

**REPORT OF THE WASC VISITING TEAM
EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW
TO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS**

APRIL 7-9, 2009

**In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation**

Team Roster

Estela Lopez (Chair)
Director of Programs
Excelencia in Education

David Fite (Assistant Chair)
Vice Chancellor for Institutional Planning and Assessment
Chapman University

Steven Butler
Vice President for Student Affairs
Humboldt State University

Jamie Dote-Kwan
Professor and Coordinator of Special Education, Teacher Education Division
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Nancy Hedlund
Associate Vice President, Planning and Assessment, Coordinator for Academic Assessment
Hawaii Pacific University

The evaluation team in conducting its review was able to evaluate the institution under the WASC Commission Standards and Core Commitments and therefore submits this Report to the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges for action and to the institution for consideration.

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit1

B. The Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report.....2

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review.....4

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Evaluation of the Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Inquiry.....9

Reflective Essay 1: Academic Master Planning.....9

Reflective Essay 2: Strengthening Academic Programs through Assessment of Student Learning.....13

Reflective Essay 3: Improving Retention of First-Year Students.....18

B. Institution’s Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning.....26

C. Student Success.....26

D. Program Review.....28

SECTION III – SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Institution’s Fulfillment of Intended Outcomes for the Review.....32

B. Value and Effectiveness of the Review.....34

C. Major Recommendations from both CPR and EER.....36

APPENDIX

Report on Accelerated BS in Nursing Program, Temecula.....39

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

Cal State San Marcos was founded in 1989 as the 20th campus of the public California State University. CSU San Marcos began as a branch of San Diego State University and evolved into an independent campus to meet expanding regional enrollment needs. The campus has grown from 280 full-time equivalent students (FTEs) in 1990 to become a medium-size campus with an enrollment of approximately 7,435 FTEs and 9,159 headcount in the Fall 2007. A significant proportion of its students are adult students and/or first-generation college students. CSU San Marcos is largely a commuter school but committed to expanding its residential population. The University in its Institutional Self-Study Proposal of May 2005 observes that it “is now at a critical juncture in its history, needing to move from its core set of liberal arts and sciences, business, and education programs to become a comprehensive regional university.”

CSU San Marcos was granted initial accreditation by the WASC Commission in June 1993. Following a WASC site visit in March 2000, the WASC Commission reaffirmed the accreditation of CSU San Marcos in June 2000 and scheduled the Capacity & Preparatory Review for its next Self-Study for Re-accreditation in the Spring 2007. In February 2005 the WASC Commission approved the Substantive Change Proposal for a Doctorate in Educational Leadership (EdD) to be offered jointly by the University of California, San Diego, San Diego State University, and California State University, San Marcos. Following a WASC Capacity & Preparatory Review site visit in March 2007, the WASC Commission acted to continue the accreditation of CSU San Marcos in June 2007 and scheduled the Educational Effectiveness Review in Spring 2009. The Commission requested that CSU San Marcos incorporate its response to the issues raised in the WASC action letter and the major recommendations of the

WASC CPR Team Report in its Educational Effectiveness Review Report. The Commission also noted that the WASC CPR team reviewed the progress of the Doctorate in Educational Leadership (EdD) offered jointly by the University of California, San Diego, and California State University, San Marcos, following the withdrawal of San Diego State University from the joint program, and that the Team found that the program was operating effectively and the University had addressed the issues raised by the WASC Commission in its approval action. In August 2008 the WASC Commission approved the Substantive Change Proposal of CSU San Marcos for an accelerated BS in Nursing Program (blended). A report on the accelerated BS in Nursing Program offered in Temecula is included in the Appendix of this Team Report.

B. The Institution’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report: Alignment with the Proposal and Quality and Rigor of the Review and Report

CSU San Marcos has taken a thematic approach to the Educational Effectiveness Review, organizing its report around the three themes of academic master planning, strengthening academic programs through assessment of student learning, and improving retention of first-year students. The University’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report is generally consistent with the themes and plans presented in its Institutional Proposal. In cases where CSU San Marcos has diverged from its Proposal, the Educational Effectiveness Review Report clearly explains the reasons for doing so, most notably in Reflective Essay One on Academic Master Planning where a new focus on three-year rolling plans, a division-wide academic strategic plan, a forecasting process, and a new comprehensive process aligning academic planning and budget has replaced the Institutional Proposal’s focus on the role of the Academic Blueprint in guiding the University’s academic master planning. The Educational Effectiveness Review Report is

clearly written and demonstrates rigorous inquiry with sound questions, appropriate methodologies, and generally effective use of evidence. The essays of the Educational Effectiveness Report do not present references to WASC standards and criteria for review but CSU San Marcos provided a separate (if somewhat incomplete) “CFR-to-Essay Bridge” at the request of the Site Visit Team.

CSU San Marcos is a young institution that has moved from rapid institutional growth to a period in which it is forced by economic challenges to level enrollments and face possible budget reductions while maintaining a vibrant academic environment and sustaining commitments to a diverse student body and outreach to local communities. The Educational Effectiveness Review process and report has enabled the University to reflect on, renew, and revitalize its efforts in the areas of academic planning, assessment for improvement of academic programs, and retention and achievement of first-year students. The Introduction to the Educational Effectiveness Review report cites “four points” which “anchor” the University’s Educational Effectiveness approach: 1. clearly articulated student learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate programs; 2. faculty-led program review processes; 3. disaggregated student data illustrating the achievement levels of students; 4. collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs on persistent student issues (p. 1). The University has made progress in increasing its organizational capacity to learn despite the challenges it faces in implementing an academic master planning process and effective program review process. (See the discussion of Program Review in Section II D of this Team Report.)

Following the CSU San Marcos Capacity and Preparatory Review site visit in Spring 2007, campus teams of faculty, staff, and administrators were convened in Fall 2007 to examine and write about the three themes of the Educational Effectiveness Review. These teams refined their task and revised certain outcomes of the original Institutional Proposal, consulted with appropriate stakeholder groups and used institutional data sources, and produced draft essays that were shared with the campus community, including the Academic Senate and its committees, through a website and five university Town Hall meetings. The self-study process demonstrates significant campus participation and engagement and institutional commitment to the creation of a “learning organization” based on an emerging “culture of evidence” and key functions such as planning, assessment, and program review that the University continues to develop and strengthen.

C. Response to Issues Raised in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

CSU San Marcos in its Educational Effectiveness Review Report presents a generally thorough response to issues highlighted by the WASC Commission in its action letter of July 13, 2007 receiving the Capacity and Preparatory Review Team Report and continuing the accreditation of the University. WASC highlighted three issues in its action letter: 1. student access and success; 2. curricular and co-curricular assessment of learning; 3. enhanced budgetary planning. The WASC Commission also asked the Site Visit Team during its visit to evaluate the effectiveness and progress of the accelerated BS in Nursing Program (blended) implemented by CSU San Marcos following WASC Commission approval in August 2008.

