

California Lutheran University
Strategic Planning Team
Work Team 3 - Graduate Academic Experience
Draft Interim Report
June 6, 2011

1. Process summary

The Work Team used a variety of meetings and sources for its work. Meetings included most Work Team members at each meeting, and full Work Team meetings took place on six occasions, including:

- March 8, 2011
- March 17, 2011
- April 4, 2011
- April 20, 2011
- May 2, 2011
- May 25, 2011

Work Team members are Gerhard Apfelthaler, George Petersen, Mindy Puopolo, Melinda Roper, Diana Stephens, Matt Ward and Paul Witman, with Chuck Maxey and Edgar Terry contributing as off-site reviewers. Matt Ward and Paul Witman served as co-facilitators for the group, and Carrie Baez took copious notes for each meeting. Our thanks to each of these individuals!

We also conducted significant amounts of outside research with team members working independently and in small groups. We looked largely at other institutions (both directly comparable, and sometimes less so) for models of organization structure, governance models, program approval models and criteria, etc. We also leveraged elements from the Noel-Levitz Adult Student Priorities Survey.

Work Team 3's work, while focused on graduate education, had occasion to intersect with the work of several other Work Teams. We invited members of Work Team 1 (CLU Culture & Identity) and to join us for our meetings, and we focused in those discussions on cultural issues affecting graduate education. Part of the objective for that discussion was to ensure that the two teams shared a common understanding of the concerns about campus culture as it relates to graduate programs, and we believe we achieved that. One of our members attended several meetings of Work Team 1's subteam focusing on campus culture.

We met also with Work Team 2 (Undergraduate Academic Experience) to leverage their work in particular with respect to experiential learning, and to discuss shared topics of concern, particularly among adult/evening learners. We found significant commonalities among the two groups, and believe that CLU's graduate programs are already significantly experiential in their learning models.

Work Team 3 held a session titled Graduate Programs Five Years Out at CLU's Professional Development Day. From that, we collected input from approximately 60 people, including graduate faculty, undergraduate faculty, staff, and administrators, and that input is included in the observations and recommendations below. The Team also briefly reviewed its progress with the Graduate and Adult Council at its May meeting, and invited comment.

2. Summary of observations and findings

The Work Team began its work with a discussion of why it was important for the University to offer Rigorous, Relevant, and Respected graduate academic programs. Key factors, not in priority order, included:

- To attract faculty
- Research funding
- Community service/collaboration
- Stronger student value for both undergraduate and graduate students
- Immediate presence in the community - as many of our graduate students tend to be working adults rooted in the area
- To attract undergraduate students - given the upward mobility into graduate programs, and the opportunity to work with graduate students and faculty on research projects.
- To enhance the reputation of the university in scholarly communities
- Possibility of intra--CLU collaboration - Undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, etc.
- Generation of additional income streams to support the University's mission
- Potential for positive impact on various rankings
- To attract excellent graduate students as a destination school
- Enrichment of university culture, including scholarly culture
- Professional development opportunities for all faculty and practitioners
- Research to inform teaching
- Leverage graduate work for faculty research agendas
- Comparison schools have graduate programs
- Service to region and state

A key theme that arose in the Team's discussions was the topic of equity across programs. This included equity of resource allocation, faculty hiring, facilities spaces, and many other topics. It was evident that many groups on campus, not just Graduate Programs, are concerned about such equity. As just one example, some undergraduate faculty wonder why some graduate programs "get" to spend some of their program's income on areas of the Dean's or Director's choosing. In contrast, graduate faculty and Program Directors take on much greater responsibility for their programs than is required of the undergraduate department chairs - actively marketing the programs, evaluating students for admission, etc.

These are all reasonable choices, but there is a lack of understanding of those choices across the various groups on campus, and thus a concern about whether resources are allocated

equitably. At no point in our discussions was there a plea for equality, even if that were measurable and doable - rather, discussion participants seemed concerned about making sure that areas in which they were stakeholders had access to an equitable share of the resources needed to make those areas excellent.

The Work Team was charged initially with 11 questions and outcomes. After some initial discussion, the Team added a twelfth item, which was to ensure that we had addressed the necessary issues and topics so that we could be successful in the original assignment. That discussion ultimately led to a taxonomy of topics related to graduate programs that needed to be addressed over the course of the Strategic Plan time period.

