

## Appendix G: Addressing the 2008 Revisions to the CFRs and Institutional Review Process

**Table A: Addressing the 2008 Revisions to the CFRs**

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
1.2	The institution develops indicators for the achievement of its purposes and educational objectives at the institutional, program, and course levels.	<p>Beyond traditional indicators reported to IPEDS such as retention and graduation rates, we have adopted <a href="#">University Learning Objectives</a>, supplemented by Diversity Learning Objectives and Sustainability Learning Objectives. All are published on a dedicated website, in the online version of the current Cal Poly Catalog, and in other locations. A university-level assessment program is underway that includes the establishment of measurable outcomes.</p> <p>All programs are required to define programmatic learning outcomes, and to assess their students' performance against these outcomes. In periodic reports to the Academic Programs office, departments are asked to disclose where their outcomes are published. Typically, they are published in departmental handbooks or other similar documents and/or on departmental websites.</p> <p>Faculty are expected to establish learning outcomes at the course level and to communicate these to their students. Current policy, <a href="#">adopted by the Academic Senate in 2006</a>, does not explicitly require that faculty include learning outcomes in written syllabi.</p>
1.2	The institution has a system of measuring student achievement, in terms of retention, completion, and student learning.	Retention and graduation rates are routinely measured and made available to programs by our office of Institutional Planning & Analysis. <a href="#">Assessment of student learning</a> takes place at the university, program, and course levels, with oversight by Academic Programs, the University Assessment Council, college assessment councils, and (in some cases) departmental assessment committees.

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
1.2	The institution makes public data on student achievement at the institutional and degree level, in a manner determined by the institution.	<p>Many of our data on student achievement are published on publicly-accessible websites. For example, data on retention and graduation appear in the university's <a href="#">Fact Book</a>, more generally on the <a href="#">IP&amp;A website</a>, and on our <a href="#">College Portrait</a> (which is accessible via drop-down menu from Cal Poly's home page).</p> <p>At this time, the results of learning outcomes assessment are less readily available to the public, although we are currently reviewing what information we provide on our College Portrait (we have been hesitant to publish data from the Collegiate Learning Assessment to date because of concerns about the test's validity and reliability). When available, we expect to publish online the results of our ongoing assessment of University Learning Objectives.</p>
1.9	The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution	The ALO is responsible for ensuring that complete and accurate reporting takes place. As far as we know, with one exception (that we disclosed as soon as it was discovered), all important changes during the past few years have been reported to WASC in a timely manner. After the single incident in which a department and college failed to keep the ALO informed of a substantive change, the ALO began to send annual reminders to the campus community about the need for timely notification. Even if a unit neglects to do this directly, the ALO is typically alerted to proposed changes through the curriculum review process.

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
2.2b	<p>GUIDELINE: Institutions offering graduate-level programs demonstrate sufficient resources and structures to sustain these programs and create a graduate-level academic culture.</p>	<p>Cal Poly's <a href="#">graduate programs</a> vary across departments and colleges in size, purpose, and support for faculty and students. With one exception (a joint doctoral program in Education with UC Santa Barbara), all programs are at the Master's level. In general, programs are small and students benefit from close mentoring by faculty. In engineering and science, programs are almost always research-focused, with a thesis or project requirement as the culminating experience. While some programs prepare students to move on to doctoral study, the majority focus on preparing students for more advanced positions in government, industry, and the professions, including teaching positions at the high school or community college level.</p> <p>Graduate programs are adequately but not generously supported. Teaching a graduate course contributes equally to workload as an undergraduate course with the same units, but a graduate FTES is counted as fewer units (12) than undergraduate (15). Workload credit for supervising a thesis or project or participating as a member of a thesis/project committee is not commensurate with effort. Support for graduate students varies widely. The most common mechanisms for supporting graduate students are Teaching Assistantships (funded through departments) and Research Assistantships (funded through faculty sponsored projects). Some programs provide no support for students. Unlike most universities, TA's and RA's do not receive fee-remission. A few (10-12) out-of-state tuition waivers are available each year to aid in recruitment of outstanding applicants from outside California.</p> <p>Graduate program faculty are almost uniformly deeply committed to the rigor and success of the programs in which they participate. Cal Poly's recent growth in sponsored research has contributed greatly to the rigor of its graduate programs by providing state-of-the-art projects for graduate student research.</p>