Student Access and Success

The WASC Commission in 2007 recognized that CSU San Marcos had made systemic commitments to the concepts and culture of diversity (CFR 1.5) and recommended that the University ensure appropriate support for diversity leadership in order to solidify and enhance these commitments. The WASC Commission also recommended that the University conduct disaggregated reviews of retention and completion rates, begin to track completion rates for different student groups, and, using this data, begin to set targets in areas where improvement is needed. CSU San Marcos addresses these recommendations in Reflective Essay 3: Improving Retention of First-Year Students in its Educational Effectiveness Review Report and in the disaggregated data on graduation rates provided in the WASC/ACSCU Summary Data Form. The University has made substantial progress in conducting disaggregated reviews of retention and completion rates for different student groups and using this data to make improvements in academic support programs and services and in student retention and achievement, especially in the first year. For analysis of the University's efforts and progress in improving student access and success, see the discussion of Reflective Essay 3 on Improving Retention of First-Year Students in Section II A and Student Success in Section II C of this Team Report.

The University continues to make progress toward its strategic priority of diversity and has sought to provide appropriate support for diversity leadership in a number of ways (CFR 1.5). The Educational Equity Task Force appointed in 2005-06 was allowed to sunset and in its place the President named a Special Assistant to the President for Educational Equity and Diversity. This position will continue until funds are available to support a full-time position. The

President's office is also funding the Social Justice and Equity Project, which is engaging faculty in conversations to foster a multicultural, global teaching and learning environment.

Following a recommendation made by the Educational Equity Task Force regarding the need for formal data gathering, a campus climate survey will be conducted this spring. Data gathering will enable the University to benchmark and measure progress on diversity-related initiatives. The President also held two diversity forums around the topics of student retention, faculty and staff recruitment, retention and mentoring, and campus climate. Through these discussions, several action goals have been identified and will be used to develop next steps.

CSU San Marcos remains on track in its goal to become an HSI (Hispanic Serving Institution) and has appointed an Implementation Team to work toward that goal. The University hopes to become a recognized Hispanic Serving Institution by the year 2010, having reached the qualifying threshold of 25% Latino student enrollment in the Spring 2009.

Curricular and Co-Curricular Assessment of Learning

The WASC Commission in 2007 observed that CSU San Marcos had made noteworthy progress in incorporating student learning outcomes into most of its academic programs and in planning for related assessment activities, but needed to incorporate direct assessment of learning more fully into all of its academic and co-curricular programs. The WASC Commission recommended that the University continue to develop ways to assess the impact of its co-curricular programs on the formation of its graduates (CFR 2.10) and observed that the use of achievement data to inform program improvement should achieve a higher degree of consistency

among the various units of the University (CFR 4.7, 4.8). The Commission also noted that support for curricular and co-curricular assessment of learning could serve as a focus of ongoing faculty and staff development. CSU San Marcos addresses these recommendations in Reflective Essay 2 on Strengthening Academic Programs through Assessment of Student Learning of its Educational Effectiveness Review Report and in the accompanying Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators. The University has made substantial but uneven progress in incorporating direct assessment of learning more fully into all of its academic and co-curricular programs. CSU San Marcos has assessed student writing and information literacy in 19 different courses engaging 50 faculty members and approved a Graduate Studies Writing Assessment Requirement Policy. The University has published student learning outcomes for all undergraduate programs and most graduate programs in the 2008-10 Catalog, and implemented an annual plan for assessment activities to be completed by all degree programs. Direct evidence of student learning and progress has been collected either at the course or program level by selected programs in all three Colleges, the School of Nursing, and Student Affairs. Most programs that have results are just beginning to make decisions for improvement and implement those decisions (CFR 1.2, 2.2-2.6, 4.6, 4.7).

At the same time, the University could not sustain a planned multi-year research study of student writing at several points in their academic progress or an institutional e-portfolio initiative. In addition, the implementation of a program review process incorporating learning outcomes assessment has been delayed by faculty resistance and concerns over the relation between program review and planning and decision-making processes and the need for institutional and budgetary support for faculty work on assessment and program review and for alignment of

retention, tenure, and promotion policies with an increased emphasis on assessment in teaching and instruction. CSU San Marcos has provided faculty and staff development and other support for assessment through the appointments of a Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow and General Education Assessment Coordinator, provision of funds for developing program assessment activities, and support for learning outcomes assessment projects in Student Affairs (CFR 2.8-2.10, 3.4. For analysis of the University's efforts and progress in improving curricular and co-curricular assessment of learning, see the discussion of Reflective Essay 2 in Section II A, the Institution's Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning in Section II B, and Program Review in Section II D of this Team Report.

Enhanced Budgetary Planning

The WASC Commission in 2007 observed that the budget planning process of CSU San Marcos was quite inclusive and transparent but could benefit from more extensive use of data on the effectiveness of its current allocations. The WASC Commission recommended that the University consider obtaining and using benchmark comparisons from similar institutions from within and beyond the CSU system (CFR 3.5, 4.8). CSU San Marcos has substantially revised its academic, master planning, and budgetary processes in the past two years with the goal of achieving an enhanced budgetary and planning process which promotes transparency, strategic thinking, and use of evidence when allocating resources. This includes creating an Academic Affairs Strategic Plan to unify planning directions, developing three-year rolling plans for all units in Academic Affairs, establishing a University Academic Master Plan Forecasting Committee to review and use university, community college, high school, regional, statewide, national, and global data in planning and decision-making processes, and more clearly aligning

budgetary and planning processes. For analysis of the University's efforts and progress in enhancing budgetary planning, see the discussion of Reflective Essay One on Academic Master Planning in Section II A of this Team Report.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS UNDER THE STANDARDS

A. Evaluation of the Institution's Educational Effectiveness Inquiry

Reflective Essay One: Academic Master Planning

Founded in 1989, CSU San Marcos is still a relatively young institution. Offering academic programs that prepare students to serve the region is of one of the highest priorities for the institution. Thus, planning and managing programmatic growth has been a consistent theme in the development of the institution as well as in the self-study process. This theme was identified in the Institutional Proposal to WASC in 2005, in the Capacity and Preparatory Review, and now in the Educational Effectiveness Review. Reflective Essay One of the CSU San Marcos Educational Effectiveness Report is dedicated to analyzing the changes that have occurred in guiding the academic planning processes since the proposal was submitted (CFR 3.5, 4.1-4.6).