The taxonomy includes four major topics, including the nature of our academic programs, operations and resource management, governance issues, and issues related to marketing, reputation, and advancement.

Academic Programs	Operations and Resource Management	Governance	Marketing, Reputation, and Advancement
Better understanding/ position of online programs o Should online programs be a separate school? o Will individual programs make this decision?	External Accreditation Commitment	Governance model that works for all faculty o Voting responsibilities for program content	Destination campus for some groups of students o What percentage of graduate students? o Which disciplines? o What support will be required?
Defined growth objectives over 5 years o New programs o New locations o Delivery models	Consider pricing models and institutional aid o Steps, data, process	Proportional/ appropriate representation of committees	School of Management building
Entrepreneurism in the Graduate programs o Financial flows	Administrative Structure for all Graduate programs	Mutual understanding amongst faculty of all programs and faculty roles	Fund development for Graduate programs o Chairs, buildings, and scholarships
Continuing Education Models o May vary by discipline o May or may not generate surplus	Service structure for Graduate programs o Student Life o Food, housing, library, career services, writing center	Transparent and systematic budget process	Define international positioning
Transparent process for adding new programs	Full time faculty in non-Thousand Oaks campuses	Graduate student government o Board of Regents representation	Marketing/advertising for Graduate programs
	Standard for hiring o Tenure track faculty as it relates to new programs o Deliberate hiring of faculty to teach across programs	Appointment, Rank and Tenure processes and committee structure	Create more appeal for new full time faculty
	Language we use for students/campuses		

Table 1 - Taxonomy of Graduate Program discussion topics

Key observations:

The University has had graduate programs in its academic mix for over 25 years. However, there was consensus among the Work Team members and across various other groups on campus that the University has not fully integrated its graduate programs into the fabric of the University. This manifests itself in a variety of ways, including among other things adjunct to full-time faculty ratios, services provided and hours of operation, governance models, and opportunities for faculty to teach across programs. It is also evident in the consistent gaps in the measures of satisfaction vs. importance in the Noel-Levitz survey data.

As part of the University's strategic approach to its graduate programs, the Work Team felt it was critical to examine challenges facing the current graduate programs, and to propose solutions or pathways to solutions to those challenges. It was observed that the University has demonstrated itself to be very good at launching new programs and finding new opportunities, but it has sometimes faltered on fully supporting those programs over time.

Fundamental to our discussions was concern that both current programs and new programs be assessed with respect to their fit to the University mission. As part of that discussion, the Team did discuss the possibility of more explicitly including graduate education as part of the University's mission statement, recognizing that this is likely beyond the scope of the immediate planning activity. However, we do believe that we need a clear, high-level statement about the University's position on the integration and value it places on all of its academic programs.

Specific observations, across the taxonomy in Table 1, are provided below.

- Academic Programs
 - Online and hybrid delivery models - the Team agreed that these were a viable part of CLU's graduate program offerings, and that each program needed to evaluate their viability related to the mission and pedagogical needs of that program. The Team noted that some institutions organize their online programs as a standalone College or School, and recommended that this topic be explicitly considered, though we saw no immediate reason to do so at CLU.
 - Growth objectives - The Team considered the request to define specific new program goals, and recommends that that task be taken on by academic units more familiar with the specific education markets, core competencies, and mission fit for each specific program. The team concluded that it was more important at this point to help define the mechanism by which new programs would be vetted, so that there was both a clear process flow as well as a clear set of criteria against which to measure new programs.
 - Entrepreneurism - One of the features of CLU's current model is that it has fostered creation of graduate programs, often excellent ones. The Work Team believes that as the education market changes over time, our ability to be responsive to those changes is important, and thus creating a structure that continues to support entrepreneurship will be important. Such a structure might

include well-defined and transparent financial flows that support the strategic goals of the University, and encourage programs to adjust to their markets.

