CLAREMONT McKENNA COLLEGE

INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL

for

REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION

Submitted to the

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

MAY 15, 2007

WASC PROPOSAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY CLAREMONT McKENNA COLLEGE: MAY 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

APPENDICES FOR PROPOSAL:

(Appendices are included in separate binders)

REQUIRED DATA EXHIBITS TO SUPPORT THE INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSAL:

(Data Exhibits are included in separate binders)

A. Institutional Type and Organizational Structure:
1. Mission (of Claremont McKenna College)
2. Organizational Chart (of Claremont McKenna College)
3. Claremont McKenna College Catalog , 2006-2007
4. Summary Data Form (Fall 2006 – IPEDS)

B. Student Body Characteristics:
1. Headcount Enrollment by Level (Fall 2006)
2. Headcount Enrollment by Status and Location (Fall 2006)
3. Degrees Granted by Level (academic year)

C. Academic Programs:
1. List of CMC Majors and Sequences (from WASC Annual Report Form)

D. Faculty and Staff:
1. Faculty by Employment Status

E. Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources:
1. Key Financial Ratios

F. Educational Effectiveness Indicators
1. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

G. Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators
1. Inventory of Concurrent Accreditation and Key Performance Indicators (none)

APPENDIX K

CLAREMONT McKENNA COLLEGE – ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT 2005 and 2006

(see Pocket 4)

A. Setting Institution's Context and Relating the Proposal to the Standards of Accreditation

A. 1. Institutional Context Statement

Claremont McKenna College (CMC) is celebrating the sixtieth anniversary of its founding during 2006-2007. Located at the extreme eastern boundary of Los Angeles County in the city of Claremont, the College is adjacent to the so-called Inland Empire, one of the fastest growing regions in the state of California. The College occupies about 60 acres of land and is acquiring an additional 18.7 acres to the east that extends into San Bernardino County. The College was founded as Claremont Men's College, a four-year, undergraduate, liberal arts college with a special mission to educate young men in public affairs, coupling the theoretical with the applied. In 1976, the College made a major decision to alter its male only character with the admission of women. In 1980, the College changed its name to Claremont McKenna College to reflect its new co-educational nature and to honor one of its founding trustees. The College has grown substantially over the years from its early enrollment of some three hundred students to 1050 in Claremont in spring 2007.

The College offers 28 majors with its own resources and a number of other majors are offered via The Claremont Colleges Consortium. The Consortium is a unique model of higher education in America. Conceived in the early part of the Twentieth Century, the Consortium consists of five undergraduate colleges, two graduate institutions, and a central organization that provides services shared by all students, faculty, and staff. The five undergraduate and two graduate institutions support and strengthen each other to become more than the sum of their parts and all but one are located on adjacent campuses. The Colleges are nationally and internationally renowned for academic excellence. The Consortium includes Pomona College, the founding institution (established in 1887), Claremont Graduate University (1925), Claremont University Consortium (1925), Scripps College (1926), Claremont McKenna College (1946), Harvey Mudd College (1955), Pitzer College (1963), and the Keck Graduate Institute of Applied Life Science (1997). The Colleges not only share a library system, bookstore, counseling and health facilities, among others, but also offer joint academic programs and cross-registration in courses. Currently the consortium has over 6,300 students, 900 faculty, and 2,400 staff. More than 2,000 courses per semester are available to students in Claremont through a common registration system.

Claremont McKenna College's mission is to educate students through the liberal arts for leadership in business, the professions, and public affairs. The unique curricular specialization of the College is inherent in the Consortium concept, which is not intended to duplicate curricular programs at each of the constituent colleges. The unique nature of the College's program can also be seen in other areas of distinction. The College's science program (the Joint Science Department) is operated jointly in conjunction with Pitzer and Scripps Colleges, and each institution takes its turn in operating the program on a rotating basis with the faculty assigned to one of the three colleges on a similar rotating basis. CMC operates a joint intercollegiate athletics program for both men and women on behalf of Harvey Mudd and Scripps Colleges. (Pomona and Pitzer form their own joint intercollegiate program.) CMC operates a Washington, D.C. semester-long program for all of the undergraduate colleges that combines academic courses and internships, and International Place for orientation, advising, support, and programming for international students from all of The Consortium's institutions.

The College also operates eleven research institutes established to engage in research efforts that relate primarily to public policy issues, to assist the College to attract and retain superior faculty, and to extend the academic program beyond the classroom through applied research projects involving faculty and students. Nearly half of our students benefit directly or indirectly through the programs of the research institutes. We believe our students are capable of engaging in substantive research, and through the opportunities to define problems, analyze data, articulate findings, and gain new skills and techniques offered to our students through their involvement with one or more of the institutes, we add substantially to their educational experience. We also encourage students to extend their education beyond Claremont through extensive study abroad sites and through college-funded summer internships in the United States and abroad. Indeed, a larger percentage of our students study abroad than at Stanford, Swarthmore, or Williams.

Despite the College's relative youth, we have become one of the leading liberal arts colleges in the nation. We are a highly selective, intensely residential institution having admitted 16% of our 4,140 applicants for fall 2007. Their combined SAT scores are 1400, and 84% are in the top ten percent of their graduating class. For the 2006-

2007 academic year, fifty-four percent of our freshmen were drawn from outside of California, and forty percent were from minority groups, with Hispanics surpassing Asian-Americans as the largest group for the first time (Appendix J, pages 2-5). The faculty is composed of teacher-scholars with high tenure standards and has grown proportionally to 124 FTE with a student-faculty ratio of 9.3:1. (Appendix F, pages 14-15). The College fully implemented a new four course teaching load for all tenured and tenure-track faculty outside of the Joint Science Department and a post-tenure review policy in 2006.

The College has a firm financial base. Our endowment reached $431 million in April 2007 (Data Exhibit A-4). Our annual operating budget is $65 million, (Data Exhibit A-4) and we had an operating surplus of $2.8 million for the 2005-06 fiscal year. (Appendix K, page 10) Forty six percent of our alumni made a financial contribution to the College last fiscal year, (Appendix J, page 72) and 100% of our seniors contributed to the College prior to graduation in May 2006. Our Office of Development had the best fundraising year in the College's history in 2005-2006, raising just under $31million. (Appendix J, page 71) Our growing student applications and financial strength are factors that have led us to consider increasing our size, and growth is one of the themes we have chosen to examine as part of our review.