As the University continues its path to becoming a regional comprehensive institution, academic planning is a critical component, especially in times of scarce resources. CSU San Marcos approached academic growth in the early part of the decade with what it referred to as “a well researched and conceived Academic Blueprint to respond to rapid population growth and student and community/employer demand” (Institutional Proposal, p. 1)

Since 2003, using the Academic Blueprint process, the University was able to start ten new programs, eight at the bachelor's level, one at the master's level, and a doctorate in Educational Leadership. Five of the bachelor's degrees were in sciences or health areas. Five of the ten programs have exceeded enrollment projections. In addition, another four programs are in final development and implementation stages. Currently, the University offers 27 bachelor's degree programs, ten master's degree programs, five teaching credentials, four advanced credentials, and one doctoral degree program.

As is evident, there has been significant programmatic growth in the last few years. Nevertheless, as Reflective Essay One describes, "over the years, those involved with program planning have identified several gaps or shortcomings in the process" (p. 5). The analysis of these gaps and the campus response to them are at the core of this reflective essay (CFR 4.1, 4.4).

The campus acknowledges that there was confusion regarding the relationship between the University Master Plan and the Academic Blueprint and among the roles of various stakeholders. In addition, there was also a disconnect between the program approval and budgeting processes. In reflecting on these issues, the Provost decided in 2006-07 to "sunset the Academic Blueprint Committee and to begin exploring options for building upon the Blueprint's strengths, while correcting some of its weaknesses" (p. 6). In its place, four interrelated activities have been identified and are at different stages of development: unit three-year rolling plans, a division-wide strategic plan, a forecasting process, and a new comprehensive process aligning academic planning and budget (CFR 3.5, 4.1-4.6).

To better link budget and planning, all units of Academic Affairs are expected to produce three-year rolling plans (CFR 4.1-4.4). These plans should connect planning assumptions and programmatic initiatives to resource allocation requests. As Reflective Essay One states, the three-year rolling plans serve as a “means of laying out” the goals of the academic units and “making transparent the costs associated with their own growth and development” (p. 7).

Academic Affairs is in the process of completing its strategic plan. During the first phase, vision, mission, core values, and goals for the division were defined. The second phase, scheduled to begin in Spring 2009, will address the development of objectives by each of the twelve units. These objectives should then become part of the units’ three-year rolling plans.

The University Academic Master Plan Forecasting Committee (UAMPFC) is a new initiative that continues some of the activities of the Academic Blueprint Committee. It includes representatives from all units of Academic Affairs, the Academic Senate, and other divisions (CFR 4.1-4.5). As a “think tank,” the UAMPFC does not recommend or make decisions, but simply “scans the environment for information that can inform planning efforts” (p. 8). This group held its first meeting in the Spring Semester 2009.

To develop a transparent budget process, the University Budget Committee began reviewing the budget cycle and processes with the expectation that in Spring 2009 it would propose a revised University budget development process for implementation in 2010-11. One of the goals of the revised budget process is increased understanding by different stakeholders of the revenues and

expenditures dimensions of the budget. Academic Affairs has also revised its budget approach and has now created “an 18-month planning calendar that takes into account the budget and academic program planning cycles” and integrates the three-year rolling plans (p. 8). This critical integration will address the cost of program development and sustaining and expanding current program offerings (CFR 4.1-4.5).

These activities of academic master planning at CSU San Marcos are still a work in progress and depend on the University’s ability to fully develop them and ensure their integration and coherence. Reflective Essay One demonstrates the campus’s ability to question and search for better approaches to align planning and budgeting.

CSU San Marcos has honestly identified the challenges it faces as the University implements the new activities (CFR 3.5, 4.1-4.6). These challenges include:

- Developing concrete academic objectives in support of campus goals
- Testing and improving planning tools
- Cultivating the knowledge and supporting the leadership of campus constituencies
- Assessing whether or not the academic master plan meets specific goals

The Team presents the following recommendations:

- The activities that have been identified as integral components of planning need to be fully developed and implemented, including unit three-year rolling plans, the academic strategic plan, a data-based forecasting process, and resource allocation (CFR 3.5, 4.1-4.6).

- The University should continue to seek innovative approaches to academic planning and program development, such as the use of Extended Learning for program development during the current time of budgetary challenges, to offer programs that serve the needs of the students and the region (CFR 4.1-4.3, 4.8).

Reflective Essay 2: Strengthening Academic Programs through Assessment of Student

Learning

Reflective Essay 2 focuses on the following four researchable outcomes:

- Improved understanding, grounded in evidence, of students' performance in the key common learning theme of writing
- Data showing the evolution and publication of student learning outcomes for each major
- Attention to the quality of student learning in periodic program review reports and annual assessment progress reports
- Use of assessment findings at the course or program level in order to improve student learning

1. Improved understanding, grounded in evidence, of students' performance in the key common learning theme of student writing

In the 2006-07 academic year, the appointment of a General Education Assessment Coordinator provided the focus for the systematic study of two key General Education (GE) learning outcomes, written communication and information literacy. Four different areas of GE--Written Communication, Critical Thinking, Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning, and Social Sciences--have participated in the assessment effort. Faculty assess their students' writing using a standard

rubric and receive individual feedback while aggregated scores are sent to the department chair without faculty names. The GE Committee has established a large database of student writing and concluded that the majority of the students in the GE courses surveyed met “a minimum standard for all SLOs for written communication (thesis, organization, and mechanics) and information literacy (finding information and using information)” (p. 11). CSU San Marcos will use these preliminary results to revise the current GE program in accordance with the new CSU Chancellor’s Office Executive Order 1033, which requires GE to be aligned with the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ LEAP (Liberal Education and America’s Promise) Initiative. CSU San Marcos has made significant progress in GE assessment, including direct assessment of student performance and engagement of faculty. It is unclear if changes have yet occurred in GE resulting from these assessment efforts. The University has extended the writing outcome beyond GE into the majors and at the graduate level, as evidenced by the Academic Senate’s approval of a Graduate Studies Writing Assessment Requirement Policy, which requires graduate programs to assess whether their students have met graduate-level writing competency before advancing to candidacy (CFR 2.2-2.6).

2. Data showing the evolution and publication of student learning outcomes for each major

All undergraduate and most graduate programs have published student learning outcomes (SLOs) in the University’s 2008-10 Catalog and most of the SLOs are available on the assessment website (CFR 2.4). Learning outcome matrices have been requested of programs undergoing five-year program review. Three methods for reinforcing SLOs as part of the campus culture (CFR 2.3) include the template for proposing new programs, the University Curriculum Committee’s requirement that all new course proposals need to specify SLOs, and the annual

assessment report's requirement that programs assess two specific SLOs and specify "what was measured, and how, and how faculty will apply the results of assessment at the program and course level for continuous improvement" (p. 15) (CFR 2.2-2.6, 4.6, 4.7).

3. Attention to the quality of student learning in periodic program review reports and annual assessment progress reports

Please see the discussion of Program Review in Section II D of this Team Report.