- New program process - CLU does have a documented process for adding new programs, though it is relatively new. The process would, we believe, benefit from a clear definition of the criteria by which new programs are judged, be they mission fit, core competencies, integration with other existing programs, financial structure, etc.
- Program quality - the Team discussed the various metrics that might be applied to measure academic quality. A detailed analysis of this topic, called "Marks of Quality in Graduate Programs" was produced some years ago and served as a resource for the team's discussion. It is included as an appendix to this report. Key aspects of this included faculty qualifications, accreditation outcomes, student and alumni results and feedback, entrance criteria, and program review results.
- Operations Resources and Management
 - External accreditation commitment - The Work Team understands that many programs require or would benefit from external accreditation beyond that afforded by WASC. Providing support for those accreditation requirements is often critical to the long-term viability of the programs.
 - Pricing models and financial aid - While the Traditional Undergraduate (TUG) programs have a sophisticated institutional aid model that supports its enrollment goals, we currently have a fairly simple "one price" model for each graduate program, and also fairly constant pricing among programs. Creating more flexibility there might better support niche programs (allowing for both higher list pricing as appropriate, along with financial aid to attract top students) in particular, and allow us to attract excellent students, and from greater distances. This supports the notion of the "destination campus" noted below in the discussion of Marketing, Reputation, and Advancement. This area is among the highest gaps between importance and satisfaction in the Noel-Levitz data.
 - Graduate Programs Administration - The Work Team noted an unevenness of administrative structure - some programs report to a Dean and then to the Provost, while others report directly to the Provost.
 - Service Structure - This topic applies to all of our evening programs, and most commonly addresses unevenness of services available in the evening and weekend hours. This includes services that we already make available, but perhaps not sufficiently, like Writing Center support, library, food service, and various business services, as well as services currently focused primarily on the TUG students (Student Life, Clubs, etc.). This addresses both hours of operation (evening hours, and sometimes weekends), as well as locations in some cases. Service excellence is the area of largest single gap between satisfaction and importance in the Noel Levitz data.
 - Full-time faculty in other campuses - Our campuses outside of Thousand Oaks (currently, Oxnard and Woodland Hills) have no or very few full-time faculty

located there, even though some programs operate primarily out of one of those campuses.

- Hiring practices - Some issues were noted about the ability to hire tenure-track faculty for some programs, making the hiring process less competitive. It was also noted that being able to hire faculty explicitly to teach in multiple areas (some combination of TUG, ADEP, and Graduate) would be of great value in contributing to cultural change.
- Language - As a sign of the campus culture, we noted the importance of the words we use to refer to students, campuses, etc., in order to properly value those groups. Rather than saying “the students are on Spring Break”, we might more accurately say “the TUG students are on Spring Break” (while Grad and ADEP students are not on break). This mindset adjustment would assist in keeping services relevant to the various student populations available when they were needed.
- Governance
 - Faculty Governance - The Work Team noted challenges in the current faculty governance model, and the need to define a model (structure and process) that works for the entire faculty. Faculty meetings are held at a time that conflicts with classes for some of our faculty. The process of voting on programs puts all programs to a vote of all faculty.
 - Representation - The Team noted, as others have before them, that Graduate programs are underrepresented in the full Committee structure of the faculty. There is currently one standing Committee (GPEC) to address essentially all graduate issues, while there are other committees that address only (or primarily) undergraduate issues(e.g., Student Life, Academic Standards, etc.).
 - Budget process - A clear process in which goals are openly stated and information flows freely among those involved is important to maintaining a healthy structure for all of our programs.
 - Graduate Student government - the University, under the Provost’s direction, has just launched a Graduate & Adult Student Council. The Team encourages this new process, and believes that it is important that this population of students be represented, ultimately, on the Board of Regents.
 - Appointment, Rank and Tenure processes - the Team observed inconsistency of representation of graduate program faculty on the Appointment, Rank and Tenure Committee (ART). As such, the Team was concerned that graduate faculty might not be assessed as appropriately as they should be.
- Marketing, Reputation, and Advancement
 - Destination campus - the Team believes that some programs (e.g., Psy.D., MS-Econ) have the potential to draw students from beyond CLU’s traditional geographic market, and beyond its current international recruiting. Much like some other prestigious schools draw students from across the country to relocate to their institution for the duration of their studies, CLU offers programs that might create a similar draw, but this will require support in terms of marketing, student services, financial aid, and other elements to support that model.

- School of Management Building - the School of Management faculty are currently distributed across five buildings around the campus, with no physical core building to serve as a meeting place for students, offices for adjuncts, etc.
- Fund development - the Team sees opportunities for fund raising for graduate programs including naming rights for Schools, construction of buildings, student scholarships, endowed chairs, and other types of opportunities.
- Marketing/advertising - the Team observed unevenness in the marketing of the graduate programs, with opportunities for greater engagement with the Program Directors and Deans in defining the marketing strategies.
- Attraction for full-time faculty - the Team sees an opportunity for the University's graduate programs to serve as support for greater attraction of full-time faculty, with the opportunities to work with graduate students (and undergrad students) on research projects, collaboration across programs and disciplines, etc.

