

Our fundamental infrastructure for supporting educational effectiveness resides in two forms – a process and an office, both of which produce measurable evidence or products.

Our model of *program review as research*, as described in detail in “Program Review Ingredients” at the end of section B.1, provides a uniform, effective process for our gathering of evidence of student learning, analyzing it, and then bringing about continuous improvements in our programs in order to achieve educational effectiveness. Thus, program review process is more than process. It is also product or content, because it generates an institutional archive of educational effectiveness data and its attendant analysis, providing a dynamic institutional account of our educational effectiveness achievement. Because program reviews are carried out by many faculty members and staff each year, the institution provides a support system, in the form of the office of Educational and Institutional Research (EIR), to oversee all educational effectiveness efforts at the institution.

The office of EIR, provides a number of resources for educational effectiveness assessment efforts. These include support in the form of a dedicated staff of EIR professionals, consulting and training for faculty & staff, connections to best practices in higher education, oversight of NSSE & HERI, data mining and analytics, EIR reports, and an annual budget, provided by the university president, to support faculty and staff who conduct program reviews, in the amount of over \$100,000 (not including the salaries of the EIR staff). This annual outlay of monies is provided to program review leaders to pay for stipends, release time, outside consultants, and conference attendance, all of which are available to every program under review each year, both for the five year reviews and the annual review updates.

Thus, the two elements – the process and the office, with its complement of staff and budgetary resources – work well together to provide ample, visible infrastructure for our ongoing – annual and five-year - emphasis on educational effectiveness. More importantly, these two elements produce tangible artifacts or products of educational effectiveness. These are reflected, in detail, in standards 2 and 4, as discussed below.

## **Standard II: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

The core functions for achieving our educational objectives are our program reviews, which are maintained and executed by our faculty. Program reviews are supported by another important core function – our office of Educational and Institutional Research.

These reviews analyze and encompass both capacity and educational effectiveness elements, producing measurable artifacts of their work in the form of faculty headcounts, student headcounts, student credit hours, student learning outcomes, student learning evidence, and curricular change.

For example, the program review conducted by the Sociology Department was supported by the office of EIR, and resulted in the following report – which was presented to our University Planning Committee in May 2008 – see attached “Sociology Program Review”.

#### **Standard IV: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement**

In addition to focusing extensive effort on improving educational objectives via our program review process, our entire university community is dedicated to learning and improvement. Primarily, then, we rely on continuous critical self-reflection of the research questions we are asking, the data we are collecting, the metrics we are formulating and updating, the analysis of our processes, and the recommendations we have for improving every aspect of the institution. However, we also see the need to stay in touch with the larger higher education community, to seek best practices as well as share our reflective experiences with these organizations. We feel that the best way to accomplish this is by ensuring that our community membership is connected externally to the higher education world. Accordingly, the university financially supports travel to conferences and annual memberships in these organizations, as well as occasionally hosting consultants and speakers from these organizations on our campus. This provides evidence of the infrastructure for every member of community to practice ongoing self-reflection on their own goal achievement and use established higher education organizations and networks to stay in touch with best practice. These include the following groups and the attending national organizations with which they maintain active membership in order to locally employ methods of assessment and improvement of the organization:

Office of Educational & Institutional Research – [www.airweb.org](http://www.airweb.org), [www.ashe.ws](http://www.ashe.ws),  
[www.nsse.edu](http://www.nsse.edu), [www.heri.ucla.edu](http://www.heri.ucla.edu)

Steering Committee – [www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu)

Deans Council – [www.chronicle.com](http://www.chronicle.com)

University Planning Committee – [www.aacu.org](http://www.aacu.org)

Facilities Management & Planning - [www.scup.org](http://www.scup.org)

University Faculty Committee – [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)

University Tenure Committee - [www.aaup.org](http://www.aaup.org)

75 Discipline Curriculum Committees – All of the discipline based national organizations, such as the American Psychological Association, National Association of Schools of Music, American Bar Association, National Communication Association, ...

Student Affairs – [www.case.org](http://www.case.org) , [www.naspa.org](http://www.naspa.org)

Libraries – [www.ala.org](http://www.ala.org)

Information Technology – [www.educause.edu](http://www.educause.edu)

Office of Financial Planning – [www.ca.edu](http://www.ca.edu)

Office of International Programs – [www.iie.org](http://www.iie.org)

Office of Human Resources – [www.cupahr.org](http://www.cupahr.org)

General Counsel – [www.abanet.org](http://www.abanet.org)