUH priorities, especially in light of the new mission, vision, and values statements. Without valid quantitative and qualitative evidence, we do not know what changes are needed to create and retain a “...faculty from vastly different backgrounds who collaborate, creating and sustaining a vibrant learning community.”

We also have policies and procedures in place to attract a diverse faculty applicant pool; however, we have not identified the best practices for CSUH in this regard, nor do we know which departments might be engaged in those best practices. We have faculty of color and women faculty, but we do not know our best practices for retention or which departments are doing the best job of implementing ways of retaining faculty, and making them feel an integral part of their departments. (Standard 3)
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*Culture of Evidence.* We struggle to integrate innovations, plans, or best practices in one part of the university with plans or practices in other university units and to institutionalize these practices in ways that will ensure their success over the long haul. Without a strong culture of evidence, we cannot track the impact of budget cuts on services or best practices, and we cannot assess the effectiveness of plans across the university. (Standard 4)

*Coordinated University-Wide Planning.* We have not institutionalized an infrastructure nor dedicated resource allocations for on-going university-wide planning, implementation and assessment. In spite of significant efforts on the part of several units in the university, a coordinated university-wide planning effort has yet to be solidified. Our biggest challenge is to develop a plan that will allow us to come together on an agreed set of priorities linked to our mission and student learning and to implement those priorities, assign responsibility and resources, track results, and assess those results for future improvements. (Standard 4)

**APPROPRIATE RECOMMENDATIONS AND FOLLOW-UP STEPS: ORGANIZING FOR EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

Based upon the analysis of our strengths and limitations, CSUH has identified six priorities for its educational effectiveness review. Each outcome is elemental to fulfilling the commitments in our new mission, vision, and values statements.

1. **Academic Quality** “CSUH strives to be known for its outstanding academic programs, recognized for their excellence.” By May 2006, CSUH will demonstrate the effectiveness of its academic programs in the following ways:
   a. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes.
      1) In the five-year reviews of 21 of 52 graduate and undergraduate programs, we will demonstrate that we have collected, analyzed, and used the results to improve student learning. [Programs Under Review]
      2) We will assess the majority of Lower Division General Education outcomes and use the results to determine improvements.
      3) We will assess student-learning outcomes in the cultural groups and women’s GE requirement. We will also assess a GE outcome that addresses socially responsible contributions to the community.
      4) We will undertake a comprehensive assessment of student learning in the First Year Information Literacy General Education program, with the results reported and used to determine improvements.
   b. The Academic Senate will consider overall recommendations to improve the process for the 5-Year Review of Academic Programs.
   c. A guide will be developed, based on best practices and research, to assist in the selection of appropriate technologies for course objectives. Faculty in selected programs will pilot the guide and assess its effectiveness.

2. **Campus Climate:** CSUH values “Learning in an academic environment that is inclusive and student-centered and where students, faculty, and staff from vastly different backgrounds collaborate-creating and sustaining a vibrant learning community that is responsive to the unique needs of its campus community.” By May 2006, CSUH will demonstrate that it knows the current qualities of its campus climate
through a comprehensive study that includes faculty, students, and staff. The study will use both qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data. The Seven Principles for Good Undergraduate Education will be a factor in the framework for the analysis and development of key questions used in the study. Data analysis with recommendations for improvement based on the evidence will be presented to all constituencies in the university.

3. **Support for Student Success.** CSUH strives to be known for its “High academic standards along with services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success.” By May 2006, CSUH will demonstrate the effectiveness of its services and support to ensure student success in the following ways:
   a. CSUH will engage in a comprehensive assessment of its current advising infrastructure and the effectiveness of advising by faculty and staff to meet the needs and expectations of an ethnically, racially, and culturally diverse student population. The outcome will be recommendations, priorities for improvement, and plans for implementation with a focus on coordination of services, clarity for students, and the reward structure for faculty.
   b. CSUH will conduct a comprehensive assessment of student retention and disaggregate the data, e.g. by discipline, gateway courses, class standing, ethnicity, gender, and financial aid status. Factors impacting the retention of all students, particularly students at risk, e.g. African American students, Latino male students and transfer students, will be identified. This process will include university-wide dialogue and the resulting recommendations for improvement and implementation plans will be made widely available across the university.