One key point of concern raised by a number of people was the over-dependence on adjunct faculty. While we hire these faculty for specific expertise, and often are able to bring practitioner perspectives into the classroom in a very meaningful way, we believe that we overutilize adjunct faculty in the graduate programs. There are a number of good reasons for this, including the fact that it is easier to hire qualified adjuncts to teach evening programs than it might be for the daytime traditional program, but we feel it is important to address this issue.

Graduate faculty data for 2010-2011 is shown in Table 2, showing the percentage of student credit units taught by adjuncts or faculty overload. On average, over 75% of student credit units are taught by adjuncts or faculty overload in the graduate programs, whereas 35%, on average, are taught by adjuncts or faculty overload in the TUG programs.

	MPPA	Graduate Management	Graduate Psychology	Graduate Education	All Graduate Programs
% of student credit units taught by adjunct or overload	84.7%	89.2%	73.4%	51.4%	75.6%
% of student credit units taught by adjunct	82.2%	77.3%	73.4%	51.4%	69.5%

Table 2 - Graduate teaching ratios - adjunct & overload vs. full-time regular load

3. Issues for consideration

- Delineate the mission of graduate programs
- Articulate the how graduate programs interact with undergraduate programs in terms of governance, human resource allocation, and budgetary model
- Develop benchmarks to define academic quality across all programs as well as criteria for individual programs
 - Admission
 - Faculty
 - Curriculum
 - Alumni outcomes
 - Accreditation
- Identify a competitor set of institutions for graduate programs
- Prioritize the market research and growth potential for Oxnard, Woodland Hills and other potential satellite campuses
- Consider distribution of faculty FTE for graduate programs to enhance program quality
- Develop student life programing for graduate students
- Consider the underlying motivation for new program development and the role of financial incentives in the process
- Determine the how online programs will be positioned in the marketplace and how they will be administered
- To what extent does CLU want to develop graduate programs for residential students, broadening its market to become a destination campus
- What role should scholarships and institutional grant aid play in developing graduate program enrollment?
- Prioritize international student markets to focus recruitment efforts
- Develop a set of criteria that must be satisfied before new programs can be launched (see appendix for examples)

4. Areas that were not covered sufficiently

- Determine the success or viability of programs at other institutions
- Research the sources of grant support and determine its role in developing new programs (i.e. STEM and STEM teaching programs)
- The priority of continuing education and certificate programs
- Identification of specific programs to launch
- Develop tools and criteria for market research
- Academic structure for programs that currently do not have a Dean

5. Recommendations

The Work Team has developed a number of immediate recommendations, and a number of recommendations for how to make progress toward more specific recommendations. The opportunities for improvement in CLU's graduate programs span many areas, and there was not sufficient time to fully delineate all the goals in detail. However, the Team will continue working as needed to more completely define the goals.

Based on an online survey of the Work Team, the bolded items in the list below were identified as most important to address.

- Academic Programs
 - **Develop cohesive strategy for online programs and other delivery models**
 - Leverage existing online programs to build policies, and consider fit and opportunity for undergraduate programs as well.
 - Explicitly define potential delivery models - online, hybrid, compressed in-person forms, etc.
 - Incorporate learnings from Carnegie hours discussions
 - Leverage current activity and market conditions to define appropriate next steps for graduate program development, in keeping with the university mission
 - **Refine financial models for graduate programs to support existing programs, incent creation of appropriate new programs, and strategically focus spending and income plans.**
 - Define five-year growth objectives
 - Research data for various markets of opportunity - new locations and delivery models for existing programs, as well as new programs.
 - Such research data might include understanding the mission and purpose of the university, a profile of the type of student that would be attracted to the university, competitive landscape, and a detailed demand assessment for the degree that considers: assessment of online key word search volume, number of bachelor degrees in programs that might naturally lead into

demand for the graduate degree, occupational data and outlook based on economic and demographic factors, national trend in demand for degree in different concentrations, regional factors, etc.