4. Use of assessment findings at the course or program level in order to improve student learning

Several examples from three colleges—Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, and Education—are presented in the Educational Effectiveness Review Report to illustrate the use of direct evidence of student learning to support learning at the course or program level. Most of the examples clearly illustrate the quality of the evidence of student learning (i.e., analyzing student papers, using pre-test/post-test design, and developing rubrics for assessing oral presentation) and the findings from the assessments. There has been significant progress in this area; whereas only 9 of 28 departments submitted annual assessment information in the 2005-06 academic year, over 75% of the programs did so in the 2007-08 academic year. These reports require programs to assess two SLOs either at the course or program level. Most programs are reporting results from this assessment process, but are just beginning to make decisions for improvement and implementing these decisions. An example is the Communication Department, which used data collected from an in-class exercise on students' comprehension of "standpoint" and implemented a change wherein faculty placed more emphasis on discussing the concept of

standpoint. Preliminary results suggest this change has improved the desired student learning outcome (CFR 4.6, 4.7).

Review of the University's Inventory of Education Effectiveness Indicators (Fall 2008) indicates that all programs have identified the data/evidence used to determine that graduates have achieved stated outcomes for the degree beyond GPA. But many programs, when queried, "How are findings used?," stated, "Continuous program improvement depending on conclusions from data analysis" rather than providing specific changes or improvements that have occurred. It is also unclear whether targets or benchmarks for improvement have been established.

In the Division of Student Affairs, co-curricular assessment of learning initially started with establishing SLOs based on the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), but was later abandoned in Spring 2008. During the 2008-09 academic year, Student Affairs' units were charged to write service and/or learning outcomes grounded in the division's mission and vision and to pilot an assessment of service and/or learning effectiveness. The Student Affairs Assessment Team designed a service outcomes, learning outcomes, and assessment worksheet as a guide to assist each unit with its planning and assessment process. Discussions with the administrators and staff in the division demonstrated a clear understanding of the difference between service outcomes and SLOs. Co-curricular service outcomes and SLOs have now been developed. Since this is a new process, units are currently piloting their assessment plans and Spring 2009 assessment results were not yet available (CFR 2.10, 4.4).

The WASC Commission in its action letter of July 13, 2007 recommended that CSU San Marcos “incorporate direct assessment of learning more fully into all of its academic and co-curricular programs” (p. 2). Although some progress has been made—for example, all undergraduate and graduate programs have SLOs—there has been a series of false starts on several initiatives. In particular, the multi-year research study by the Office of Analytic Studies of the common learning theme of writing using writing samples envisioned in the University’s Institutional Proposal could not be sustained, and the e-portfolio described in the University’s Capacity and Preparatory Review Report was deemed unfeasible (p. 11). The consequence of these changes in direction has been uneven progress in incorporating direct assessment of learning into all of the University’s academic and co-curricular programs in order to make changes or improvements.

The Team presents the following recommendations:

- Although there has been significant progress in the area of assessment in some programs, the University needs to take important next steps to assess and improve programs (CFR 2.2-2.6, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7).
- The University should continue and strengthen its efforts in assessing educational effectiveness across all curricular and co-curricular programs, using program-level student learning outcomes, direct methods of assessment supplemented by indirect methods, and descriptive data.
- All programs should review and analyze their assessment results to make improvements in their programs and in students’ educational experiences based on assessment evidence and findings, and should document these efforts.

Reflective Essay 3: Improving Retention of First-Year Students

Reflective Essay 3 focuses on the following seven researchable outcomes:

- Upward movement in the one-year continuation rate for first-time freshmen
- A significant improvement in the percentage of students who become successfully remediated in mathematics and/or English within one year of entry
- More readily available advising services for incoming freshmen and greater student satisfaction with them
- An increase in the percentage of minority students among the first-time freshmen returning for a second year of study
- Strengthening our campus learning assistance centers
- Improved academic performance and retention of freshmen participating in an intensive summer program and/or a learning community
- Development of a campus-wide “Action Plan for First-Year Improvement” based on the comprehensive Foundations of Excellence process in 2007-08

1. Upward movement in the one-year continuation rate for first-time freshmen

CSU San Marcos has applied significant resources in assisting its freshman students to succeed. The University reported a freshman retention rate from Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 of 70.4% (CFR 2.10). Approximately 80% of freshmen enroll in General Education Lifelong Learning (GEL 101), a comprehensive college success course, and all freshmen are required to enroll in General Education Writing (GEW) (CFR 2.11). CSU San Marcos provides solid evidence of the success of its first-year programs, analyzing one year of students who took GEL 101 compared to non-GEL 101 students across various cohort groups (i.e., summer program, student athletes, and

residential students). CSU San Marcos has implemented a number of changes since its Capacity and Preparatory Review, including a Summer Bridge Program, College Assistance Migrant Program, Fall Bridge for Educational Opportunity Program, and a First-Year Council (pp. 29, 31, 34, 36, 39) (CFR 2.10-13). Eight of the nine committee work-groups formed to carry out the Foundations of Excellence initiative were co-chaired by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs managers, and the First-Year Council has substantial representation from both areas and reports to both the Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs (CFR 2.11).

The University's commitment to first-time freshmen is clearly evident by the creation of a new department, First-Year Programs (FYP), and First-Year Academic Support Coordinator. This commitment of budgetary as well as personnel resources has resulted in an in-depth examination of the relationship between retention and remediation which establishes baselines to benchmark future efforts. The University has demonstrated a commitment to improving its freshman retention rate of 70%, which remains lower than the CSU average for the same cohort of 81%. In order to further raise the first-year retention rate, CSU San Marcos will need to following through on its focused efforts of the last few years.

2. A significant improvement in the percentage of students who become successfully remediated in mathematics and/or English within one year of entry

The First-Year Academic Support Coordinator has assessed student performance in remedial mathematics and found how to improve persistence while consolidating the three levels of remediation into two semesters. CSU San Marcos has partnered with a local community college to help provide basic math remediation (CFR 2.14). The University has also “block registered” students as cohorts for remediation, allowing greater access to courses. As a result of cohort

bridge programs and revisions in math remediation, 75% of all first-year students who entered in Fall 2007 requiring remediation completed it within one year, an 8% increase from the same period in 2006 (p. 26).

Given the considerable remediation required for entering freshmen at CSU San Marcos, which ranked third lowest in remediation rates within the CSU system in 2005-06 (p. 25), it may be difficult for the University soon to approach the CSU average. Although the demographics of CSU San Marcos's entering freshmen may pose particular challenges, the University should not be deterred from its focused efforts to improve student retention. While CSU San Marcos has demonstrated significant analysis and improvement of its mathematics remediation program and student performance (pp. 24-25), it was not apparent from the Educational Effectiveness Review that the University has made the same kind of assessment and improvements in English remediation.