<b>CFR #</b>	<b>Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1</b>	<b>Self-Assessment</b>
2.3	The institution's student learning outcomes and expectations for student attainment are clearly stated at the course, program and, as appropriate, institutional level.	<p>Student learning outcomes have been established at all three levels. At institutional and programmatic levels they are typically published on websites and/or written departmental documents (e.g., handbooks). Some faculty include program-level learning outcomes on course syllabi (see Data Exhibit 7.1: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators).</p> <p>To date, the Academic Senate has not agreed to requiring faculty to include any learning outcomes on written syllabi, although many (probably most) include at least course-level outcomes. Some departments require it. This issue is likely to be revisited soon in the Academic Senate.</p>
2.7	All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes analyses of the achievement of the program's learning objectives and outcomes, program retention and completion, and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations.	Information about program review is included in the essay on Integration and Student Learning. Our program review process meets the CFR.
2.8	GUIDELINE: Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	The essay on the Teacher-Scholar Model recommends that the Academic Senate define scholarship in Boyer's terms as discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning.

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
2.10	The institution collects and analyzes student data disaggregated by demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and campus climate to support student success.	<p>In addition to tracking data on quantitative indicators such as retention and graduation, which are disaggregated by various categories (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity), the institution regularly participates in national surveys such as the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), while conducting occasional surveys of its own (e.g., the student survey used in this self-study).</p> <p>Because of resource constraints, coupled with the need to satisfy demands from the CSU Chancellor’s Office for extensive reporting, our Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IP&amp;A) has not yet been able to develop as systematic an approach as it would like to the analysis of student data; rather, it has performed this analysis, to a large extent, on an ad hoc basis. Nevertheless, progress is now being made in this regard, with analysis by IP&amp;A and others on campus contributing to a demonstrable increase in evidence-based decision-making.</p>
2.11	Consistent with its purposes, the institution develops and assesses its co-curricular programs.	This topic is addressed in the essay on Integration and Student Learning. Cal Poly offers extensive co-curricular programs. These programs are assessed on an ongoing basis using CAS Standards, and the findings are routinely used for improvement. More information is available on the Student Affairs website under <a href="#">Student Life and Leadership</a> and <a href="#">Assessment</a> .
3.2	GUIDELINE: The institution systematically engages full-time non-tenure track, adjunct, and part-time faculty in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development.	Little or no distinction is made between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty for purposes of involvement in academic program review and other academic processes affecting student learning. Faculty development opportunities are available to both tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, e.g., workshops and other services offered by the <a href="#">Center for Teaching and Learning</a> .
3.3	Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives.	<a href="#">Collective bargaining agreements</a> with faculty and staff, negotiated statewide between the CSU and faculty/staff unions, govern many of our practices in this area, which must also be consistent with state personnel requirements. Campus policy requires all recruitment committees to include trained employment equity facilitators. In addition to orientations within their departments and colleges, all new faculty are encouraged to attend one of two university-wide orientation workshops offered annually by the Center for Teaching and Learning, with a significant focus in recent years on the University Learning Objectives.

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
3.4	GUIDELINE: The institution provides training and support for faculty members teaching by means of technology-mediated instruction.	<p>The responsibility for training and support is shared between Information Technology Services (ITS), the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the colleges/departments. For several years, ITS has employed two instructional designers who provide training and support through CTL, primarily for the use of BlackBoard in regular classes. A recent initiative involving ITS in a partnership with CTL trained faculty to teach in a hybrid modality. The Orfalea College of Business and the Continuing Education Division have added instructional designers to provide technology-related support.</p> <p>BlackBoard is used widely and effectively throughout the campus. Assessment of student learning in our ongoing distance education program in Biomedical Engineering (e.g., via direct assessment of student theses) has shown that students at remote sites have performed as well as students on campus.</p>
3.5	The institution has a history of financial stability, unqualified independent financial audits and has resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability.... If an institution has an accumulated deficit, it has realistic plans to eliminate the deficit.	The institution has operated within its operating revenues and budgets, without incurring deficits, and continues to do so. Adjustments in operations (e.g., reduced student enrollment) are being made to reflect reductions in revenues from state appropriations. Annual independent financial audits are conducted. The institution is financially sustainable now and for the foreseeable future.
3.6	The institution holds, or provides access to, information resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind to support its academic offerings and the scholarship of its members. These information resources, services and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.	The <a href="#">Robert E. Kennedy Library</a> provides information resources that are adequate to support our undergraduate programs but less robust in attempting to support our graduate programs and our faculty as teacher-scholars (see also our self-study essay on the Teacher-Scholar Model). Student per capita funding for the library is roughly half that provided at most of the institutions which we have identified as our peers. Cal Poly's current administration has indicated a willingness to provide additional funds, but none are currently forthcoming and the outlook is not optimistic, at least in the short term, given California's budget crisis. On a positive note, our library's hours of operation exceed those of all but one of the other CSU campuses; our building is used more actively than buildings elsewhere in the CSU and at comparison institutions; it has been significantly remodeled and reorganized to promote student learning.