- Ensure that we build the infrastructure to support new programs as well as existing programs - marketing, physical plant, tech support for online programs, faculty resources, student services, etc.
- **Codify both the new program creation and vetting process, and document the criteria by which new program creations (and program reviews) will be assessed.**
- Define criteria for assessing program quality. These might include criteria that are shared across the university; it might also include criteria specific to a given program.
- Define (or refine) strategy and position related to continuing education programs, supporting those professional disciplines that require continuing education units on a regular basis.
- Operations Resources and Management
 - Develop pricing models and financial aid packages for specific graduate programs that may best utilize such packages.
 - Aid models might include graduate assistantships, teaching opportunities, grants, research opportunities, and simple tuition discounts.
 - Consider higher base prices for niche & unique programs
 - **Consider creation or modification of administrative structure to better support all graduate programs.**
 - This could be in the form of an administrative head of all graduate programs, or a model that integrates graduate and undergraduate faculty by discipline, or some other model.
 - **Evaluate all services across campus with respect to their applicability, service level, and priority for graduate education. Consider and prioritize appropriate changes to these services to better fit the needs of graduate students, noting that this may in some cases also better serve our ADEP population.**
 - This might include changes to the Writing Center (along with editing for doctoral dissertations), Business Office, food service for all campuses, housing options including options near our other campuses, Student Life, Financial Aid, Registrar, and other services.
 - Consider hiring full-time faculty with specific targets
 - Offices located in other campuses, as appropriate to their programs
 - Faculty hired with teaching load defined to span programs or disciplines
 - Assess and define a program to help refine the university culture, for staff, faculty, and administrators, to fully value all of our student populations and campuses.
- Governance
 - **Review and consider changes to faculty governance**

- Consider alternative governance models, such as a faculty senate model, which may be more appropriate as the university and its faculty numbers grow.
 - Faculty meeting times that don't fit with some faculty teaching responsibilities
 - Committee structures that need to include explicit graduate faculty representation
 - New Committees, where appropriate, to address elements of the graduate experience that are currently under-attended or not addressed by a Faculty Committee.
 - **Clarify budget process, defining data flows from program directors through Deans, Provost, President, and Regents, and back down the food chain.**
 - Graduate Student government
 - Continue to support the new Graduate and Adult Student Council
 - Engage that group to create the appropriate rigor and structure to their system of government
 - Consider requesting a seat on the Board of Regents for a designated representative of the Council.
 - Review Appointment, Rank and Tenure processes to ensure appropriate attention and equity is provided to graduate faculty and graduate program issues, which might include requiring graduate faculty representation on the ART.
- Marketing, Reputation, and Advancement
 - **Consider the changes necessary to make CLU a destination campus for certain programs, and prioritize those changes for specific programs.**
 - **Consider adding a School of Management Building to the Master Plan for the University, and to the priority list for construction.**
 - Create a strategic plan for fund development related to graduate programs, including naming rights for Schools, construction of buildings, student scholarships, endowed chairs, and other types of opportunities.
 - Define and execute a strategic marketing plan, incorporating early and continuous engagement with Program Directors and Deans.
 - Consider how CLU's graduate programs might be highlighted in its hiring of faculty, staff, and administrators, and how those programs might allow us to draw higher-caliber candidates to the campus.

6. Appendices

APPENDIX A

Original (with one additional) questions and outcomes:

0. What questions or discussion points do we need to address first, before we can dig into the other appropriate aspects of our charge?

1. Lay out the mission and place of the graduate education programs within the context of a comprehensive university.

2. Assess academic rigor and quality of our programs – how do we assess these? What more can be done to retain and advance academic quality and rigor? (e.g., accreditations, etc.)

a. Are there programs that should be added/dropped/emphasized?

b. Do we further develop and institute alternative types of learning (e.g., on-line courses, hybrid courses, compressed-format courses)?

c. How do we effectively adopt experiential learning to advance academic quality and eliminate the division and the learning of solitary skills?

3. Create a list of recommended modifications to currently existing programs based on an assessment of existing programs

a. Fit with university and graduate programs mission

b. Service to the professional field

c. Reputation

d. Enrollment trends

e. Faculty (full-time, adjunct, units taught analysis)

f. Student population profile

g. Competitor institution student profiles (what students are we not getting that perhaps we could?)

h. Program capacity

4. Identify and prioritize potential new programs, new delivery methods, and/or new locations

a. Fit with university and graduate programs mission

b. New programs where we already have expertise

c. Potential cross-disciplinary programs requiring collaboration within CLU

5. Identify integration and leverage points between undergrad and graduate programs, and with neighboring institutions

a. Fit with university and graduate programs mission

b. Both formal and informal – e.g., encouraging and preparing BS-Econ to students to consider MS-Econ degree; encouraging and preparing Liberal Studies majors to consider M.Ed.

