

We begin by restating our intended CPR outcomes:

1. The development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness to support institutional planning and decision making;
2. Greater clarity about the institution’s educational objectives and criteria and standards of judgment for defining and evaluating those objectives;
3. Improvement of the institution’s capacity for self review and of its systems of quality assurance;

We see each of standards 1, 3, & 4 contributing significantly toward these results, as described below.

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity from standard 1. These all flow from CFR 1.2 and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2:

- Educational Objective (EO) Indicators – calling for our need to develop indicators for a number of educational program objectives and standards and criteria of judgment.
- Educational Objective Recognition – stating that educational objectives are not clear throughout the institution, but that this recognition is uneven.
- Evidence of Educational Objective Fulfillment – telling us that we need to work toward developing minimum thresholds of achievement of our educational objectives, so that we can mark progress toward fulfilling these objectives.

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issue	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes
EO Indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASC Self-Review • Program Review Student Learning Outcome Indicators • Educational Effectiveness Inventory • Data Exhibit 7 Indicators • NSSE High Impact Activity Participation Rates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration • Program Review Leaders • Program Review Leaders • Program 	CPR OUTCOME 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and Report Self-Review • Program Reviews • Annual EEI • Specialized Accreditation • Curriculum Reform

		Review Leaders of accredited programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seaver Dean's Cabinet 		
EO Recognition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASC Self-Review • Program Reviews • Educational Effectiveness Inventory (EEI) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration • Program Review Leaders • Program Review Leaders 	CPR OUTCOME 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and Report Self-Review • Program Reviews • Annual EEI
EO Fulfillment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASC Self-Review • Program Reviews • Educational Effectiveness Inventory • Data Exhibit 7 • NSSE High Impact Activity Participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration • Program Review Leaders • Program Review Leaders • Program Review Leaders of accredited programs • Seaver Dean's Cabinet 	CPR OUTCOME 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and Report Self-Review • Program Reviews • Annual EEI • Specialized Accreditation • Curriculum Reform

Standard III: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity, from standard 3, and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2:

- 3.2 – Faculty Distribution – indicating our need to maintain sufficient numbers of qualified and diversity.

- 3.4 – Faculty Development – calling for appropriate faculty development to improve teaching and learning as they relate to assessment findings.
- 3.5 – Alignment – calling for alignment between purposes and resources.
- 3.6 – IT Resources: Scope – calling for sufficient scope of IT offerings.
- 3.7- IT Resources: Coordination – suggesting that IT coordination done well.
- 3.8 – Decision Making – indicating the need to clarify decision making processes.
- 3.10 – President – calling for the president and his leadership to be fully devoted to leading the institution.
- 3.11 – Faculty Governance – calling for enhanced academic leadership from the faculty.

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issue	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes
Faculty Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASC Self-Review • Fact Book • Program Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration • EIR Office • Program Review Leaders 	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and Report Self-Review • EIR annual dissemination • Program Reviews
Faculty Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for Teaching Excellence 	CPR Outcome 2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTE Faculty Development Events
Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review • Board of Regents Annual Dashboard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Board of Regents 	CPR Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Reviews
IT Resources – Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tech Qual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIO 	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Tech Qual and its follow up
IT Resources - Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tech Qual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIO 	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Tech Qual and its follow up

Decision Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic and Administrative Leadership, University Planning Committee, University Faculty Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic and Administrative Leadership, University Planning Committee, University Faculty Committee 	CPR Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodic Meetings of these groups
President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> President, Senior Administrative Team, School Deans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> President, Senior Administrative Team, School Deans 	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Day to Day activities of these groups
Faculty Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Faculty Council, School Faculty Senates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> University Faculty Council, School Faculty Senates 	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodic Meetings of these groups

Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

Our Self-Review has helped us measure a number of key issues that relate to capacity from standard 4, and represent elaboration on our analysis of the Self-Review in section A.2. These are:

- 4.2 – Planning aligns academic, personnel, fiscal, physical, and technological needs
- 4.3 – Planning relies on data, evidence of student learning
- 4.5 – Institutional Research addresses and reviews strategic data needs and processes
- 4.7 – Best practice in teaching and learning is in use and undergoes continual improvement

As a means of monitoring these key issues, several groups regularly review the following key indicators and employ organized activities to achieve the desired outcome for these themes, as described below:

Issues	Key Indicator	Groups responsible	Desired outcomes	Activities to achieve outcomes

Planning Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WASC Self-Review • Program Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders, Deans, Senior Administration • Program Review Leaders 	CPR Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and Report Self-Review • Program Reviews
Planning Evidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review Leaders 	CPR Outcome 1,2,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Review
Institutional Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIR Support & Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIR 	CPR Outcome 1,3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing Activity of the office of EIR
Teaching and Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) • Faculty RTP Data • Course Evaluation Indicators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center for Teaching Excellence • Faculty • Faculty, Chairs, and Deans 	CPR Outcome 1,2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTE Faculty Development Events • RTP Processes • Course Evaluation Collection and Analysis