Since the last WASC review, a number of changes have taken place at the College. A Strategic Plan was adopted in 2002, and Matthew Bibbens'92 was appointed Vice President for Planning to oversee its implementation. A new academic dean, Gregory Hess, Russell Bock Professor of Economics, assumed office in the 2006-07 academic year, and a new Vice President for Student Affairs, Jefferson Huang, assumed office in the fall of 2006l. A new Vice President for Development and External Relations, William Lowery, took up his duties in February 2006, and a new Treasurer, Robin Aspinall, and a new Chief Technology Officer, Cynthia Humes, were appointed in the last several years. New academic programs in financial economics, neuroscience, classical studies, human rights, genocide and Holocaust studies, and environmental science have been added. Physical changes include the construction of an office complex at 400 Claremont Blvd. that houses the Alumni Office, Development Office, Public Affairs, and Human Resources. The W. M. Keck Science Center was renovated in 2004 to permit the addition of six new lab spaces and a number of faculty offices. Several members of the History Department and two research institutes moved into the Mills Avenue buildings, which were formerly administrative offices. The North Quad residence halls were renovated and two-story pavilions were added to each of them. Parking facilities were expanded.

We are currently preparing to construct or completing plans to construct a new residence hall, new tennis court facility, new academic building (to include Admissions), an additional science building, an events center/sports arena, and several new rental houses for faculty. We are also preparing major renovations of two of our tower residence halls, and our gymnasium. We have recently received approval to purchase land to the east of our campus for construction of a new baseball and softball complex as well as additional parking.

Despite these advances and our growing strength, there are several issues that need our attention. Foremost among these are identifying and assessing student learning outcomes and planning carefully for possible future growth.

Prior Commission Actions
The Commission's letter to President Gann of March 10, 2000 identified six visiting team recommendations and agreed that, "the College should give them full consideration." The six recommendations included: balancing the liberal arts with the College's special focus; continuing its efforts to develop an educational outcomes and assessment program and enhancing institutional research capacity; developing a culture and mechanisms for enhanced faculty governance; giving increased attention to diversity among the Board and faculty and to the experience of women, minority students, faculty, and staff; giving greater attention to program reviews and external reviewers; and making greater use of the consortium. In addition, the Commission, "highlighted three areas warranting special attention," several of which emanate from the six recommendations. The three areas are educational effectiveness, diversity, and faculty governance.

The College has made substantial investments to "***manage its major dilemma of balancing the broader liberal arts (especially in the humanities) with the special focus on government, business, and the professions.***"

While the two largest departments, economics and government, accounted for 1/3 of the 124 total faculty FTE, in 2006-07, the number of FTE faculty in economics and government has increased only by 3 since 2000, while the number of faculty FTE in the humanities and history has increased by 9 (Appendix F, page 18). History, psychology, and economics have experienced the greatest growth in faculty positions since the last WASC visit. Four faculty members have been added in each. Total courses added in economics and government has increased by 28 since 2000-2001. In all other areas (excluding Joint Science), the increase has been 27 (see Appendix M for details). Of the three newest research institutes, one is in economics and the other two are in the humanities and psychology. Four new endowed chairs have been created in History and one each has been established in philosophy and literature.

We have used the resources of the Consortium to enhance existing programs in theater, music, mathematics, science, gender studies, ethnic studies, and modern languages. We have invested new resources in modern languages by adding full-time faculty in a cooperative program with the other colleges. We have recently collaborated with all four of our sister undergraduate institutions to create a new interdisciplinary major in neuroscience. All five colleges have a new interdisciplinary media studies program to which CMC contributes through the Film Studies program. In addition, to the above programs, CMC has several intercollegiate programs with one or more of the other undergraduate colleges including American Studies, Asian Studies, Classical Studies, Religious Studies, and Legal Studies.   With the Joint Science Department we received two successive grants from the Mellon Foundation to create a new major in environmental science.

Another major resource of the College to aid in balancing our specialized focus with the liberal arts is the Athenaeum program. A dedicated facility for bringing students into contact over meals with major figures drawn from various fields as diverse as literature, music, politics, business, science, education, and ethics. This program operates at lunch and dinner four days a week providing a constant source of challenging opinions and perspectives to students. The College seeks similar balance in terms of commencement speakers. In the last ten years, speakers have included Seamus Haney, Irish Poet and Nobel Laureate, actor Sidney Poitier, Historians Doris Kearns Goodwin and Stephen Ambrose, and author Ray Bradbury.

An even more consequential area identified by the Commission is the College's efforts to focus on educational outcomes and assessment which "***must be continued, expanded, and institutionalized.*" *"The Commission encourages the College…to create a system for assessment that fits the particular ethos and resources of [CMC]…account[ing] for identifying student learning outcomes, assessing learning against those outcomes, regularly reviewing the effectiveness of program curriculum and pedagogy, and cycling the results from assessment and program review into efforts for improvement in curriculum and pedagogy."* The College has continued its efforts to survey students and graduates which the Commission noted positively in its letter to the College. Most recently, we surveyed both current students and alumni regarding the educational outcomes of working at one of our research institutes. Two years ago, we created an Office of Institutional Research with a full-time researcher within the Registrar's Office. This Office has been instrumental in enhancing the College's capacity to conduct survey research and to collect and analyze data. However, as our review of the Criteria for Review (CFRs) has clearly demonstrated to us, we have not made sufficient overall progress in the vital area of assessing student learning. Thus, we have chosen educational effectiveness as one of the two themes for our review. As we set out in this Proposal, we have an ambitious plan of action intended to create an extensive assessment and evaluation program to measure student learning outcomes.

We have, however, made substantial progress in another aspect of educational effectiveness, external program reviews. The Commission recommended, *"that the College design a review process that will add value to programs and contribute to their organizational learning about curricular design and pedagogy."* We were urged to include the use of external reviewers. The College responded aggressively to this recommendation, developed a plan for external reviews, and has now completed an extensive external review of every departmental major except Religious Studies. We have also reviewed all of our research institutes except the three newest ones. We have made hiring decisions and programmatic and curricular changes based on the recommendations we have received. We plan to tie future external reviews to student learning outcomes.