6. Identify potential strategic partnerships with other institutions (both domestic and international)

a. Fit with university and graduate programs mission

b. Sustainable, long-term relationships

c. Develop criteria for such relationships

7. In keeping with the mission, identify and prioritize opportunities for certificate programs – both post-baccalaureate and post-Masters.

a. Opportunities for service to the professional field?

b. Opportunities to strengthen existing degree programs

8. Create appropriate policies and procedures that guide new program exploration and start up

a. Do we need stronger/more central oversight to ensure program/mission fit, program sustainability, etc.?

b. Will “too much” oversight and policy guidance impede our ability to create new programs when we need to do so?

9. Create and prioritize new locations and delivery models for graduate programs.

10. Provide an assessment of the benefits/costs of integrating experiential learning throughout the curriculum including any differences in needs between the traditional and ADEP populations.

11. What more can be done to enhance experiential learning opportunities for grad students?

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLE SET OF CRITERIA #1

Source: Dickeson, R. C., (1999). *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance*. San Francisco, CA. Joseey-Bass Publishers

Chapter 5: Selecting Appropriate Criteria (p.53-75)

Criteria:

1. History, Development, and Expectations of the Program
2. External Demand for the Program
3. Internal Demand for the Program
4. Quality of Program Inputs and Processes
 - o Faculty and Staff
 - o Percentage of Instruction offered by Full-Time Faculty
 - o Students
 - o Curriculum
 - o Adaptability with Technology
 - o Equipment, Facilities and Other Resources
5. Quality of Program Outcomes
6. Size, Scope, and Productivity of the Program
7. Revenue and Other Resources Generated by the Program
 - o Enrollments
 - o Cross-subsidies
 - o Research grants
 - o Fundraising
 - o Equipment grants
 - o Potential revenue
 - o Other sources
8. Costs and Other Expenses Associated with the Program
9. Impact, Justification and Overall Essentiality of the Program
10. Opportunity Analysis of the Program

Source: Tucker, A., and Bryan, R. A. (1999). *The Academic Dean: Dove, Dragon and Diplomat* (2nd Ed.) American Council on Education, Phoenix, AZ.. Oryx Press

Chapter 4: Dividing the Budget Among Academic Departments and Programs (p.52-76)

Criteria:

1. Strengths and Weaknesses of Programs
2. Internal Arrangements with other Colleges
3. The Changing Needs of Society
4. Opportunities for Students and Student Demand

5. Desires and Aspirations of the Faculty: Involving Faculty and Developing a Plan

Program Viability

1. Institutional Essentiality and Centrality
2. Societal Need
3. Demand for Programs and Services
4. Geographical Location and Environmental and Political Factors
5. Quality Factors
6. Cost
7. Timing

APPENDIX C

EXAMPLE SET OF CRITERIA # 2

Source: <http://www.uregina.ca/gradstudies/publications/newprograms.pdf>

“Approval Process for Major New Programs,”

Short Synopsis:

Phase 1 application that considers two beginning questions and addressed several key Issues.

Beginning questions –

- 1) How will the program fit into faculty plans and priorities and contribute to the University’s mission, vision, goals and emphasis.
- 2) How might resources required be made available?

Issues –

- 1) program fit,
- 2) student demand, anticipated growth,
- 3) current and proposed faculty and research resources required to support the program,
- 4) other resources needed such as library, operating budget, space,
- 5) confirmed and expected external support,
- 6) possible and confirmed partnerships with other units and institutions,
- 7) impact on existing units,
- 8) timeline feasibility,
- 9) assessment of immediate and long-term costs

Phase 2 application that again considers the two beginning questions and several curriculum and delivery issues

Curriculum and delivery issues –

- 1) comparison of program with similar programs at other universities,
- 2) duplication issues,
- 3) trans-disciplinary opportunities,
- 4) consultation with other university programs and co-operation opportunities,
- 5) partnerships with other post-secondary schools.

APPENDIX D

CALIFORNIA LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY MARKS OF QUALITY OF GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

Graduate and professional programs at California Lutheran University are defined by the following marks of quality:

I. Challenging, advanced study. Students engage in critical thinking, writing, reasoning, and research. They spend significant time outside of class reading and preparing for class discussions and completing assignments. They learn to pursue depth of understanding, acquisition and refinement of skills, critical questioning, probing of ideas, thoughtful research and inquiry, and application of knowledge.