4. **Faculty Learning Community.** CSUH strives to be known for “…faculty from vastly different backgrounds [who] collaborate—creating and sustaining a vibrant learning community. By May 2006, CSUH will demonstrate the current characteristics of its faculty learning community in the following ways:
   a. A faculty committee will conduct quantitative and qualitative research to investigate faculty experiences with the PTR process and to determine its ability to reflect the new university commitments. A report summarizing the research will be presented to faculty governance for deliberation and action.
   b. The Seven Principles for Good Undergraduate Education and the proposed mission for a faculty learning community will be presented to faculty governance for deliberation and action.
   c. Based upon the thirty (30) new tenure track searches (2004/05), CSUH will identify the departments most successful in securing diverse applicant pools. We will then analyze and promote the practices used to achieve that goal.
   d. Using the results of the new campus climate study and other data yet to be determined, CSUH will identify departments that engage in best practices for retaining faculty.

5. **Culture of Evidence.** CSUH strives to know and use evidence in order to actualize more fully its mission, vision, and values. By May 2006, CSUH will demonstrate the effectiveness of its culture of evidence through a comprehensive institutional research
portfolio that will be created to meet the needs of the faculty, administrators, students, staff, and the public.

6. **Coordinated University-wide Planning.** CSUH wants to be fully engaged in an ongoing strategic planning process. By May 2006, CSUH will seek to achieve that in the following ways:
   a. We will study the best practices at other universities (CSU and non-CSU institutions).
   b. We will recommend to the president a university-wide planning infrastructure that is aligned with resources.
   c. We will collect and analyze current university unit plans, recommending ways to integrate these plans and link them to resources.

**COMMENTARY ON THE INSTITUTION’S PREPAREDNESS FOR UNDERTAKING THE EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW**

CSUH is poised and committed to the six aforementioned outcomes for the Educational Effectiveness Review. The indicators for Academic Quality, Support for Student Success, and Culture of Evidence are underway. The Campus Climate Study and the Faculty Learning Community Outcomes will draw upon the capabilities of the new IRA office. Responsibility for the six outcomes will depend upon the expertise of the faculty and staff from the 12 COTS, and will involve the collective will of the faculty and the university administration.

We feel confident that we can meet our outcomes in an 18-month period. Therefore we are requesting an extension, as suggested by the Commission Advisory for 2004-2005 Visits.\(^1\) Twelve months between reviews is insufficient time to meet the expectations for educational effectiveness, especially given the quarter system. Faculty are not paid during the summer which would leave essentially Winter and Spring quarter of 2005 for the bulk of the work to be done, with Fall of 2005 being a combination of work and report preparation.

---

APPENDIX I

RESPONSE TO WASC CONCERNS

This Appendix is divided into four sections: 1) concerns from 1995 reaffirmation of accreditation letter; 2) concerns from the 2000 fifth-year report letter; 3) concerns expressed in substantive change letters; and 4) a brief report on our one online degree program in response to a verbal request from Ralph Wolff to include such a report as part of our Capacity and Preparatory Review.

1. Concerns from 1995 Reaffirmation of Accreditation Letter
The accreditation of CSUH was reaffirmed in a letter from Stephen Weiner, then Executive Director of WASC, dated June 28, 1995. The major concerns expressed in this letter were for the university to use information-based discussion and decision making, establish goals and priorities, and use assessment strategies to guide the design of new, coherent curricula. The letter also mentioned the need to assess the two off-site degree programs that were active at that time.

The university responded to these concerns in its Fifth-Year Report submitted in 2000 [Volume 1 http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/vol1.pdf and Volume 2 [http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/vol2.pdf]. The university and WASC agreed that the Fifth-Year Report would address these concerns by establishing a set of University Goals and Objectives. The Fifth-Year Report, Volume 2, was comprised of the following seven goals [http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/vol2.pdf]:

1. Rigorous Educational Programs and Assessment
2. Student Recruitment and Retention
3. Diverse, Highly Qualified Faculty and Staff
4. Appropriate Technologies
5. Partnerships with Outside Agencies
6. The University as a Regional Cultural Resource
7. Development of Additional Funding Sources

The letter from Gregory Scott, Associate Director of WASC, dated August 1, 2000 stated that the “University’s report drew high praise from the [Interim Report] Committee.” It went on to say that, “Not only does the report respond fully and completely to the team’s [1995 Visiting Team’s] recommendations, it also clearly demonstrates the high quality of collaboration between faculty, administration and staff. The Committee particularly valued the way in which the University used its own statement of goals and objectives as context for its response to the team’s recommendations and its presentation of the University accomplishments since the last evaluation visit.”

