

RECOMMENDATIONS AND AREAS FOR ATTENTION FROM THE 2005-06 PREPARATORY AND CAPACITY REVIEW

During the 2005-06 academic year, the campus participated with WASC in our Capacity and Preparatory Review, an important first step in our initial accreditation review. Included in this review was a self-study prepared by the CSUCI Accreditation Committee, a site visit from a WASC Site Visit team, a report from this team on its visit, and finally, a meeting of the WASC Accrediting Commission to review the reports prepared by the campus and the site visit team. The report from the site visit team and the letter from WASC Accrediting Commission include recommendations and areas for attention that the campus must address in its self-study on educational effectiveness. These recommendations and areas for attention are as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SITE VISIT TEAM

Recommendation 1:

CSUCI must take steps to ensure by the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review that the institution will have clear evidence of the extent of student achievement in Student Learning Outcomes at the course, program (major), and degree levels. At the degree level, there should be evidence of student achievement in regard to learning within and across disciplines; interdisciplinary learning; experiential learning; multicultural perspectives; and international perspectives. In addition, CSUCI should have in place a system that can assess student learning in these areas and procedures to ensure that evidence is used for program improvement.

Recommendation 2:

By the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, CSUCI needs to clearly identify the structural role of the Centers in achieving the University Mission and student learning outcomes.

Recommendation 3:

CSUCI should review and restructure mission-critical councils and committees to achieve institutional goals, ensure rotation of committee memberships, to reduce redundancy, and to clarify authority.

Recommendation 4:

By the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, the system of collecting, analyzing, coordinating, and using data should be in place even if longitudinal data may not yet be available. Data need to support the mission and drive decision-making.

Recommendation 5:

With full appreciation for the determination of faculty, staff, and administrative leaders to build a 21st Century university with only the resources and time they have available, the effort and cost required to begin a wholly new institution can never fully be recovered through enrollment funding and, therefore, we recommend that the State of California

make a strategic investment of special funding at this critical stage of capacity-building to ensure that the vision for CSU Channel Islands can be realized.

AREAS OF CONCERN FROM THE WASC COMMISSION ACTION LETTER

Concern A. Consistent Student Achievement:

As more data are available on the culminating achievements of its own graduates, the institution needs to be able to demonstrate the extent to which all categories of students are consistently achieving designated learning outcomes. By increasing engagement with actual evidences of student learning, faculty need to be able to determine that students are achieving at a level they deem appropriate to the degree being granted. By making reference to disaggregated achievement data, the institution should be able to express a clear picture of each component of its diverse student body. Such "achievement portraits" should be able to include the experience of transfer students and be able to identify areas that may need improvement for each segment of the student population.

Concern B. Program Review:

The institution also needs to demonstrate that it is implementing purposeful, coordinated, and effective program reviews. At the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review, CSUCI will need to formalize its approaches for identifying, obtaining, and evaluating essential student achievement data and demonstrate it is using such outcomes information to formulate action plans to improve learning. The several departments, committees, and centers with responsibilities in this area need to clarify the roles and procedures of each in order to achieve a greater sense of focus in the multiple forms of assessment activities. The institution's Program Review process should include a strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of the review process itself. Program reviews should plan to include co-curricular and service units as well.

Concern C. Interdisciplinarity:

In order to optimize a distinctive characteristic of the CSUCI educational experience defined as "interdisciplinarity," the institution should demonstrate significant progress in developing reliable interdisciplinarity assessment strategies and instruments. These strategies should be able to both validate achievement of, and inform decisions about improving, outcomes in this area of learning. Such efforts would likely include a higher degree of specificity in the definitions of the intended outcomes. These assessments should at least lay the foundation for aligning criteria for faculty performance reviews associated with rewards and promotions.

Concern D. Strategic Resource Funding:

In keeping with the "Special Comment and Recommendation #5" in the team report, the Commission urges CSUCI leadership to engage with CSU System leadership and other state-level decision makers regarding strategic funding for the institution. While recognizing that the institution holds a finite level of control over this outcome, the Commission urges that there be efforts to find ways to ensure the continued development of the University during these critical founding years and the special needs of this start-up period are recognized.