CFR #	Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1	Self-Assessment
3.8	GUIDELINE: The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority, which are reflected in an organization chart.	Cal Poly’s <a href="#">organization charts</a> reflect clear lines of responsibility. Management personnel and staff are required to have formal position descriptions, updated as necessary to keep them current. The position descriptions used in recruiting individual faculty members serve to define the responsibilities of those people; further definition may be provided in documents at college and department levels.
3.9	GUIDELINE: The governing body regularly engages in self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	<p>New members of the CSU Board of Trustees are given an orientation that is designed to enhance the functioning of the board. Development happens along the way, with the system divisions providing presentations on various operations, initiatives, and programs on our campuses (and systemwide). This practice, too, is designed to enhance the board's knowledge of systemwide priorities and practices. Ultimately, this would also enhance the functionality of the board.</p> <p>More information about the Board of Trustees is available in the <a href="#">CSU System Data Portfolio</a>.</p>
3.10	The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibility is to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management	Cal Poly has a full-time CEO and a full-time CFO, and a sufficient number of qualified administrators to provide effective leadership and management.
3.11	GUIDELINE: The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty.	The governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of the faculty are defined in the <a href="#">Constitution of the General Faculty and ByLaws of the Academic Senate</a> . State law in the form of the Higher Education Employer-Employees Relations Act provides statutory support for shared governance.

<b>CFR #</b>	<b>Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1</b>	<b>Self-Assessment</b>
4.4	<p>The institution employs a deliberate set of quality assurance processes at each level of institutional functioning, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, ongoing evaluation, and data collection. These processes include assessing effectiveness, tracking results over time, using comparative data from external sources, and improving structures, processes, curricula, and pedagogy.</p>	<p>Cal Poly has clear policies and practices that provide quality assurance at each level of institutional functioning. For example, all proposals for new or substantially modified <a href="#">programs, curricula and courses</a> are reviewed by peer committees and administrators at the department, college, and institutional levels. Reviewers' findings are communicated to those making the proposals, often resulting in improvements to the proposals. All academic programs undergo periodic <a href="#">program review</a>, with standard program data provided by IP&amp;A and external reviewers in effect benchmarking against other institutions. Programs are required to maintain assessment plans and prepare action plans intended to turn recommendations into realized improvements.</p>

<b>CFR #</b>	<b>Revised Criteria for Review (CFR) or Revised Guideline to CFR1</b>	<b>Self-Assessment</b>
4.5	<p>The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and objectives. Institutional research addresses strategic data needs, is disseminated in a timely manner, and is incorporated in institutional review and decision-making processes. Included in the institutional research function is the collection of appropriate data to support the assessment of student learning. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the research function and the suitability and usefulness of data.</p>	<p>In the past, Cal Poly’s <a href="#">Institutional Planning and Analysis</a> (IP&amp;A) office has been largely preoccupied with supplying data to meet the needs of the CSU Chancellor’s Office. In recent years, although still burdened with a considerable amount of CSU reporting, the unit has increasingly taken on research assignments that support assessment activities and decision-making within the institution, although the implementation of PeopleSoft set us back significantly. The new director, appointed in 2006, is both qualified for, and interested in, performing a more expansive IR role. The office now routinely supplies a broad range of needed data and, in many cases, assists with the analysis of those data. To date, IP&amp;A has not been subject to periodic reviews, but the director has for about a year been investigating effective ways of conducting such reviews and expects to initiate an ongoing review process as soon as time and resources permit.</p>