3. More readily available advising services for incoming freshmen and greater student satisfaction with them

In 2003, CSU San Marcos identified academic advising as an area in need of improvement. In 2007, a series of local surveys queried students on access to and satisfaction with academic advising. A Foundations of Excellence Student Survey administered in Fall 2007 queried students on who provided them with advisement, timeliness and access to advisement, and frequency and quality of the advisement (CFR 2.10, 2.12). Institutional Planning and Analysis compared first-year students' use of advising services with retention, graduation, and

continuation rates. The various surveys resulted in helpful feedback and positive changes concerning academic advising.

One of the advising improvements was installation of an electronic scheduler for academic advising that enabled students to email questions to advisors. However, in Fall 2006, only 35% of the freshmen using the electronic scheduler for academic advising scheduled an academic advising session (p. 28). During the Educational Effectiveness Review site visit, the Team spoke with students who indicated that access to advising was difficult as they had to schedule appointments 2-3 weeks in advance, and most of the students indicated that they did not avail themselves of email communication with their advisors. Improving the effectiveness of academic advising related to student retention continues to be a challenge for CSU San Marcos (p. 28). The Team suggests that the University utilize its newly formed First-Year Council to revise and improve its ability to advise and connect with first-year students and that the University extend its investigation of the impact of academic advising to include upper-division and transfer students as well.

4. An increase in the percentage of minority students among the first-time freshmen returning for a second year of study

CSU San Marcos has identified a large percent of its student population as ethnic minority. In Fall 2007, 42% of freshmen self-identified as minority students and 37.3% of the total student body were minority students. The one-year freshman retention rate from Fall 2007 to Fall 2008 was 71.3% for white students versus 69.7% for minority students (p. 29). CSU San Marcos is

slowly but steadily improving its freshman retention rate for minority students to approach that of other students.

CSU San Marcos is in the final application stage of becoming an Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) (CFR 1.5, 2.10). Addressing the academic success needs of minority students, CSU San Marcos has created the College Assistance Migrant Program, a summer academic enrichment program for students from migrant farm worker families, and a Summer Bridge Program for EOP students, and has redesigned its delivery of math remediation from three semesters to two semesters in an effort to increase persistence. The University has improved its efforts to retain minority students and used the results of ongoing analysis to improve the effectiveness of its delivery of remediation and academic assistance services. As CSU San Marcos continues to grow more ethnically diverse and approaches becoming an Hispanic Serving Institution, the University will need to stay diligent in its monitoring and analysis of the retention and success of minority students in order to improve its delivery of services to this changing student population (CFR 1.5, 2.1-2.3, 2.10-2.14, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).

5. Strengthening our campus learning assistance centers

The Centers for Learning and Academic Support Services (CLASS) are a collection of tutorial and student service centers aimed at improving student academic success and retention and graduation rates, which have an especially significant impact on first-year students. CSU San Marcos has re-organized to have all the academic support services report through one organizational structure, as reported in the Educational Effectiveness Review site visit. The synergy and effectiveness of the academic support services--Writing Center, Math Lab,

Language Learning Center, and Educational Opportunity Program/Student Support Services advising, counseling, and supplemental instruction--have improved the University's outreach to students, while the University has increased the number of student mentors and improved student-mentor training (CFR 2.3, 2.10-2.13). The Centers have conducted annual satisfaction surveys indicating that at least 85% of students report that they have received quality tutoring (p. 32). The challenge that the University must manage in the immediate and foreseeable future is attempting to maintain the synergy and improvements documented above while facing a possible shortfall of resources applied to learning centers caused by CSU and University budget reductions.

6. Improved academic performance and retention of freshmen participating in an intensive summer program and/or a learning community

CSU San Marcos has a variety of summer and fall cohort-based academic support programs. Since the Capacity and Preparatory Review, the University has created several new learning communities focused on specific student populations such as student athletes (p. 34). Programs such as the Summer Academy, San Marcos Experience, and First-Year Business Learning Community have all been launched in an effort to improve freshman success. While the size of these cohort programs is small, the results are positive in terms of student feedback and persistence. "Although these various examples represent considerable collaboration between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs, our efforts have been relatively decentralized and we have not yet developed a full-blown campus-wide framework, vision, and assessment process for the freshman year" (p. 35). CSU San Marcos's Foundations of Excellence plan and new First-

Year Council should supply focus and vision in the University's continued promotion and improvement of its freshman students' academic performance.

7. Development of a campus-wide "Action Plan for First-Year Improvement" based on the comprehensive Foundations of Excellence process in 2007-08

In an effort to consolidate and focus its freshman success programs, CSU San Marcos initiated the Foundations of Excellence (FoE) program in 2007 with a year-long self-study and improvement planning process to enhance programs and services for first-year students, which included an internal inventory of all programs, policies, and practices relevant to the first year of college (pp. 35, 39) (CFR 2.3, 2.6, 4.1, 4.6). As reported to the Team during the Educational Effectiveness Review site visit, the FoE self-study resulted in the creation of the First-Year Council, charged with implementing the recommendations of the Foundations of Excellence. The First-Year Council is a team approach between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs (CFR 2.11), and has resulted in new initiatives such as block registration, revision of math remediation, supplemental instruction for Mathematics 50 and 51, and consolidation of tutorial and learning centers into one coordinated unit (CFR 2.3, 2.10-2.14). The Foundations of Excellence model "emphasizes that student success is much more than retention....this initiative has exemplified our active commitment to a more coherent 'University First' model of educational effectiveness" (p. 36).

CSU San Marcos is to be commended for its efforts in improving freshman retention, increasing the enrollment and success of diverse student populations, creating educational partners with community colleges, and moving towards becoming an Hispanic Serving Institution. The

University has conducted a year-long comprehensive study of its first-year student experience, resulting in a comprehensive plan via the Foundations of Excellence model. The FoE plan spawned a campus-wide First-Year Council, and the council is accountable to the Provost and the Vice President of Student Affairs, which has taken significant steps in creating effective approaches to student success, including cross-divisional support for academic support programs, remediation, learning communities, and student engagement in curricular and co-curricular activities.

The Team presents the following recommendations in support of CSU San Marcos's efforts in promoting first-year student success and the success of all its students:

- The University should continue its efforts through the Foundations of Excellence process to define, coordinate, and improve its programs and services in support of freshman retention and student success, seeking out the opportunities resulting from the creation of a First-Year Council (CFR 2.3, 2.6, 2.10-2.13, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).
- The University should expand its efforts to monitor and improve the progress of its students at all levels in support of student success, including sophomore through senior-level year students, upper-division transfer students, and graduate students (CFR 2.3, 2.10-2.14, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).
- The University should continue to seek innovative approaches to curricular and co-curricular programs and student success as it strives to serve the needs of its students and the region. This includes serving the needs of a growing population of minority students and at the same time managing and allocating scarce resources according to a documented strategic plan (CFR 1.5, 2.3, 2.10-2.14, 3.5, 4.1-4.3, 4.6, 4.8).