The Commission also identified diversity as an area that requires persistent efforts, and encouraged ***"giving attention to the experience of women faculty and students from 'minority' backgrounds."*** The Commission recommended that, ***"CMC regularly assess the culture of the campus in terms of the extent to which it welcomes and supports diverse populations of students, staff and faculty."*** We have addressed diversity concerns in several ways. First, as part of our recently concluded Irvine Diversity Initiative, we hired a full-time Assistant Dean of Students, Jennifer Jimenez Marana, to focus on concerns of minority students and, more recently, freshmen. She has conducted many group sessions with minority students to provide a forum for expressing their concerns and experiences. We initiated a Campus Climate survey which we have conducted annually to gain regular feedback from our students on diversity issues and which is currently included in the CMC Student Life Survey (Appendix D). The results from the Survey are reviewed regularly by our Diversity Committee which has used the results to sponsor workshops for faculty and students. For example, in April, 2007 the Committee conducted two diversity workshops for staff that drew 80 participants. The Committee has funding to support faculty research and course development on diversity (Appendix A.) The Committee developed a Statement on Diversity approved by our faculty in April and approved by our Board of Trustees on May 12, 2007 (Appendix B). We have continued our efforts to attract more women faculty, and in 2006-07 women accounted for 34% of our tenured and tenure-track faculty an increase from 26% in 1999-2000. We revised the application of our parental leave policy in 2006, and a major effort is nearing completion on a new parental leave policy to create equity for women and men. Faculty diversity was the central issue in our Irvine Diversity Initiative. We have made modest progress in this area over the last several years. In 2004, we hired a tenure track African-American in Literature, a tenure track Latina in Modern Languages, and a tenure track Latino in Religious Studies. Of the new tenure-track faculty members hired for 2007-08, three are women and two are Asian-American. Still, minority faculty account for only 11% in our tenured and tenure-track faculty, but an increase of 7% since 1999-00. We have done much better with students. The College joined the Posse Foundation in 2004, becoming the first liberal arts college in California to do so − accepting 10 students per year from Los Angeles schools for full scholarships. This year we joined Questbridge for additional assistance in enrolling underrepresented and low-income students and will have 8 Questbridge Scholars in our Freshman class in 2007-08. In 2006-07, minority students made up 39.8% of our freshmen class the second highest percentage ever. With regard to diversity on our Board of Trustees, the Board Affairs Committee adopted guidelines for membership on September 1, 2004 noting, "The Board's current level of diversity in terms of gender and race and ethnicity is low. Over time, expanding the pool of trustee candidates to improve the diversity of the Board in these respects is an important priority." Current membership is 41. This includes 6 women (14.6%), 1 African-American (2.4%), 1 Asian-American (2.4%), and 1 Latino (2.4%) (Appendix N). An African American woman will join the Board in July.

Faculty governance was an additional area cited by the Commission which urged, ***"…continued commitment to full faculty participation in governance."*** The College was urged to develop a "culture" of effective faculty governance. The President and senior officers of the College are committed to full faculty participation in governance. We are currently conducting an exhaustive revision of our Faculty Handbook in close concert with the faculty's Administration Committee that addresses numerous governance issues. Three years ago, the Board of Trustees mandated that the faculty address issues of governance and urged particular attention be paid to the structure of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee. The Administration Committee was charged with carrying out a major review. It surveyed the entire faculty on governance issues during 2004-2005. While there remained a desire on the part of many junior faculty to have a larger role in governance, there was a concomitant desire not to take on additional time consuming duties to accomplish their aims. The efforts resulted in a modest restructuring of some faculty committees, changes in voting rights in the faculty meeting and on committees to enhance the position of faculty and reduce that of administrators and staff, and an increase in the number of assistant professors on the Administration Committee. The recommendation of a special committee studying the APT process calling for a smaller APT Committee was not adopted.

A final recommendation stemming from the visiting team related to the Consortium. ***"The Claremont consortium has significant untapped potential for students and faculty that should be optimized."*** CMC was encouraged to increase the 15% of its students' courses taken at the other colleges. In terms of courses taken at the other colleges, the current figure remains about the same. The College's ability to increase this percentage is limited by the fact that CMC has a relative balance of students taking courses at the other Claremont colleges in

relation to the number of students coming to us from the other colleges. Efforts to upset this balance would be resisted by our sister institutions. Moreover, all of the undergraduate colleges have an agreement to limit the number of courses taken at the other Claremont Colleges by freshmen and sophomores to one course per semester; and by juniors and seniors to half of their course load. This 15% figure also seriously under represents the enrollments taken through the Consortium since two of our general education requirements, science and language, are offered through intercollegiate programs which are not included in the 15% figure. In fact, CMC students take more than 30% of their courses in off-campus and joint intercollegiate programs (Appendix L).

A. 2. Preliminary Self-Review Under the Standards of Accreditation

This spring, the Steering Committee devoted a number of meetings to a review of the Standards using the Self-Review Worksheet as a guide to evaluate the College's compliance with each of the CFRs. We enclose our completed Worksheet as Appendix C. This assessment established several major conclusions. First, the College has much work to do in the area of educational effectiveness. Although we have conducted some surveying of student learning outcomes and a large number of external program reviews, we have only just begun to develop learning outcomes for students and methods of measuring our progress towards achieving those outcomes. Because we have not yet established systematic learning outcomes, we are not in a position to demonstrate their achievement or the use of assessment results. This conclusion was shared with the faculty at several faculty meetings during the spring. It was also the topic of a major discussion at a meeting of department chairs in April led by the Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty. Several programs are already at work on establishing learning outcomes as a result of this dialogue. Still, the self-review identified twelve CFRs that need varying degrees of attention. In nearly every case, they are related to educational effectiveness shortfalls. Each case is identified and discussed in our completed Worksheet. CFRs so identified are: 1.2; 2.2; 2.4; 2.6; 2.7; 4.1; 4.3; 4.4; 4.5; 4.6; 4.7; and 4.8.

Second, our review indicates the College has established good planning and data collection practices which make it possible for us to assess the quality of our operations and organization. For instance, our annual surveys of student satisfaction, the Student Life Survey and the Senior Survey, permit us to assess student perceptions of our operations with respect to the academic program, student services, student life, and administrative and staff support. The metrics covered in our annual <u>Strategic Indicators</u> provide a steady stream of valuable data to our Administration and Board to assess and evaluate our programs and operations. Our review indicates that with very few exceptions our level of quality assurance is high. Survey and other data are attached as Appendices D, E, and F. This bodes well for our adoption of a comprehensive educational outcomes assessment and evaluation program as envisioned in one of our themes.

In some other cases, we identified shortcomings related to the CFRs and have already moved to address them, such as 1.1 where we noted our mission statement was not reproduced in full in our catalog, although it is quoted in part on the first page. We have corrected this in our next edition. We also noted that in 1.5 the lack of an institutional statement on diversity could be considered inconsistent with our institutional commitment to diversity. Thus, we have moved to craft and adopt such a statement.