**Table B: Addressing New 2008 Requirements of the Institutional Review Process**

New Required Coverage	Response
<p>A study and analysis of student success, drawing from, but not limited to, [the institution’s] data on retention and graduation rates, disaggregated by student type and by program. To the extent possible, the study should include comparisons with similar institutions and, where appropriate, recommendations for improvement.</p>	<p>The subject of student success is a significant component of Cal Poly’s self-study essay on Integration and Student Learning. Some additional capacity-related analysis is provided here.</p> <p>As mentioned elsewhere, we routinely collect and publish data on retention and graduation, disaggregated by student type and program. Analysis of these data takes place at all levels of the university, leading in many cases to recommendations for action; for example, during periodic <a href="#">program review</a>, departments are required to reflect on program-level data and address issues and opportunities, as appropriate, in their resulting action plans.</p> <p>At the institutional level, we have often in the past used other CSU campuses for comparison purposes, while recognizing that in many ways, including the academic quality of our incoming undergraduates, we more closely resemble campuses in the UC system. As part of both the recent strategic planning process and the preparation of our WASC self-study essay on Our Polytechnic Identity, we devoted a considerable amount of effort to the identification of a more solidly defensible list of comparison institutions, which proved especially difficult given Cal Poly’s unique mix of majors. The result of these efforts was the production of a peer list based on the Carnegie classification. The list appears in the current version of our <a href="#">strategic plan</a>.</p> <p>The strategic plan commits us to tracking our future performance using key performance indicators, many of which we have measured in the past. After fine tuning our list of comparison institutions, we intend to develop target benchmark levels relative to the comparison group.</p> <p>In the meantime, as we have since at least the time of our last WASC visit, we continue to seek improvements in retention and graduation. With limited institutional research capacity (as discussed elsewhere), our knowledge of the key factors affecting student success has been less than complete; however, evidence from a number of studies (e.g., surveys of students who have applied to graduate but have failed to complete all requirements in time to do so) has suggested that multiple factors have been at work. Some have been under the university’s control (e.g., unclear curricular requirements, including those governing senior project; issues relating to change of major; lack of spaces in courses; scheduling conflicts; and failure to</p>

New Required Coverage	Response
	<p>prevent students from “walking” at commencement ceremonies before completing their degrees). Others have been the responsibility of students (e.g., failure to seek advising or to follow advice; lack of desire to graduate in a timely manner).</p> <p>In the period between 2000 and 2008, various attempts were made to address these and other perceived obstacles, resulting in Academic Senate resolutions on <a href="#">commencement</a>, <a href="#">incompletes</a>, <a href="#">change of major</a>, <a href="#">senior project</a>, <a href="#">course syllabi</a>, <a href="#">grade forgiveness</a>, and <a href="#">timely accessibility to instructional materials</a>. Efforts were also made to reduce the quarter units required for a baccalaureate toward the CSU minimum of 180; update and improve curricular flowcharts; strengthen orientation programs for entering students; expand <a href="#">Supplemental Workshops</a> and related academic support programs; and influence the campus culture so that timely graduation would be considered the norm rather than the exception. For example, our student ambassadors (e.g., Poly Reps) were asked to refrain from joking about undergraduates taking “forever” to complete their degrees. Many of these efforts were coordinated by our Student Success Council.</p> <p>Cal Poly’s six-year graduation rate has consistently crept upward during this period, increasing from 68.6% for freshmen entering in 2000 to 73.8% for those entering in 2003. While the ever-improving academic quality of our entering students is almost certainly a contributory factor, we are currently investigating whether other actions taken by the university during the past few years (as described in the previous paragraph) have also been a cause of this increase.</p> <p>As mentioned in our self-study essay on Integration and Student Learning, the arrival of a new provost in 2008 heralded a renewed emphasis on retention and graduation, as well as a new commitment to removing barriers to timely graduation. After many years of trying, we have finally been able to implement for most students an automated <a href="#">system for tracking progress to degree</a>, replacing the manual evaluation system previously in use; this is expected to help considerably with advising as well as self-monitoring by students. As this report is being written, a number of task forces are examining available evidence regarding many of the perceived obstacles to graduation with the intention of taking further steps to overcome them.</p> <p>Even the most recently announced increase in our six-year graduation rate does not bring us up to the rates achieved by most of the UC campuses and by some of the other institutions on our comparison list. We currently believe that a rate of 80% or more should be achievable, given the academic quality of our entering</p>

<b>New Required Coverage</b>	<b>Response</b>
	students. Our performance will be further addressed in our Educational Effectiveness Review.