II. Values-driven perspective. An ethical dimension is incorporated into course material, discussions, and assignments. Professional ethics and values are an intentional focus of teaching and learning. Students and faculty exhibit strong character and espouse the highest principles of professional practice.

III. Active learning pedagogy. Students are active participants in constructing their own learning rather than passive recipients of knowledge. Students engage in collaborative learning, interdisciplinary exploration, field-based opportunities for learning, reflective opportunities, experiential learning, self-examination, thoughtful discussions, and varied interpretations of concepts and ideas.

IV. Use of information resources and technology. Students make use of a variety of materials and resources to broaden their understanding of the tools available to them in their scholarship and their work. New technological tools expand the possibilities and enhance learning experiences for all, connecting students with people, ideas, and resources that may not be available to them in other formats.

V. Research orientation. Courses are designed to help students build the seamless connections between theory, research, and practice. Students learn to appreciate the strong theoretical underpinnings of their chosen profession and the necessary tools to understand and conduct research related to their own work.

VI. Preparation for leadership in a global society. Diversity brings opportunities to the learning environment. Students learn to examine other perspectives, ideas, values, and orientations that they will encounter in their lives and in their work. They develop the knowledge, skills, and perspectives to become effective leaders in their own profession and in their communities.

VII. Faculty mentoring in academic and career planning and development. Faculty are highly regarded for their knowledge, their experience, and their connections to the professional

world that students wish to enter. They take personal interest in each student and seek to actively mentor and assist student in pursuit of their career goals.

APPENDIX E

PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO THE MISSION STATEMENT

1. Lay out the mission and place of the graduate education programs within the context of a comprehensive university

Current Mission Statement (2011)

California Lutheran University is a diverse scholarly community dedicated to excellence in the liberal arts and professional studies. Rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith, the University encourages critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason. The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.

Suggested Future Revision to Current Mission Statement*

California Lutheran University rooted in the Lutheran tradition of Christian faith is a diverse scholarly community committed to the liberal arts and sciences with preparation for professions, careers, and leadership. The liberal arts and sciences are recognized not only for their intrinsic value in undergraduate but in graduate degree programs as well. The University embraces critical inquiry into matters of both faith and reason and is dedicated to intellectual pursuits while governed by the highest standards of scholarly practice, critical thought, and creativity. The mission of the University is to educate leaders for a global society who are strong in character and judgment, confident in their identity and vocation, and committed to service and justice.

**** Wording changes are reflected in BLUE***

APPENDIX F
Notes on Graduate Financial Aid

Broadening Financial Aid Options at the Graduate Level as a Strategic Initiative

C. Maxey

I would also like us to begin a broader discussion of how we, as an institution, use financial aid at the graduate level. Our existing policies and procedures (all of this is to the best of my knowledge), stem from the era in which most or all of our graduate students were part-time and we did not think of ourselves as an institution of choice for full-time, residential graduate study. As a result, we have not been intentional, as other universities have, in using financial aid to attract high quality graduate students or as a means to provide faculty with the quality of research assistants in the ways that are typical of larger and older institutions.

In fact, we have had much broader objectives for and more sophisticated applications of financial aid at the undergraduate level. For (traditional) undergraduates the scale and mix of aid packages is much more varied and the allocation of financial aid to individual applicants serves as a set of tools to reach a variety of institutional objectives including student quality, diversity and net net-revenue generation.

Given the substantial growth in the number and type of graduate programs we now offer and the various kinds of students we hope to attract, I think it is now time to consider a broader range of financial aid options at the graduate level as well. And, of course, this discussion should include consideration of how we price our programs and how more flexibility in financial aid awards for graduate students can be funded and managed at the program level.

One example is the new MS program in Economics. Our intention is to attract high quality students for full-time in residence study (though we will accept part-time students as well). We are developing a faculty->faculty recruiting program, where our faculty will contact others at selected institutions to make them aware of the unique aspects of our program and to ask for their assistance in identifying promising candidates. To get the best students we may well need to offer some fellowship money, just as we do at the UG level.

We don't want or need to do this for every graduate program – perhaps not even for most. But, on a selective basis, we need to have more aggressive recruiting programs in place.