

## **Welcome to the Educational Effectiveness Report of CETYS University**

In our preparation efforts for the Educational Effectiveness phase, CETYS University decided to continue working with the WASC Internal Organization that was created since the inception of the Institutional Capacity phase. The four working groups that were established, one for every WASC standard, turned out to be both highly effective and productive. As progress was made in the accreditation process, the members of the various planning groups (over 40 individuals) were developing a better understanding of the entire WASC philosophy and process, as well as grasping the depth of the institutional analysis that was required as part of the overall accreditation process and specifically for purposes of the Educational Effectiveness phase. The decision to continue with the already established internal WASC structure and acting in accordance with the structure established by WASC in its accreditation manual, provided the means to approach the Educational Effectiveness phase.

March 2007 was a very important month for CETYS University; the Capacity Review site visit by the WASC Commission was an event of great significance for the CETYS community for two major reasons: 1) it was an opportunity to assess the progress made in the accreditation process; and 2) to learn of new challenges pertaining to the self-study of Educational Effectiveness. The site visit by the WASC Commission was highly anticipated and generated great interest in the impression that the visiting team (and WASC) would have of CETYS University.

The findings of the WASC following the Capacity Review site visit were recorded, and in the following months, the recommendations made by the WASC Commission were the subject of analysis and discussion by the Standards Teams, faculty, and administration at CETYS. These analyses, discussions, and reflections became more intense as soon as WASC set the date for the Educational Effectiveness Review site visit (March 25 – 28, 2008). From that point forward, work efforts at CETYS University became increasingly intense and extensive.

### **Focus Toward the Definition of a Strategy to Approach Educational Effectiveness**

The first step in the Educational Effectiveness self study process was to schedule a series of meetings with the members of the WASC team in order to identify what needed to be done and how to accomplish it in the most effective way. Although concepts such as learning assessment, learning-centered organization, quality assurance and improvement, were not new to CETYS, they were not part of the daily activities performed by the administrative staff and faculty. Providing evidence that CETYS University students and alumni had actually learned what the institution expected them to learn became the central challenge of the study of Educational Effectiveness. Subsequently it became necessary to define a timetable for all the activities to be implemented, so that all members of the team would be aware of the deadline for every task, and to ensure their commitment to the due dates for the various elements that would constitute the Effectiveness Report.

Once the recommendations of the Institutional Capacity Report (CPR) had been fully reviewed, an additional meeting between the representatives of the WASC Commission and our liaison, Dr. Ralph Wolff, was held in San Diego, where questions raised by both parties (CETYS and WASC) were clarified. Subsequently, CETYS University President, Enrique Blancas, called for a work session to carefully and thoroughly define how the recommendations were to be addressed. Next, work sessions were held with the Standard leaders, so as to ensure that all recommendations deemed relevant were reviewed and incorporated in their respective reports, and also to ensure that it became evident that the institution was following up on each of the Team WASC recommendations. (Evidence #86)

### **Focus Toward In-Depth Analysis of Assessment**

It should be pointed out that as we have made progress in the accreditation process, CETYS University has taken steps to ensure that a team from CETYS is present at all WASC sponsored Seminars and Workshops as preparation for each of the accreditation stages. After a group of academicians and administrators from CETYS participated in the *WASC Annual Conference*, which took place in April, 2007 in San José, California, and in the *Evaluation of Learning-Centered Institutions Conference*, which took place in July, 2007, San Diego, it was clear that in order to approach the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) it would be necessary to develop a Student Learning Assessment Institutional Model that could address the following questions:

1. What do we want our students to learn by the time they complete their academic programs?

2. How can we make sure that they are learning what they are expected to learn?
3. How well are they learning what they are expected to learn?
4. How can we use the information about learning achieved by students in order to improve their learning and the functioning of CETYS?
5. How can CETYS make sure that its initiatives designed to improve student learning and our performance as an institution are actually working?

At the same time, the Student Learning Assessment Institutional Model should continue to guide the process of learning assessment throughout the CETYS System. As a result of our deliberations, the following topics soon became evident:

1. Institutional Student Learning Outcomes.
2. Educational objectives of academic programs.
3. Learning outcomes of the academic programs.
4. Curricular mapping of all learning outcomes.
5. Performance criteria in learning and student learning assessment instruments.
6. Annual learning assessment plan.
7. Organizational infrastructure for learning assessment.
8. Information systems to organize, store, and distribute evidence and the learning assessment outcomes.
9. Alignment of CETYS functional areas around learning and improvement thereof.