B. Institution's Systems for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness and Student Learning

CSU San Marcos's Educational Effectiveness Review Report defines the foundation of the University's approach to educational effectiveness as the following: publication and dissemination of formal program learning outcomes; annual learning outcomes assessment progress reports and faculty-led program reviews that include external reviewers and incorporation of student learning outcomes and assessment; disaggregated data used to illustrate achievement of various levels of students; and collaboration of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to address persistent student issues and promote student success. Team members met with various groups during the Educational Effectiveness Review site visit in which discussions included confirmation that there is a commitment to using quality assurance processes, especially as relates to student learning. For example, the University's programs and evaluation activities with respect to first-year students have included collaboration between faculty, Academic Affairs, and Student Affairs, monitoring retention, disaggregation of student success data, and implementation of improvements based on data analysis and interpretation of results. The next steps to be taken with program review will build on this foundation and are expected to significantly strengthen the overall quality assurance system and create an approach to educational effectiveness that effectively integrates efforts in the academic arena, faculty governance, student affairs, and institutional research.

C. Student Success

CSU San Marcos has focused most of its student success efforts on first-year students. Reflective Essay 3 in the Educational Effectiveness Review Report in particular highlights the University's initiatives and academic support programs aimed at improving retention and

persistence of the freshman class. The University's first-year retention rates have improved slightly over the last several years, especially for minority students and those completing mathematics remediation, and the first-year retention rate for the 2007 freshman class was 70.4%.

Using IPEDS data for 6-year cohort graduation rates, CSU San Marcos's 2001 freshman cohort graduated at a rate of 38.2%, and the three-year average for 1999-2001 freshman cohorts was 38.5%. When the 2001 freshman class six-year graduation rate is disaggregated by ethnicity and gender, we find the following graduation rates: Black, non-Hispanic: 37.4% ; Asian/Pacific Islander: 42.0%; Hispanic/Latino: 42.1%; White, non-Hispanic: 49.8%; Ethnicity unknown: 36%; Male: 29.1%; Female: 44.3%. The transfer student graduation rate for the cohort enrolling in Fall 2004 and graduating in 2007 was 57.7%. The graduate student graduation rate for the cohort enrolling in master's degrees programs in Fall 2004 and graduating in 2007 was 38.9%.

The Team finds evidence of significant planning and implementation of programs promoting student success for first-year students. The University's Foundations of Excellence model "emphasizes that student success is much more than retention" and the "number and range of practical, creative, and visionary action items for improving first-year students' experience affirms that emphasis" (p. 36). It is now incumbent on CSU San Marcos as a still-developing institution to address sub-average student success indicators as documented in the above IPEDS data and to expand its efforts to monitor and improve persistence and graduation rates of students

at all levels, including freshman through senior years, minority and male students, and graduate students.

D. Program Review

The program review process at CSU San Marcos reflects a commitment to implementing ongoing review and improvement (CFR 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7). The University's Educational Effectiveness Report addresses the program review process in researchable outcome 3 of Reflective Essay 2 within the larger context of learning assessment and the University's commitment to focus on student learning. A series of revisions in the program review process was undertaken beginning in 2005-06 by the Program Assessment Committee (PAC). The PAC shifted program reviews from comprehensive reviews to more in-depth analyses of selected learning outcomes. Subsequent feedback from faculty and external reviewers suggested the need to include program capacity as well as educational effectiveness. Since the Capacity and Preparatory Review site visit, a series of extensive changes was undertaken to enable the program review process to focus on selected areas along with the assessment of program-level student learning outcomes.

The PAC recommendations included a variety of revisions of the University's Program Evaluation and Planning (PEP) document. As described in the Educational Effectiveness Review Report, the revisions were intended to alleviate faculty workload, promote departmental discussions, and make the program review process more meaningful. After continued work on these revisions with the University-wide Graduate Studies Council to develop guidelines for graduate program reviews, the resulting Program Review Policy was shared with faculty for

broader discussion and review. Despite a variety of methods employed to achieve faculty support, the Program Review Policy was not approved by the Academic Senate in 2008. The Educational Effectiveness Review Report concludes, however, that significant strides have been made with continuing revisions of the program review process and implementation of annual assessment plans and reports. The Report additionally states that many elements of the Program Review Policy are being voluntarily adopted, even though the policy has not been endorsed by the Academic Senate.

An assessment website supports the program review process with information and explanations of the program review process. The website is intended to facilitate sharing and learning across programs and to promote program review as an ongoing process of assessment rather than an every-five-years undertaking. Annual assessment plans have been implemented along with annual progress reports. These annual assessment reports provide an important method for establishing learning assessment as an ongoing process.

Two PAC resolutions have resulted in enhanced institutional support for assessment and program review. One was a request for funding to support assessment of student learning by departments and programs required to submit annual assessment plans and progress reports. Over \$25,000 was awarded in the 2007-08 academic year. A second successful resolution created a new position of Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow to guide and support departments and programs in their development of student learning outcomes and assessment plans and reports. These forward steps have demonstrated institutional support and strengthened faculty engagement with assessment (CFR 2.8-2.9, 3.4).

Prior to the site visit, the Team reviewed the University's Educational Effectiveness Review Report and links to evidence, the accompanying Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators and other supporting documents, and the University's assessment website postings related to program review, student learning outcomes, and learning outcomes assessment. During the site visit, Team members reviewed selected program review reports and annual assessment reports for 2007-08. Program review was addressed during meetings with faculty members conducting program review, the University Curriculum Committee, the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the Program Assessment Committee, and the Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow.

The evidence confirms that all academic programs are expected to be engaged with the program review process and learning assessment. Learning outcomes are posted on the assessment website and in the University Catalog for almost all degree programs. The proposed Program Review Policy relates program review to annual learning outcomes assessment and shows commitment to use of external reviews and feedback regarding assessment plans and reports. At the same time, there is variability in the levels of engagement and currency of program reviews, and much of the work is still in the beginning stages. As a result, the program review process has not progressed to the point where it can be effectively connected with the University's planning, budgeting, and decision-making processes.

The Educational Effectiveness Review Report shows a strong emphasis on student learning assessment in current and projected assessment and program review activities. This emphasis

constitutes an important strength of the work undertaken so far and, at the same time, poses a potential limitation for future work. As the University has acknowledged, the proposed program review policy needs to be expanded to require a broader analysis of program capacity and effectiveness based on clear institutional criteria if program review results and recommendations are to be linked with planning, budgeting, and decision-making. A program portfolio/data notebook is referenced in the draft program review policy that will be an important resource of relevant information and support broader analysis of program effectiveness.