A. 3. Process for Proposal Development and Leadership Involvement

In the fall of 2005, the Dean of the Faculty, Jerome Garris, convened a planning group for the WASC accreditation review process. A WASC Steering Committee chaired by Garris, now Vice-President for Special Projects and Senior Associate Dean of the Faculty, and including two faculty members, the Assistant Dean of the Faculty, the Registrar, and the Assistant Director of Institutional Research started its planning and coordinating efforts in spring 2006. Since then, the Dean of the Faculty or an Associate Dean made presentations regarding the new WASC process and our Proposal at faculty meetings, to the entire administrative staff and to the Board of Trustees. These reports have been on-going. The Senior Staff, comprised of the President, and Vice Presidents, the Chief Technology Officer and several other senior administrators, made a formal decision based on a recommendation of the Steering Committee in the early spring of 2006 that we would pursue the thematic approach. Members of the Steering Committee held discussions with President Gann, nearly all of the senior administrators, individual members of the faculty, and alumni to become informed on issues considered important by various groups. Using input from these discussions, the Steering Committee identified 37 potential issues of interest which could be subsequently structured into five themes, each with several sub-themes. Following

discussions with the President, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Students, and the Director of Alumni Relations, a community-wide (faculty, staff, students, alumni, and trustees) on-line survey was developed by the Steering Committee as the best means to ascertain the relative importance of the wide range of topics that could serve as themes for our institutional review. Two broad thematic areas clearly emerged as priorities with consistently high ratings of importance across all of the groups. *Planning For Growth* (e.g., how our plan to increase student enrollments will affect admissions decisions, faculty hiring, facilities, budgeting, student services, etc.) emerged as one major theme. *Assessing Student Learning in the areas of general education skills and in the major* was the second broad theme.

The survey we conducted produced remarkable results in at least two respects. First, the response rate was very high with a total of 525 respondents; including 67% of our tenured and tenure-track faculty, 30% of our students, 45% of our staff and 40% of our trustees and alumni board members. This response clearly indicates a genuine interest in the issues presented for study by means of the survey questionnaire. Secondly, there was broad consensus among all groups surveyed regarding those issues that were most in need of greater examination. (See Appendix G for the results of the survey.) The Steering Committee recommended the adoption of the two themes in late January and the Senior Staff and President concurred. The Board of Trustees was apprised of the two themes at its retreat in March 2007. The Steering Committee appointed two Subcommittees to work on drafts of the capacity and preparatory review and the educational effectiveness review sections of our Proposal. Each Subcommittee has two faculty members, one serving as chair, two administrators, and one student. Although membership will vary over time due to graduation, sabbaticals, and needs, it is anticipated that the two Subcommittees will draft the documents needed for the Capacity and Preparatory Review due in the fall 2009 and the Educational Effectiveness Review due in spring 2011. This Proposal was presented to student leaders for discussion on April 30, 2007. The Faculty discussed the Proposal on May 8, 2007, and several subsequent changes were made to reflect faculty views. The Board of Trustees reviewed the Proposal on May 12, 2007, and passed a resolution endorsing the two themes and supporting the general thrust of the Proposal with the proviso that the Board, with mutual consent from WASC, may want to add additional items to our self-study process as it progresses.

As we move ahead with our CPR and EER, we will involve the President and Senior Staff at every phase of the review. We will especially need the direct participation of the Treasurer as we tackle issues of financial and physical resources relating both to institutional growth and education effectiveness. The Dean of the Faculty will lead the EER efforts in terms of monitoring departmental and programmatic progress and will oversee the collection of data. The Assessment Subcommittee, to be formed by the Dean, will be the main agent in this effort. The Subcommittee will be chaired by an Associate Dean of the Faculty and will include four-five faculty members, two staff members, and two students. The Committee will be responsible for shepherding the overall educational effectiveness effort and will make periodic reports to the Faculty at its monthly meetings on the progress the College is making on implementation of an enhanced educational assessment and evaluation program. The Subcommittee will also prepare written annual progress reports annually for the Dean and the WASC Steering Committee from each department and program. These reports will be considered by the Senior Staff at its annual late summer planning retreats. The Subcommittee will also prepare the written report to the Dean of Faculty and the WASC Steering Committee providing responses to the questions contained in this Proposal and to additional questions that will emerge for incorporation into our CPR.

The Vice President for Planning will form an Ad-hoc Master Planning Committee to lead the institutional growth master planning effort by overseeing the collection and analysis of relevant data to prepare a final master planning document for review by our Board. The Ad-hoc Committee will be composed of representatives from the Office of the Treasurer, Admissions, Dean of Faculty, Dean of Students, Facilities, two faculty members, and two students. The Ad-hoc Committee will be responsible for conducting a master planning effort that will address the questions raised in this Proposal and for preparing a written report for transmittal to the WASC Steering Committee for inclusion in the CPR. This Committee will work closely with several committees of the Board of Trustees including the Building and Grounds Committee and provide them with regular written quarterly updates on its master planning efforts. Its goal is to provide a final master planning document to the Board of Trustees during 2010.

B. Framing the Review Process to Connect the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

B. 1. Overview and Goals for the Accreditation Review Process

CMC is fortunate to be embarking on an accreditation review process in which the central themes we wish to pursue, *Planning for Growth* and *Assessing Student Learning,* form a powerful nexus with the Standards' emphasis on institutional capacity, educational effectiveness, and student learning outcomes. Indeed, it would be nearly impossible for us to undertake a master planning effort for institutional growth without examining our capacity for growth and its effects on student learning outcomes. It is also impossible to envision the implementation of a comprehensive institution-wide assessment and evaluation program without carefully studying our capacity to carry out such a program.

Assessing Student Learning

CMC recognizes the emerging consensus in higher education surrounding student learning outcomes as a measure of institutional performance. We are committed to using our accreditation review process as a vehicle to design and implement a college-wide program of assessing student learning both in specific academic programs and in terms of general educational objectives. By the end of our review process in the spring of 2011, we expect:

- to have every program fully engaged in evaluating progress towards specific educational goals and
- to demonstrate the use of our assessment results to improve program delivery and educational outcomes and
- to have the results of our assessments serve as an integral part of our external program review process which is not currently feasible and
- to have determined whether we wish every student to graduate at that point with a complete electronic portfolio that demonstrates their enhanced skills and capabilities.

This will permit us to supplement our current methods of evaluating student learning outcomes involving tests, papers, surveys, and class discussions with additional methods of evaluation to be developed by faculty in various departments and programs. We believe this effort will systematically involve the entire faculty in a deeper exploration of the teaching and learning process that marks our educational program. The development of effective measures of student learning will also position the College to be an active participant in the national dialogue regarding institutional effectiveness, transparency, and quality assurance.

Planning for Growth

Ultimately, and in contrast to institutions that are more dependent on tuition revenue, CMC benefits from the ability to choose either to grow or not to grow. We expect to present a master plan regarding institutional growth to our Board of Trustees during 2010. The Master Plan we develop and present to our Board of Trustees will need to provide answers to questions such as:

- What will be the scale and scope of additional physical facilities needed?

- What staffing additions will be needed and in what areas of the College?

- What faculty additions will be needed and in what disciplines and programs?

- What additional financial resources will be needed and in what areas of operations?

- What changes in educational effectiveness, curricular offerings, and pedagogy may be needed?

- What changes in our campus milieu will occur?

- What are the central arguments for and against growth?