2. Concerns from 2000 Fifth-Year Report Letter
The only significant concern expressed in the 2000 Fifth-Year Report letter was that Accounts Receivables for 1998-99 had increased to 10.44% of the University budget, compared to 8.1% in 1997-98.

In response to this concern, the Accounting Office has increased its collection efforts for Accounts Receivable by dedicating an individual to the collection of outstanding amounts due to the University. Additionally, to the extent that internal collection processes are unsuccessful, the University uses outside collection agencies and participates in the California Franchise Tax Board’s Tax Offset Program.

3. Concerns Expressed in Substantive Change Letters
Below is a brief outline of the major concerns raised in letters from WASC regarding Cal State Hayward’s Substantive Change Proposals for our overseas MBA programs. Also, outlined are the responses we have made to address these concerns. CSUH has received approval for 8 overseas MBA programs. However, at this time only four are active: Moscow, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Graz, Austria.

As part of our Capacity/Preparatory Review, we have submitted a System Review for our off-site programs which also addresses the concerns expressed by WASC regarding these programs.

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

**Concern:** In the WASC letter for the Moscow MBA Program dated, August 17, 1994, concern was raised about providing a “formal model of evaluation that reaches beyond anecdotal information.”

**Response:** In July, 2001, an Outcome Assessment Report for the Moscow MBA Program, which included not only a model of evaluation but collected assessment data as well, was submitted to WASC. We have heard no response from WASC on this Outcome Assessment Report.

**Concern:** The concern for an assessment plan was mentioned in the approval letter for the first MBA in Beijing dated December 11, 1998, the MBA in Singapore letter dated February 11, 2000, and in a letter dated January 19, 2001 denying a new MBA in Beijing. The approval letter for an MBA in Beijing, dated May 7, 2002, stated that this program should not begin until there was plan for assessing educational effectiveness.

**Response:** In June 2003, we submitted a “Student Learning Outcome Assessment Plan,” which was accepted by WASC. The MBA in Beijing has not yet been implemented. The Substantive Change Proposal for an MBA in Shanghai included the assessment plan that was developed for the MBA in Beijing. The approval letter for the MBA in Shanghai signed by Greg Scott, dated July 21, 2003, included the following statement:

“The Proposal provided information about what the University has learned through assessment of the educational effectiveness of existing off-campus programs and that the University has involved its Director of Assessment
and Testing in the development of more refined approaches to measuring student learning outcomes associated with its off-campus MBA programs. In my judgment, this information fulfills the Panel’s May 7, 2002, request for a separate report in response to its concerns about the educational effectiveness of these accelerated and off-campus MBA programs”.

**Concern**: Letters approving the MBA in Brazil and Graz, Austria both dated September 8, 2003, stated that the assessment plans in the proposals met the Panel’s May 7, 2002 concern for an assessment plan. However, it was noted that we have yet to show results from collected assessment data on our overseas MBA programs and that “These data should be in use by the time of the next Comprehensive Review.”

**Response**: We are now in the process of assessment data for our two active overseas MBA programs. We will report on the collection and use of this data in our Educational Effectiveness Review due in 2006.

**INSTRUCTIONAL FORMAT**

**Concern**: Evaluation of the effectiveness of the accelerated model of instruction was mentioned in the MBA Moscow letter dated August 17, 1994, the MBA Hong Kong letter dated December 14, 1995, and the MBA in Beijing dated May 7, 2002.

**Response**: The assessment plan that was developed for the MBA in Shanghai and cited as acceptable in the July 21, 2003 approval letter, has become the model for assessing the educational effectiveness of the overseas MBA programs including the instructional format. As mentioned above, assessment data collection has begun and will be reported on in our Educational Effectiveness Review.