Given the absence of a clear institutional model to guide program review or require specific elements, it is positive that some individual programs--for example, the Departments of Chemistry, Economics, and Communication--have forged ahead and created useful records of work. These areas of progress are supportive of organizational change in which growth is from the "ground up." However, it is a major institutional limitation that the faculty and administration have not agreed on a program review model and guidelines for this essential component of educational effectiveness. The University's Educational Effectiveness Review Report gives much attention to the program review process and policy revisions when more emphasis needs to be placed on effects or improvements achieved by program review and learning outcomes assessment. There is a need for higher and more specific expectations for program review as part of organizational learning and educational effectiveness.

The Team presents the following recommendations:

- It is imperative that the University implement a program review model that features faculty engagement, incorporates learning outcomes assessment, and is clearly connected to planning, decision-making, and budgetary processes (CFR 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).
- Expertise is needed to identify best practices and successful models that can guide the University to implement the previous recommendation.

SECTION III – SUMMARY, MAJOR FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Institution’s Fulfillment of Intended Outcomes for the Review

The Educational Effectiveness Review marks the third phase of the accreditation process that began when CSU San Marcos submitted its Institutional Proposal in May 2005. The process continued with the Capacity and Preparatory Review and concludes with the Educational Effectiveness Review Report and site visit. The University’s Educational Effectiveness Review Report is generally consistent with the themes and plans presented in its Institutional Proposal but the University has revised certain outcomes of the original Proposal for reasons that are clearly explained. The Educational Effectiveness Review process has enabled the University to reflect on its efforts and progress in the areas of academic master planning, strengthening academic programs through assessment of student learning, and improving retention of first-year students. These themes have “provided the University community with a framework to sustain intentional conversations around high value issues” and its “collective aspirations and how to achieve them” (p. 38). These conversations, in turn, have produced “a complement of concrete outcomes with measurable results,” coalescing “around the goal of student success” (pp. 38-39).

The concluding essay of the Educational Effectiveness Report summarizes the outcomes of each of the self-study themes: 1. An enhanced budget and planning process which promotes transparency, strategic thinking, and use of evidence when allocating resources; 2. A culture shift toward the use of assessments in an intentional, systematic manner to inform teaching, curriculum development, and program reviews; 3. An in-depth, cross-unit analysis of first-year policies, practices, and data, which provides the insight and leverage to make changes and use new approaches for addressing the needs of the University's diverse student population not only in the first year but across all the years of the undergraduate experience (pp. 38-39).

CSU San Marcos has not yet fulfilled all of the intended outcomes of the self-study process defined in its Institutional Proposal. Most notably, the University needs to develop and deepen core competencies in the key functions of academic master planning, program review, and learning outcomes assessment. CSU San Marcos has taken "many incremental but meaningful steps to build momentum" as a learning organization through its self-study process (p. 39). The University has made progress in increasing its organizational capacity to learn both through successful efforts such as improving first-year programs and student achievement and through challenges such as developing effective academic master planning, program review, and assessment processes. The self-study process of CSU San Marcos demonstrates significant institutional commitment to the creation of a learning organization based on an emerging culture of evidence, and key functions such as planning, assessment, and program review that the University must continue to develop and strengthen (CFR 1.2, 2.2-2.7, 3.5, 4.1-4.8).

B. Value and Effectiveness of the Review

The WASC Site Visit Team was treated with collegiality, generosity, and hospitality during its well-organized three-day site visit to CSU San Marcos. The Team found campus members to be pleasant, collegial, professional, and committed to advancing the educational mission of CSU San Marcos despite the challenges of an adverse economic and budgetary environment. The Team was impressed by many aspects of the University and many examples of good practices across the University. In particular, the Team's interviews with undergraduate and graduate students, including students in the joint Doctorate in Educational Leadership (EdD) Program, demonstrated the positive educational experiences that students have at CSU San Marcos, resulting from close faculty-student interactions, small class size, and enriched curricular and co-curricular activities.

In framing its commendations and recommendations, the Team has taken into account that CSU San Marcos is a young institution which has moved from rapid institutional growth to a period in which it is forced by economic challenges to level enrollments and face possible budget reductions while maintaining a vibrant academic environment and sustaining commitments to a diverse student body and outreach to local communities. The Team's commendations and recommendations are driven by a desire to support the University's momentum and its path of continuous inquiry, reflection, and action.

The Team presents the following commendations:

- The University has initiated efforts to develop a more integrated and transparent planning and budgetary process connected to program development and review (CFR 2.7, 3.5, 4.1-4.6).
- The University has made progress in implementing learning outcomes assessment, as evidenced by the appointment of a Learning Outcomes Assessment Fellow and a General Education Assessment Coordinator; the publication of student learning outcomes for academic programs in the University Catalog and assessment website; the engagement of faculty and staff with student learning outcomes across the curriculum and co-curriculum, and a substantial increase in submission of annual learning assessment reports by academic programs (CFR 1.2, 2.2-2.6, 2.10, 3.4, 4.1, 4.6, 4.7).
- The University has conducted significant assessment of writing and information literacy in the General Education curriculum and has demonstrated commitment to a university-wide writing requirement across the educational experience, which is acknowledged as an asset by current students as well as alumni (CFR 2.2-2.6).
- The University has made impressive efforts to develop learning communities and promote student engagement in curricular and co-curricular activities (CFR 2.3, 2.10, 2.11).
- The University has undertaken successful efforts to improve student retention in the first-year by creating cross-divisional support for academic support programs, remediation, and student first-year experiences (CFR 1.5, 2.3, 2.10-2.13, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).

- The University has sought the opportunity of participation in the Foundations of Excellence process, which has resulted in the development of a campus-wide Action Plan for First-Year Improvement and the creation of a First-Year Council to implement the recommendations of that action plan (2.3, 2.10-2.13, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).
- The University has made continued progress toward its strategic priority of diversity, as evidenced by the increased enrollment and student success of diverse student populations; educational partnerships with school districts, community colleges, and tribal organizations; community partnerships with local businesses such as the new BS in Nursing Program in Temecula; continued progress toward becoming an Hispanic Serving Institution; and the establishment of the Social Justice and Equity Project (CFR 1.5, 2.10-2.14, 4.8).

As CSU San Marcos moves forward, it will be the University's challenge and responsibility to maintain and expand its significant growth and development in the above areas.

C. Major Recommendations from both CPR and EER

Although CSU San Marcos has made significant progress since its Capacity and Preparatory Review in support of educational effectiveness, the University continues to need to develop and deepen core competencies in key areas such as academic master planning, assessment, and program review.