As we plan for future growth of the student body, faculty, and staff we will need to gather data in a continuing process to ensure the on-going quality of our programs and their educational outcomes. Our capacity to sustain and monitor quality outcomes amid growth will require us to enhance our data collection and analysis capabilities. Finally, we will need to carefully consider the capacity of our financial and personnel resources needed to carry out the tasks we envision.

Thus, our Capacity and Preparatory Review and Educational Effectiveness Review plans are deeply intertwined. Since we have so much to accomplish in terms of student learning outcomes, an in-depth exploration of our faculty, staff, and financial capacity to accomplish our goal of creating a comprehensive assessment program is essential to ensure adequate resources are made available in a timely fashion. This is also true with respect to institutional growth. Many of the questions to be resolved in our master planning efforts will impinge on developing a student learning environment and vice versa. Thus, the stimulus of the Capacity and Preparatory Review provides a timely and structured process for collecting the data and conducting the analysis needed to complete both of our thematic studies.

With respect to the WASC Outcomes of the Accreditation Review Process, we believe that our review process will result in CMC developing and using even more effective measures of institutional and, especially, educational performance to assist in planning and decision-making. We will certainly make great advances in establishing clarity regarding our educational objectives that is now lacking. Our measures of self-review and quality assurance will be enhanced particularly in terms of educational effectiveness and student learning outcomes. The development of various measures of assessing student learning and the use of the results for program improvement holds the promise of revitalizing the dialogue about learning and teaching on our campus. Our faculty will become widely involved in this process as a result of our review and the themes we have chosen. This effort will provide external validation of our evidence that we are an institution that is constantly seeking ways to improve, which is in compliance with the Standards, and fully fulfills its commitment to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness.

B. 2. Approach for the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)

B. 2. a. Self Assessment of Capacity

Our plans for the CPR, due in fall 2009, include an extensive review of our institutional capacity intended to uncover shortfalls in personnel, resources, data management, IT, and expertise as we address our dual themes of *Planning for Growth* and *Assessing Student Learning.* As our self-review indicates, we have adequate resource capacity for our current operations. Considering Standard 3, Claremont McKenna College has excellent organizational structures and systems in place. The College operates smoothly with effective and efficient management, careful oversight from our Board of Trustees, a large and growing endowment, excellent and expanding facilities, good staffing levels, highly qualified and respected faculty, some of the world's finest and most-competitive students, and a very high-quality of life on campus for both employees and students. We are proud of our strengths. We have a highly desirable student faculty ratio of 9.3:1; the endowment per student is $358,000; in 2005-06, the College received $26.2 million in gifts and in terms of the budget, revenue exceeded expenditures by $2.8 million (Appendix F, page 15, Appendix K, pages2, 10). In addition, as the College has worked to attract and retain outstanding faculty, it has faced downward pressure on teaching loads, moving from five per year to four in 2006-2007.

However, master planning for growth will bring our current capacity into question. The same is true for our plans to develop a comprehensive educational effectiveness program. Thus, what is adequate presently, may not serve us well if we choose to grow and as we establish and evaluate student learning outcomes.

With respect to *Planning for Growth*, the key capacity issues to be examined are:

- implications for admission and financial aid including selectivity and shape of the class;
- implications for faculty and academic programs including, faculty development issues, curricular development;
- implications for residential life including campus intimacy, dining/campus center facilities and residential facilities;
- implications for the existing the Campus Master Plan including organization of residential and academic facilities, density/open space impacts, parking and circulation;
- implications for alumni and development including financial impacts; budgetary outlays and income; endowment per student; and

- implications for the Consortium.

Although enrollment growth is an important issue at most colleges, it is especially important in Claremont due to our membership in the Consortium which requires the member college remain small. Under the Constitution of The Consortium, CMC is limited to 1400 students.

In October 2005, the CMC Board of Trustees authorized an increase in size from approximately 1,000 students in Claremont to approximately 1,125 students in Claremont and we are moving toward that goal. At the same time, the Board decided unanimously that the College should conduct a master planning effort based on a potential enrollment of 1,400 students in Claremont. We will conduct this master planning effort as part of our CPR. We believe that the resources of our Vice President for Planning, Office of Institutional Research, Office of the Dean of Faculty, and various faculty and college committees, under the guidance of the Board of Trustees, are sufficient to successfully carry out the planning effort.

Several recent developments make this effort timely. CMC is nearing its maximum facilities capacity. Dormitories are filled; some faculty are sharing offices; classrooms are booked solid during the academic week. Space for meetings and special events is at a premium. Even a relatively small expansion in enrollment, requires substantial growth in facilities and infrastructure: new student housing, new academic space, expanded athletic facilities, and additional administrative space, along with all of the support such facilities require. CMC has experienced a significant increase in the number of freshman applications which have increased from approximately 3,000 in the early 2000's to over 4,140 applications in 2007. CMC's rate of acceptance has correspondingly fallen from approximately 30% to 16% for fall 2007, the lowest in its history. The College is currently in the silent phase of a multi-year capital campaign to raise funds that are likely to provide resources for institutional growth. The College also made the decision in 2006 to pursue a major new construction project on the West Campus that would significantly increase the size of our academic facilities at that region of our campus. Finally, College obtained approval to purchase additional land from the CUC in April 2006, land necessary to acquire in order for the College to be able to secure the potential for growth to 1,400 students in Claremont. These circumstances have made the topic of growth a central priority for the Board of Trustees. In addition, the College's "WASC Themes Survey" indicated that growth was an important topic to all of our major stakeholders (students, faculty, alumni, and staff).

Assessing Student Learning will be a much larger task. We know that our current assessment and evaluation program is neither wide-spread nor geared specifically to student learning outcomes in the context of the Standards. We have much work ahead of us to address this theme and come into compliance with regard to educational effectiveness. The key questions to be examined are:

- How will faculty and staff workloads be affected by a focus on educational effectiveness?

- How will incentives for faculty be managed to ensure their active and willing participation in the educational effectiveness effort?

- How frequently should departmental and programmatic assessment and evaluation take place?

- How much emphasis should be placed on general education outcomes as opposed to programmatic outcomes?

- How can we ensure that our data collection efforts will be conducted in a timely fashion and that the results will be available to decision-makers in a timely fashion?

- How can we involve our Teaching Resource Center in educational effectiveness activities to enhance pedagogical effectiveness and SLOs?

Under the management of the Dean of the Faculty, and with the guidance of an Assessment Subcommittee composed of faculty and staff, the work will involve a significant effort by every academic department and program and allied activity to develop a set of measurable student learning outcomes (SLOs). The Curriculum Committee will be charged with developing a set of SLOs for the general education program. Once agreed upon, the various departments and programs will be charged with developing a means of evaluating whether and to what extent the program is accomplishing the goals it set for its students. The Curriculum Committee or some other representative committee of the faculty will evaluate various options for assessing general educational outcomes

such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment. All departments and programs will be expected to have completed this process by the time the College submits its CPR in fall 2009. The Assessment Subcommittee, acting under the authority of the Dean of the Faculty, will act as the clearing house to receive the results of the assessments by the various departments and programs and will produce an annual report on the results.