**IMPACT OF OVERSEAS MBA ON THE HAYWARD CAMPUS**

**Concern**: Worry about the possibility of overextending the faculty due to the overseas MBA programs and thus negatively impacting on-campus programs was mentioned in the MBA Hong Kong letter dated December 14, 1995, the MBA Vienna letter dated July 24, 1996, and the MBA Singapore letter dated February 11, 2000.

**Response**: This issue was addressed the MBA Brazil proposal. The College of Business and Economics has 72 full-time faculty members. At present, only about 25% of the College’s faculty are involved in overseas MBA programs. In addition, the CSU has policies in place to ensure that no faculty member can earn more than 125% of their time base. This acts as a firm limit on the amount of individual participation in the overseas MBA programs and guarantees that we do not overextend our faculty.

**ACADEMIC CONTROL**

**Concern**: The issue of academic control resting solely with Cal State Hayward and not with an overseas partner was raised in the MBA Vienna letter dated July 24, 1996, the

**Response:** As we gained experience with drafting MOUs between Cal State Hayward and our partners overseas, we have put in strong language to ensure that academic control rests with CSUH. This has not been mentioned as an issue in any of our recent Substantive Change Proposals.

**TEACH OUT PROVISIONS**

**Concern:** Concern for appropriate teach out provisions was raised in the MBA in Beijing (first program) letter dated December 11, 1998, the MBA in Beijing (second program) letter dated January 19, 2001, the MBA in Graz letter dated September 8, 2003 and the MBA in Brazil dated September 8, 2003.

**Response:** Cal State Hayward revised the MOUs for the MBA in Graz to include a stronger teach out provision and sent the revised document to WASC on March 18, 2004. Greg Scott responded in a letter that these teach out provisions were acceptable. The strong teach out provision included in this revised MOU was used for the MBA in Brazil and will be used for all future overseas MBA programs.

**LIBRARY RESOURCES**

**Concern:** A concern for adequate library resources was mentioned in the Beijing MBA (second program) letter dated January 19, 2001, the Beijing MBA (third program) letter dated May 7, 2002, and the Shanghai MBA program letter dated July 21, 2003.

**Response:** The second Beijing MBA program was never started. Agreements for students to use local university library resources were negotiated for the third Beijing MBA program and the Shanghai MBA program.

4. **Report on the M.S. in Education, Option in Online Teaching and Learning (offered entirely online).**

The M.S. in Education, Option in Online Teaching & Learning degree is earned completely online, with no on-campus attendance requirement, and with no face-to-face sections of these classes. Students in this program become subject matter experts in online teaching and learning theories, research, and practice. Most students come to the program as educators, trainers, or technical support staff, and learn “best practices” in converting their existing materials (as well as creating new materials) into an interactive, pedagogically robust, online or hybrid format. This is an interdisciplinary program, and students are admitted to the program with undergraduate degrees in almost every subject area possible.

The degree was accredited by WASC in spring 1999. As of December 2004, 203 graduates had been awarded the degrees from this program.
Approximately half of the students reside in California, though most are not from the San Francisco Bay Area. Of the remaining half, approximately six percent live in other countries and the rest are from all over the United States. The program is administered through the Division of Continuing and International Education, and when graduates come to Commencement, they march with their colleagues from the College of Education and Allied Studies. The program is overseen by the Associate Vice President of Academic Programs and Graduate Studies.

Since the subject matter of this degree—online teaching and learning—is ever evolving, the program faculty have found it necessary to substantially revise classes almost every time they are taught. The program administrator, who is a faculty member of both the Sociology and Social Services and the Interdisciplinary Education Departments, oversees all course updates and redesigns, and attends many national workshops on instructional technology, course design, and online teaching and learning. Other faculty are from Geography, Educational Psychology, Teacher Education, Interdisciplinary Education, Recreation and Community Service, English, and Multimedia.

When the program first began, students had to meet the graduate writing skills requirement by taking the CSHU Writing Skills Test (WST). The university’s Testing Office worked out procedures for having the test administered by a proctor who was geographically close to the student. Since then, the university’s WST Subcommittee has designated one of the required courses in the program, Research in Online Teaching & Learning (EDUI 6706), as fulfilling the WST requirement if the student earns a “B” or better. A writing coach (chosen from those M.A. English students who have focused on Composition) and a Cal State Hayward Librarian participate with students in this course. Students have full online access to the Library holdings.