The Team presents the following recommendations in support of the continuing efforts of CSU San Marcos to improve its educational effectiveness:

- The University needs to fully develop and implement the activities described as integral components of academic master planning, including unit three-year rolling plans, an academic strategic plan, a data-based forecasting process, and resource allocation (CFR 3.5, 4.1-4.6).
- The University should continue to seek innovative approaches to academic planning and program development, such as the use of Extended Learning for program development during the current time of budgetary challenges, in its efforts to serve the needs of its students and the region (CFR 4.1-4.3, 4.8).
- Although there has been significant progress in the area of assessment in some programs, the University needs to take important next steps to assess and improve programs. The University should continue and strengthen its efforts in assessing educational effectiveness across all curricular and co-curricular programs, using program-level student learning outcomes, direct methods of assessment supplemented by indirect methods, and descriptive data. All programs should review and analyze their assessment results to make improvements in their programs and in students' educational experiences based on assessment evidence and findings, and should document these efforts (CFR 2.2-2.6, 2.10, 4.1, 4.6, 4.7)
- It is imperative that the University implement a program review model that features faculty engagement, incorporates learning outcomes assessment, and is clearly connected to planning, decision-making, and budgetary processes (CFR 2.6, 2.7, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7).
- Expertise is needed to identify best practices and successful models that can guide the University to implement the previous two recommendations.

- The University should continue its efforts through the Foundations of Excellence process to define, coordinate, and improve its programs and services in support of freshman retention and student success, seeking out the opportunities resulting from the creation of a First-Year Council (CFR 2.3, 2.6, 2.10-2.13, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).
- The University should expand its efforts to monitor and improve the progress of its students at all levels in support of student success, including sophomore through senior-level students, upper-division transfer students, as well as graduate students (CFR 2.3, 2.10-2.14, 4.1-4.3, 4.6).
- The University should continue to seek innovative approaches to curricular and co-curricular programs and student success as it strives to serve the needs of its students and the region. This includes serving the needs of a growing population of minority students and at the same time managing and allocating scarce resources according to a documented strategic plan (CFR 1.5, 2.3, 2.10-2.14, 3.5, 4.1-4.3, 4.6, 4.8).
- Finally, the University should continue to realize its commitment to a “University First” mentality that will enable CSU San Marcos to continue to define itself clearly, to meet the challenges it faces, and to work together to achieve its educational mission and goals (CFR 1.2, 4.1-4.3, 4.6-4.8).

We offer the above recommendations in order to support the efforts of CSU San Marcos to continue on the “path of continuous inquiry, reflection and action” established by its accreditation review process and pursue “effective responses to discoveries made during the self-study processes” (p. 39).

APPENDIX

Off-Campus Site Summary: Accelerated BS in Nursing Program, Temecula

1. INSTITUTION: California State University, San Marcos

2. SITE LOCATION:

27455 Tierra Way
Temecula, CA 92590

3. TEAM MEMBER(S)/REVIEWER(S):

Jamie Dote-Kwan, Estela Lopez, David Fite, Steven Butler, and Nancy Hedlund

4. CONTEXT:

The Temecula campus offers one degree program (i.e., Accelerated BS in Nursing) and several continuing education courses including test preparation, personal enrichment, and the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute. All of the programs offered are self-supported and operated through Extended Education. Five part-time clinical faculty and two part-time lecturers in the BSN program are housed at the Temecula campus.

5. DATE VISITED & LENGTH OF VISIT: April 7, 2009 from 9:30 to 10:30 a.m.

6. VISITED IN CONJUNCTION WITH: EER

7. DESCRIPTION OF ON-SITE INTERACTIONS:

Campus tour of the facilities followed by group interview with Suzanne Lingold, Assistant Dean of Extended Learning – Southwest Riverside County; Judith Papenhausen, Director of the School of Nursing; Eric Bullard, Assistant Dean for Extended Learning; and Jennifer Jeffries, Interim Associate Vice President for Planning and Academic Resources.

8. OTHER MATERIALS REVIEWED: Campus website.

<p>Suggested Lines of Inquiry. Please address each of the following. Representative CFRs are noted in each cell below.</p>	<p>Observations and Findings</p>	<p>Check (X) here if follow-up is needed</p>
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> Is the physical environment and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to the fostering of learning and dialogue between faculty and students? (CFRs 2.1, 2.5, 3.5)</p>	<p>The campus has administrative and faculty offices, simulation laboratories, skills laboratories, student and faculty/staff lounges, a video conferencing room, four technology enhanced classrooms, a modest student computer lab with four stations, and 60 laptop computers.</p>	
<p><i>Student Support Services.</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advisement, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? (CFRs 2.13, 3.6)</p>	<p>The campus provides on-site advisement and computing services. Students can access counseling only on the main campus. Online Library access is available. There is one full-time administrator and staff on site. Facilities are open 8 to 5 pm Monday through Friday and evenings and weekends if classes are scheduled.</p>	
<p><i>Connection of Students and Faculty to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the home campus (or broader institution) at the off-campus site? (CFR 2.10)</p>	<p>The Accelerated BS in Nursing Program is offered at both the main and off-campus site. Both are self-supported, faculty teach the didactic courses at both sites via synchronous video conferencing, and WebCT houses the online exams. The off-campus site has local clinical sites (i.e., Fallbrook and Murrieta).</p>	
<p><i>Relationship of institution's goals for CPR/EER Reviews to off-campus activities.</i> In what ways, if any, do the institution's efforts to build capacity and enhance educational effectiveness through the reaffirmation process on the home campus carry over to activities at this site? (CFRs 4.1, 4.8)</p>	<p>The Accelerated BS in Nursing addresses gaps in areas of high regional demand articulated in the Academic Blueprint from 2003 to present. The hiring of an expert in Nursing to write the program proposal and later become the founding faculty member and director of the School of Nursing serves as a model for "program development when specific campus expertise was lacking" (EER, p. 6)</p>	
<p><i>Context of this site in the broader institution.</i> How does the institution conceive of this site relative to its mission, other current and potential remote sites, and administrative structure? How is this operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.8)</p>	<p>Establishment of this off-campus site has allowed the School of Nursing to increase its enrollments. It is also responsive to the local area for the need for qualified health care professionals. This is evident by the community support for the program (i.e., City of Temecula donated \$115,00 and an area developer donate \$100,000 to renovate the industrial building which is provided rent-free for 2 years, and \$100,000 in equipment was donated by Southwest Healthcare).</p>	
<p><i>Educational Effectiveness Preparedness.</i> How has the institution organized itself to address student learning and educational effectiveness at this site? What are the quality and nature of institutional data analysis systems, quality improvement systems and systems to evaluate student learning at this site? (CFRs 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>The programs are seeking CCNE (Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education) accreditation. Both main and off-campus programs operate under the same evaluation plan which is extensive and addresses each CCNE criterion with multiple sources of evidence (surveys, student evaluation, institutional data, etc.).</p>	

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS, OBSERVATIONS, OR COMMENTS:

The Accelerated BS in Nursing is an entry-level nursing program for individuals who possess a bachelor's degree in a related field. It is a one-year, full-time program where students complete four quarters or 62 units. Twelve full-time and 14 adjunct faculty provide the didactic instruction and clinical supervision. The program has experienced tremendous growth, starting with 54 students in January 2009 and admitting an additional 54 students in Summer 2009 followed by another 54 students in Spring 2010.