We believe we have the capacity at the departmental and program level to complete these tasks. However, we may need additional clerical assistance to handle the burden of the assessment data we produce. All external reviews conducted after fall 2009 will require the inclusion of SLO materials. Since these evaluation and assessment activities may well require additional survey efforts, it may be necessary to add staff assistance in the Office of Institutional Research. The CPR will permit the College to consider the staffing and other costs associated with an ongoing educational effectiveness program and prepare budget requests appropriately.

B. 2. b. Outcomes of CPR, Key Indicators, Organizational Activities
With respect to Planning for Growth, the leading indicators we need to address are the answers to a series of questions. Can we increase our student enrollment and maintain or improve student quality? Can we recruit additional faculty and maintain our teacher-scholar identity and preserve our student–faculty ratio? Will we need to add additional curricular programs? How will growth affect student learning? What types of additional physical facilities will be needed and where would they be placed? What staffing increases would be needed and in what functional areas? What effects would be absorbed by The Consortium and what costs might be involved? How will the views of faculty, students, alumni, and staff be considered? What additional financial burdens will be incurred? What additional financial resources will become available? To help us explore the answers to these questions, The Vice President for Planning will lead the master planning effort. We will need the input of the Treasurer to provide analysis of the financial, budgetary, facilities, and services needed to effectively accommodate growth. We will conduct a forward looking review of infrastructure, staffing, and budgeting through appropriate faculty, ad hoc, and Trustee committees including the Building and Grounds Committee, Finance Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, and Student and Alumni Affairs Committee. Each of these committees will be expected to contribute to the final master plan. Thus, we will ensure that faculty, staff, students, and alumni have an opportunity to assist in the planning effort.

Our CPR will also permit us to examine our current and projected capacity to carry out our plans for *Assessing Student Learning.* This area of educational effectiveness will receive special attention from the Assessment Subcommittee to be formed by the Dean of Faculty. The Subcommittee will be responsible for gathering useful assessment materials to make available to departments and programs to aid in their development of SLOs. It will provide advice and encouragement to the faculty and staff's efforts to establish SLOs for every program where appropriate. We have already budgeted resources for 2007-08 to bring discipline-based consultants to campus to assist departments and programs that may need expert assistance in this effort. We are also fortunate that Diane Halpern a recognized authority on assessment and evaluation of student learning is a member of our faculty and of our WASC Steering Committee. (She is the coauthor of "Applying the Science of Learning to the University and Beyond: Teaching for Long-Term Retention and Transfer," *Change,* July-August 2003 with Milton Hakel, a featured speaker at the April 2007 WASC Annual Meeting.) The Assessment Subcommittee will review all SLOs adopted as a means of monitoring the process to keep the overall effort on track. It will perform the same oversight functions for the development of means of evaluating the programs' success in student learning outcomes. By working directly with every academic department, program, and general education, we expect to have a fully realized set of educational goals and a means of evaluating progress towards meeting those goals by the time our CPR is completed. Evaluation measures we will consider include imbedded questions in exams, standardized tests, reviews of senior theses, capstone courses, portfolios of students' work, exit exams, surveys of alumni and employers, and external reviewers of student research projects. However, we do not anticipate having extensive results of our evaluation efforts completed by that time. In the larger context of The Claremont Consortium, we will have to explore with our sister institutions the best means of establishing SLOs for our cooperative programs. At present, we do not have such a plan.

Finally, with leadership from the Assessment Subcommittee, the College will consider whether to create a proposed e-portfolio for every student with the intention of making a decision to implement such a program by the end of the 2007-08 academic year. Depending on the choices of departments and programs the e-portfolios

could be used by departments, etc. as a partial means of assessing SLOs. The College has the capacity to develop an e-portfolio program via SAKAI, our on-line courseware system, which includes an e-portfolio component. If we choose to implement an e-portfolio program, our Chief Technology Officer will take the lead in designing an appropriate format for our e-portfolios and we will also consult with our Career Services Office and students on what they would like to see included in the portfolios. We will report on our preparations for a decision in our CPR.

With respect to CFR 2.6, we presently have no systematic mechanism for assessing the "success" of our graduates. We know that our graduates go on to successful and often lucrative careers and to highly selective graduate and professional schools. We also know that that they report a very high level of satisfaction with their undergraduate education in their senior exit surveys. However, we must and will develop surveys and other techniques for tracking our graduates over time. As part of our CPR, our Alumni, Advancement, and Career Services offices along with academic departments follow up with our graduates over time to determine in what ways the education they received at CMC is related to their future successes.

While we have had all but one of our departmental majors at CMC externally reviewed, we have not reviewed our interdisciplinary or non-departmental majors with the same routine scrutiny. Moreover those which are reviewed rarely have significant follow up because no department or faculty member has "ownership" over the program. The Dean of Faculty and the Curriculum Committee will develop a program to conduct external reviews of our non-departmental major programs as part of our capacity review relating to CFR 2.7.

Beyond our theme of institutional growth, our capacity and preparatory review efforts will also be characterized by attention to CFR 1.5, where despite our efforts and the support of the Irvine Foundation, we continue to make slow progress in attracting under-represented individuals to our faculty and Board. CMC currently has good infrastructure for tracking diversity at all levels and for exploring student attitudes regarding diversity on our campus.

B. 2. c. Relevant CFRs
We will integrate our master planning effort on growth with the CFRs that relate to capacity and planning including 2.1, 2.13, 3.1, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 4.1, and 4.2. In terms of Educational Effectiveness, we need to address a wide range of CFRs including all or parts of 1.2, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8. We intend to produce a CPR that lays out the central issues of institutional capacity, explores those areas where resources or infrastructure are insufficient, and establishes priorities for improvement.

B. 3. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)
B. 3. a. Outcomes, Systems of Quality Assurance to be Reviewed
Our EER will provide the basis for a report on our efforts to evaluate the educational effectiveness of our academic and related programs. In terms of our second theme, *Assessing Student Learning*, we will focus on the progress we will have made in addressing our current shortcomings with respect to establishing educational objectives for our students, evaluating our achievement of those goals and demonstrating program alterations to improve effectiveness where appropriate based on the results of our evaluation efforts.