Students have two choices for their capstone experience; the Project (EDUI 6899) is the one usually chosen. For their Project, most students create an online course (or courses) they have designed using the best practices most applicable to their students and institutional settings (middle or high school, college or university, corporate or non-profit organizations, and the military). For students who are in institutions that do not yet have their own course management systems, a Blackboard shell is provided. In addition to course creation, students write a paper that defends and justifies their course design. They must include a discussion of learning objectives, collaborative assignments, accessibility issues for students who might have disabilities, assessment and evaluation techniques. In addition to providing an extensive review of the literature in online teaching and learning, they must also include relevant literature specific to teaching or training in their subject matter, teaching or training their specific learners, or teaching/training in their specific context.

Students who choose a traditional thesis option perform research on an area of online teaching and learning.

Whether or not students focus on an online course of their own design for their capstone course, they all work on course design throughout the program. Students must allow
guest access to their online course to program faculty and their student colleagues. Students and faculty then critique the design, navigation, accessibility, objectives, assessment, and evaluation of the course, plus perform user testing.

Each course in the program requires some combination of the following: threaded discussions (always a major component of all courses), individual projects/papers, group projects/papers, collaborative activities (“jigsaw” exercises, debates), peer review of drafts, submitting short papers for publication, and facilitation of threaded discussions. While no synchronous activities are mandatory given the time-zone differences among students, practice in Chat and Whiteboard does take place in small groups once time-compatibility has been established.

Except for the project or thesis, none of the courses are self-paced. Instead all have well-established timelines for a variety of activities, and students must typically log into the class at least 3-4 times each week.

Graduates of the program usually remain where they are as instructors, trainers, or support staff. Many have made lateral or upward moves in their organizations to become the local expert in online course design.
APPENDIX II
Stipulated Polices

Available to the public as well as during the period of accreditation are policies as specified in the WASC accreditation handbook.

Institutional Integrity

A widely disseminated, written policy statement of commitment to academic freedom in teaching, learning, research, publication, and oral presentation.
http://www.aba.csuhayward.edu/BusAndFinance/AcademicFreedom.pdf

Due process procedures that demonstrate faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/2004-2005/a-040apndx.html#

Written policies on due process and grievance procedures for faculty, staff and students.
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/article10.shtml
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CSEA_Contract/Article7.shtml
http://wwwsa.csuhayward.edu/~jaf/resources.shtml

A clear statement of institutional policies, requirements, and expectations to current and prospective employees.
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/CFAtoc.shtml

Institutionally developed and published non-discrimination, equal opportunity, and affirmative action policies.
http://www.aba.csuhayward.edu/BusAndFinance/AfrmtvActn.pdf

Clearly written policies on conflict of interest for board, administration, faculty and staff, including appropriate limitations on the relations of business, industry, government, and private donors to research in the institution.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/conflict.pdf

A clear statement that the institution agrees to abide by WASC Policy on Substantive Change and the Policy on Distance and Technology-Mediated Instruction.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/about_csuh/wasc/misc/iss.pdf
Research

Policies covering human subjects and animals in research, classified research, patent provisions, cooperative research relations with industry, and other similar issues related to the integrity and independence of the research enterprise.

http://www.csuhayward.edu/ORSP/ORSP_Homepage.html
http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/conflict.pdf

Institutions that support applied research having the potential for producing significant revenue have clear policies on how faculty responsible for such research share revenue from patents, licenses, and sales. Institutions supporting entrepreneurial activity of faculty of institutionally sponsored research parks have clear policies covering the involvement of faculty in such ventures, the protections of basic research, and the publication of research results.

http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/copyrt.pdf

Educational Programs

Precise, accurate, and current information in printed material regarding a) educational purposes; b) degrees, curricular programs, educational resources, and course offerings; c) student charges and other financial obligations, student financial aid, and fee refund policies; d) requirements for admissions and for achievement of degrees; and e) the names of the administration, faculty, and governing board.

a) http://www.csuhayward.edu/why_csuh/
b) http://www.csuhayward.edu/about_csuh_academic_programs_and_services/academic_programs_and_services.html#
c) http://esweb.csuhayward.edu/index.shtml
d) http://esweb.csuhayward.edu/index.shtml
e) http://www.csuhayward.edu/about_csuh/president/admin_team.html

