

Interim and Progress Report Action Summary

Report Type	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interim Report (panel review) <input type="checkbox"/> Progress Report (staff review)	
Institution	CSU San Bernardino	
ALO	Clare Weber	
WSCUC Staff Liaison	Mark Goor	
Review Call Date (Interim Report reviews only)	November 21, 2017	
Interim Report Panel	First Reader: John M Hofmann Second Reader: Gerardo Marin	
Institutional Representatives (Interim Report reviews only)	Name	Title
	Tomas Morales	President
	Shari McMahon	Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
	Clare Weber	Deputy Provost, Academic Programs
	Muriel Lopez-Wagner	Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Director of Institutional Research
	Janelle Gilbert	Professor of Psychology and University Assessment Coordinator
Topics to be Covered as Required by Commission in Letter Dated 3/6/2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A completed Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI) that provides a list of the learning outcomes in column (1) (as opposed to a “yes” or “no” answer) and gives attention to the non-GPA data used in assessing each learning outcome (column 3) and the use of evidence for making programmatic improvements based on assessment data (column 5). Learning outcomes information should be provided for the Institutional Learning Outcomes, The General Education Learning Outcomes, Program Learning Outcomes, and the applicable Co0Curricular Learning Outcomes. 2. Two specific examples that describe in detail the process of “closing the loop” on assessment in areas that do not fall under external professional accreditation. These examples should describe the learning outcomes, the data gathered, an analysis of the data, and the actions taken on the findings. 3. A description of the progress made in implementing the strategic plan. 	

Findings of the Committee Interim Report:	
Commendations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Interim Report clearly and completely addressed the topics from the Commission letter. 2. The IEEI provided s comprehensive overview of CSUSB’s assessment processes. 3. The Provost Office has identified areas for faculty development based on what was learned from the IEEI. 4. The report of how the GE Writing program is closing the loop was exemplary. It was comprehensive, detailed, identified meaningful trends, looked at important results differences between student subpopulations (e.g., transfer students from local community colleges), and highlighted areas of concern or underperformance and what CSUSB has done to address them. 5. The establishment of CLASS is an impressive approach to supporting curricular and co-curricular assessment. 6. Reviewers were impressed with the use of the quarter to semester transition to re-examine curriculum.

	<p>7. The university has a Steering Committee that has set ambitious goals for ensuring student engagement with High Impact Practices.</p> <p>8. The strategic plan progress report was thorough and comprehensive and provided lots of information about progress with plan implementation. CSUSB appears to be maintaining momentum in implementing its many strategic planning tactical plans.</p>
Recommendations	<p>1. The IEEI revealed some significant differences in how programs vary in how they make use of assessment data to promote student learning and promote effective teaching. CSUSB is encouraged to continue identifying programs that need support for defining learning outcomes and improving outcomes assessment processes, drawing from the skills and expertise of faculty from more developed programs.</p> <p>2. While the IEEI provided extensive information about CSUSB's assessments processes, the worksheet was incomplete. Most notably, assessment at the institutional level and for General Education had no information in columns 3-6. This areas should be clearly addressed by the time of the university's mid-cycle review.</p>

<p>Recommended Actions:</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Receive the Report; and</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proceed to next scheduled interaction with WSCUC (see below) (the institution is expected to address any Recommendations in the next scheduled interaction)</p>

<p>Next Scheduled Interaction with WSCUC:</p>
<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mid-Cycle Review in <u>Spring 2019</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Review: Offsite Review in <u>Spring 2021</u> and Accreditation Visit in <u>Fall 2021</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>Commission Approval and Date</p>
<p>Not Applicable for Progress Report</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Approved on _____</p>
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved on and referred back to Committee/Staff Liaison on _____</p>

Note: The effective date of this action is the date of the Commission action