As noted above, we expect to report that all departments and programs have accomplished this task by fall 2009 in our CPR. In addition, we will ask the Curriculum Committee, in concert with the Assessment Subcommittee, to develop a set of learning goals for the general education program of the College and to agree on a means of evaluating outcomes. We will consider the adoption of a nationally normed test as one means of evaluation for our general overall education outcomes. The Assessment Subcommittee next will assist every department, academic program, and allied program that affects student learning to conduct a meaningful assessment by more than a single means to determine progress towards achieving the student learning goals and outcomes they have established for their respective programs. After evaluating the results of their assessment and reporting the results to the Assessment Subcommittee, each program will then make changes to their program where appropriate to enhance their capacity to meet the goals they have set for their students. Our EER, due in spring 2011, will document the results of our efforts. We will include in the EER examples of SLOs from various departments and programs, examples of assessments and evaluations of the results by the departments and programs, and any

specific examples of changes or advances to programs emerging from the result of the evaluation process. We will also provide access to student e-portfolios if we chose to adopt them as part of our EER. We have the capacity and infrastructure to develop clearly defined objectives for student learning, but it will require a concerted effort and substantial buy-in from academic departments. Moreover, this will be an on-going process not simply a one-time effort to be forgotten. It is helpful that the recently created Associate Dean positions will play a substantial role in this effort.

B. 3. b. Research Questions Methods, Key Indicators

Because we use traditional methods of evaluating our students' learning such as grades, writing assignments, student course evaluations, classroom presentations, surveys of student perceptions of their learning, and external program reviews, we have an existing perception of our students' learning. But our theme of *Assessing Student Learning* calls for a substantial addition to our current thinking about the student learning outcomes evaluation process. It will require faculty in nearly every discipline to engage in a fresh dialogue regarding what students should know, and then to develop plans to add to our traditional means of assessing what students have learned and what they can do when they complete the major or program. Some academic disciplines have learning objectives and ways of assessing if students have achieved the objects that are published by academic and learned societies. For example, the American Psychological Association published a comprehensive set of learning objectives for undergraduate majors along with recommendations for assessment. Ten broad categories of outcomes are listed 1) Content knowledge of the disciplines (e.g., the major theories, works, etc.); 2) Methods and basic research concepts in the discipline; 3) Critical thinking skills in psychology; 4) Applications of psychology; 5) Values in psychology; 6) Information and technological literacy; 7) Communication skills; 8) Socio-cultural and international awareness; 9) Personal development; 10) Career planning and development. Although any major may decide to focus on a subset of these goals or expand them in a way that reflects departmental strengths, this list provides a good starting point for department-level discussions about desired outcomes for majors. Additional information, along with a matrix that crosses each outcome with multiple ways of assessing it, can be found at http://www.apa.org/ed/pcue/taskforcereport2.pdf. Some professional societies in other disciplines have similar documents, so some departments or programs may be able to borrow heavily from others within their field. Methods of assessing student learning are equally broad. Each department and program will be free to choose the methods that best fit their own circumstances. Once this process has been completed by departments and programs, we will be able to begin databases on student learning and, in cases where appropriate, compile improvement histories for our departments and programs.

It terms of overall student learning, our theme also requires us to begin to ask ourselves precisely what it is we want our students to learn. Our assessment of learning outcomes will focus on several broad areas including basic skills that are a primary focus of our general education program and are further developed throughout the curriculum in courses in the major and in electives. This assessment will include student gains in a) writing, b) critical thinking, and c) oral communication, all of which are integral to our curriculum and essential for leaders and educated citizens in the 21st century. We will also assess the impact of the overall educational experience on the development of leadership skills among our students. Finally, we will study outcomes in academic majors and programs. The Assessment Subcommittee will present this general approach for assessing student learning to the faculty, students, staff, administration, and our Board in the fall of 2007. It should also be noted that although contemporary assessment models focus on learning outcomes stressing basic skills and knowledge, CMC with its emphasis on liberal learning for civic leadership embraces a broad understanding of liberal education that includes, but goes well beyond, the teaching of skills.

Electronic portfolios have worked well on other campuses and may be suitable for our particular campus and student body. An electronic portfolio that each student controls can provide a way of having students reflect on their learning throughout the four years they are at CMC and also keep costs manageable by shifting some of the record keeping to each student. We could have a checklist of items that must be in each portfolio. Students could add additional items as appropriate. Academic advisors could assist students with their portfolios. Each student portfolio might include a) a writing sample completed before enrolling at CMC—most likely a college application essay; b) the first (or an early) writing sampling from our freshman writing class; c) an additional writing sample each semester, selected by each student, in consultation with an advisor. These samples should represent the student's best work each semester; d) a 12-minute video clip of each student making an oral presentation—the

first to be recorded within the first two or three weeks of freshman year, other 12-minute video clips to be added in the junior and senior year (This is a minimal requirement; some students might want to add additional clips at any time.); e) scores and samples of reasoning from a standardized test of critical thinking which would be taken within the first few weeks of freshman year and repeated in the second half of senior year; f) numerous other items that could be specified by the major department or by the student's own choice. Some students might see electronic portfolios as an opportunity to be more creative in how they approach their assignments and more reflective about their own learning. Additional items included might be a short video of the student discussing a topic in a foreign language, leading a group, art projects, mathematical problems solved, examples of analytical tools and technologies that were used by the student, such as a program in which the student analyzed a data set. Senior theses could also be included. Senior capstone courses could include a reflective essay on what was learned during four years at CMC and how the learning will be applied after graduation. Internships, leadership roles, and other activities would also be included and would vary among students. We have already begun a dialogue with our IT staff to discuss possible means of carrying out this program.

Student Services will also assess their contribution to student outcomes, although the specifics of their plan will necessarily vary by program. We expect to include the Office of International Students, Career Planning, Student Life, and other similar programs. Similarly, our research institutes will continue to assess student learning outcomes.

As part of The Claremont Colleges Consortium students have opportunities that are not usually available on other campuses, such as intercampus agreements that make it easy for students to take classes and even entire majors on other Claremont College campuses. We do not yet know how we will combine on-campus and off-campus assessments. For example, we do not have primary control of the intercollegiate major in Black Studies. Students can also major in sociology, theatre, or art history, for example, at other Claremont College campuses because we do not offer these majors at CMC. Because each intercampus program and major was created with a different set of arrangements and agreements, some involving all of the campuses, others only at one other campus, we will have to develop a cooperative arrangement regarding student learning outcomes that may vary for each program.