Publications that make clear the status (e.g. full-time, part-time, adjunct) of each faculty member.

http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/article12.shtml
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts_HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/article2.shtml
http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/adjunct.pdf

Clearly articulated policies for the transfer of credit to ensure that students who transfer in with general education course credits meet the institution’s own standards for the completion of the general education requirement.

http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/20042005/i-080admiss.html#section

Policies and procedures for additions and deletions of programs.

http://www.csuhayward.edu/cap/cpm/ch5.htm
http://www.csuhayward.edu/cap/cpm/ch9.htm

Requirements for continuation in, or termination from, academic programs, and a policy for readmission of students who are disqualified for academic reasons.

http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/general/grading/html#part09
Clearly stated graduation requirements that are consistently applied in the degree certification process.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/2004-2005/u-010babs.html#section2

**Faculty**

Personnel policies governing employment of teaching fellows and assistants.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/ta.pdf
http://www.csuhayward.edu/OAA/apptap.pdf

Policy designed to integrate part-time faculty appropriately into the life of the institution.
http://www.imctwo.csuhayward.edu/senate/documents/Treatmnt%20of%20Lect.pdf

Explicit and equitable faculty personnel policies and procedures.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ODEO/shpp.pdf

Policies on salaries and benefits.
http://www.abas.csuhayward.edu/HR/Handbook/StaffHandbook.pdf (pgs. 5-13, 19-26)
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/article31.shtml
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/CFA_CONTRACT/article32.shtml
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/CSEA_Contract/index.shtml (arts. 20 & 21)
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/SETC/index.shtml (arts. 24 & 25)
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/SUPA_Contract/SUPAcon.shtml (arts. 17 & 21)
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/UAPD_Contract/UAPDcon.shtml (arts. 19 & 20)
http://www.calstate.edu/LaborRel/Contracts.HTML/CMA/index.shtml (arts. 24 & 25)

Policies for faculty and staff regarding privacy and accessibility of information.
http://wwwsa.csuhayward.edu/safepa.shtml

**Library**

Written library collection development and weeding policies, including the bases for accepting gifts.
http://www.library.csuhayward.edu
http://www.csuhayward.edu/alumni_friends/development/makeagift/programs/library/library.html
Students

Admission and retention policies and procedures, with particular attention to the application of sound admission and retention policies for athletes, international students, and other cases where unusual pressures may be anticipated.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/20042005/i-80admiss.html#
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ecat/20042005/g-010gradst.html#

Clearly defined admissions policies attentive to the special needs of international students.
http://esweb.csuhayward.edu/becoming_student/undergraduate_admissions/admission_requirements/international.asp

Policies on student rights and responsibilities, including the rights of due process and redress of grievance.
http://www.csuhayward.edu/ODEO/matrix.html

Publications that include policies and rules defining inappropriate student conduct.
http://www.sa.csuhayward.edu/~jaf/conductcode.shtml

A policy regarding fee refunds that is uniformly administered, and consistent with customary standards.
http://esailor.csuhayward.edu/refund.html

Finances

Policies, guidelines, and processes for developing the budget.
http://www.aba.csuhayward.edu/BUDGET/BUDbp.htm

Clearly defined and implemented policies with regard to cash management and investments, approved by the governing board.
http://www.calstate.edu/SFO/

Policies and code of ethics for employees involved in buying, bidding, or providing purchase orders.
http://www.aba.csuhayward.edu/PROCURE/Psspur.htm
http://www.calstate.edu/CSP/

Policies on risk management, addressing loss by fire, burglary and defalcation; liability of the governing board and administration; and liability for personal injury and property damage.
http://www.aba.csuhayward.edu/PROCURE/Risk_Management/default.htm
Policies regarding fundraising activities that comply with sound ethical accounting and financial principles.

Fundraising activities at CSUH comply with the financial and accounting principles set forth by the Internal Audit Division of the California State University for all auxiliaries
http://www.calstate.edu/audit/purpose.shtml

Fundraising activities at CSUH subscribe to the CASE (Council for Advancement and Support of Education) Code of Ethics as noted on the bottom of the “About University Advancement” web page
http://www.csuhayward.edu/alumni_friends/development/about.html