B. 3. c. Current State of SLO Assessment
CMC's faculty conducts assessments of student learning in largely traditional fashions, grading student work, reading student senior theses, evaluating oral presentations, evaluating student performances in capstones courses, etc. We also conduct annual surveys of student's educational experiences at the college. However, the College does not have a systematic, coordinated process for studying and analyzing student learning outcomes using data collected specifically for that purpose. Our theme, *Assessing Student Learning* commits us to establish a systematic, college-wide SLO program and represents a major addition to current practice.
Our faculty and the academic programs for which they are responsible have excellent reputations and annual surveys of students report strong satisfaction with the instructional program we provide, but our standards and expectations are neither codified nor evaluated. Although CMC uses data to inform nearly every decision that the College makes, we have not developed any comprehensive data collection process as it relates to SLOs apart from our effort to study SLOs for students working with our research institutes (Appendices H and I). Therefore, our decisions as they relate to student learning and the curriculum tend to be based on the experiences and areas of expertise among our faculty, rather than on systematic collection of qualitative or quantitative data. This tends to be true of the current external program review process as well. The EER due in spring 2011, will describe a substantially different environment. The Assessment Subcommittee will work with every academic department and program, with student services, and with Information Technology Services to assist in the process of developing student learning goals for every major, academic program, and co-curricular activities. The Subcommittee will also provide guidance as departments and programs develop means of measuring progress towards learning outcome goals. The Subcommittee will be the clearing house for receipt, maintenance, and distribution of all departmental, programmatic, and general educational assessment data under the supervision of the Dean of the Faculty.

B. 3. d. Relevant CFRs.
These efforts will move the College a considerable distance towards fulfilling our obligations under CFRs 1.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7 and 4.8.

B. 3. e. Plans for Improving Student and Organizational Learning
The practice of external program reviews is now well developed at the College since the last Commission actions. Each department conducts a self-study prior to the review which is shared with the reviewers prior to their visit. While the self-study presents substantial amounts of data gathered in traditional fashion, including, in some cases, examples of student work, it does not include a focus on student learning based on an agreed upon set of learning objectives for students. Our plan to create a comprehensive student assessment and evaluation program will ensure that program reviews scheduled for the future contain assessment results of student learning.

C. Demonstrating A Feasible Plan of Work and Engagement of Key Constituencies

C. 1. Workplan and Milestones
The following timeline represents current plans for studying our two themes. Faculty, staff, and Trustees will work closely with the Dean of the Faculty, the Assessment Subcommittee, the Vice President for Planning, Treasurer, Office of Institutional Research, Information Technology Services, Student Services, the Curriculum Committee, and outside consultants to move the process forward.

May 2007 through November 1, 2007:
- Dean of Faculty appoints Assessment Subcommittee to Work with Steering Committee
- Dean of Faculty presents a campus-wide plan for assessment in three general education skills areas and in the major to all constituent groups: faculty, students, staff, alumni, and board of directors. Modify plans as each group suggests revisions
- Assessment Subcommittee with ITS staff begins discussion on the use of electronic portfolios. Considers appropriate software (one works directly with Sakai, the on-line student learning system we will begin using in September 2007).
- Assessment Subcommittee brings consultants to campus to work with individual departments and programs as needed.
- Vice President for Planning establishes Ad-hoc Master Planning Committee which sets key factors for review of master planning effort and seeks Board approval.

November 2007 through March 2008:
- Each department and program will draft documents stating the learning outcomes they desire for their students and the means by which the objectives will be assessed.
- Departmental learning objectives will be submitted to the Assessment Subcommittee for discussion and feedback.
- Plans for assessing writing, critical thinking, and oral communication will be finalized by Assessment Subcommittee, Curriculum Committee, Writing Center, and Director of Forensics.
- Teaching Resource Center Committee initiates review of its ability to add to educational effectiveness efforts.
- Meet with off-campus programs and majors to plan a coordinated program for intercampus student learning outcomes
- Ad-hoc Committee gathers data for master planning effort on institutional growth. Present preliminary findings to Trustees.
- Faculty decides whether to adopt e-portfolios

March 2008 through May 2008:
- Assessment plans will be finalized and all materials in place to begin data collection with the incoming class in 2008.
- Develop master planning surveys of various constituencies.
- Assessment Committee presents first annual report to Dean.

August and September 2008:
- Freshmen will learn about electronic portfolios if adopted; take a standardized critical thinking assessment if adopted (with written essays that explain their thinking); make a brief presentation on a topic that is assigned during orientation and have it videotaped sometime before the third week of class;

upload their first written assignment in Literature 10 (or other freshman writing class) to their portfolio if adopted

- When students meet with their advisors, they will review their plans for selecting and uploading documents to their electronic portfolios if adopted. Other campuses allow students to decide if they want to make their portfolio public, portions of it public, or maintain all items in private with access only by necessary faculty and staff.
- Refine master planning data based on Trustee directives.

October 2008 through December 2008:
Conduct master planning surveys

December 2008:
Freshmen will upload an additional writing sample of their choice and other documents that they believe will highlight their learning if e-portfolios adopted.

January 2009 through January 2010:
- Departments will continue to collect assessment data.
- Ad-hoc Committee will analyze data from master planning surveys.
- Ad hoc Committee will prepare final recommendation for Board of Trustees on institutional growth.

January 2010 through May 2010:
- Departments will analyze data and use results for program changes as appropriate.
- Departments will document and archive any improvement histories.
- Board of Trustees will consider master plan final recommendations and decide on institutional growth.

C. 2. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

CMC has well established data gathering and analysis capabilities. Data contained in our annual <u>Strategic Indicators</u> (Appendix F) and our <u>Fact Book</u> (Appendix J) track a wide variety of institutional activities. Special reports on specific topics are prepared each year to enable informed decision-making. Most data is tracked on an annual basis permitting analysis over time. We survey students annually on a host of issues to ensure student satisfaction levels remain high. We have a substantial investment in staff time in providing IPEDS data. We have recently surveyed students and alumni regarding learning outcomes for those who have worked with our research institutes. We regularly collect retention data, admission data, job placement and graduate acceptance data. We survey annually on the campus climate regarding diversity. We collect data on competitor institutions in order to conduct annual comparisons across a number of factors. All of this data is made available to our Senior Staff for annual review and to inform decision-making. It is also provided to our Board of Trustees annually. We believe we have a "culture of evidence" at CMC. The only serious shortfall is in regard to collecting data on SLOs and this will be remedied our plan to assess student learning.

C. 3. Commitment of Resources to Support the Accrediting Review

We have already developed a budget for 2007-08 that includes financial resources for our participation in CLA, for a sufficient number of outside consultants for each department that desires such assistance as they develop their learning outcomes and to cover costs of surveys. We are not currently certain what levels of staffing may need to be added to ensure the proper assistance for the collection and archiving of data and for IT assistance including the addition of a web site and e-portfolios. However, we are committed to expending the resources need to conduct our review and accomplish the goals we have set for ourselves and we have the financial strength to make it happen.

D. Presenting Appendices Connected to the Proposal

D. 1. Data Tables

Data Tables: Please see accompanying pocket file.

Appendices: Please see accompanying pocket file.

D. 2. Off-Campus and Distance Education Degree Programs
N/A