We conducted research on how other universities and accrediting agencies in the United States approach learning assessment, which allowed us to identify the most promising strategies in accordance with our institutional and educational profile. This was a task of reflection and analysis which helped us to understand that the WASC accreditation process would have a major impact on the way in which CETYS University engages in education.

Additionally, by conducting an in-depth analysis of the WASC Commission's rubric for assessing the degree of development of institutions in the evaluation of their Educational Effectiveness, it became clear that the task of fully developing and implementing student learning assessment would take longer than anticipated and that not all questions and issues concerning learning assessment would be addressed or satisfied by the time the next site visit by the WASC Commission is to take place in March, 2008.

This indeed was an important finding, for it led CETYS University faculty and administration to reflect on the need to improve the synergy between the academic and administrative areas of the organization, so that student learning assessment would be provided with the human resources and infrastructure necessary for its successful operation. We realized that learning assessment would be an initiative that should be incorporated into the daily activities of instructors and administrators, and would require effective leadership in both areas in order to begin to work under an umbrella of an "Evidence-oriented Culture." Although this was also nothing completely new to CETYS, engaging in it from a perspective of student learning assessment and assuming institutional

accountability for the achievement of evident outcomes in student learning suddenly became new undertakings for the institution. This approach to assessment of student learning is quite progressive and rare in the context of higher education in Mexico, but the administration and the Board of CETYS University are fully aware of the benefits that the process of accreditation can bring in terms of developing an evidence-oriented culture – continuous improvement of the quality of the institution's education. Thus, CETYS University could then provide evidence of its Educational Effectiveness to its various constituencies, including the members of the community it intends to serve.

Changes in the organizational structure of CETYS University such as appointing a new Academic Vice-president, as well as a restructuring under a scheme of schools and colleges, are facilitating the institutional incorporation of a learning assessment culture. As soon as a new element of the Learning Assessment Model (MIMA) is defined by the academia leaders, it can more readily become operational in each college or school and the support areas. Although this has been a somewhat slow process, we feel that the inherent changes should be managed well so that they may become well-rooted, particularly within the academia arena, including the faculty.

More specifically, as soon as a MIMA component was defined, it immediately became operative by involving the professoriate in the various colleges and schools. Starting in September, 2007, the new leadership of the Academic Vice-presidency became evident by creating work methodologies that involved the directors of schools and colleges, who in turn engaged in defining the missions and visions of their academic departments and programs,

institutional learning outcomes, learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate programs, and organized full-time faculty in schools and colleges to review the programs, develop the learning assessment instruments, and to assess learning.

With these initiatives, starting in September 2007 and continuing through November of the same year, firm foundations began to be established so that learning assessment could be fully and systematically incorporated in the daily work of the faculty and administration of the institution.

### **Incorporation of Learning Assessment to Academic Reform**

Another important adjustment that had to be made in the academic area was to synchronize and incorporate the current Academic Reform to the process of student learning outcome assessment. The academic reform emphasized curriculum design and implementation, but it still had not addressed evaluation; it was at this phase that student learning outcome assessment connected with the Academic Reform. Suddenly all the pieces of the puzzle were in place in order to undergo the review of CETYS University's Educational Effectiveness. There was now a more complete vision, structure, and means for how to implement the student learning assessment process.

In October 2007, once again a team of CETYS representatives attended a series of workshops about student learning assessment organized by WASC in Irvine, California. The substance of the presentations were instrumental in helping these individuals ratify with greater confidence the direction that student learning assessment should follow in CETYS University. The workshops also inspired

the idea offering a seminar on learning assessment to full- and part-time faculty at CETYS. University President Enrique Blancas, in his continued support of the accreditation process, invited Dr. Mary Allen, a well known expert in this field to conduct such a seminar, which is scheduled for January 7, 2008.

### **REFLECTION AND COMMITMENT**

Responding to the Educational Effectiveness Review was a main undertaking of the WASC Coordinating Commission; the accreditation process had to be established so that the working groups could have a clear idea as to how to formulate their respective reports. The WASC accreditation Manual and the rubric provided by the WASC Commission were decisive and exceptionally helpful aids. They provided precise guidelines about the nature and structure of the Educational Effectiveness report and the type of evidence required.

During 2007, multiple sessions took place in which the leadership of project WASC of CETYS University, with the support of the vice-president of academic affairs, gave various presentations to inform academic and administrative leaders about all the work that would be required for the culmination of the Educational Effectiveness Report.

CETYS University has established an unwavering commitment toward: the development of a culture of evidence on its three campuses; developing and training faculty in strategies of learning assessment; and above all, the procurement of academic quality in the learning outcomes established in all of the academic programs and at the institutional level. This report is evidence of CETYS University's commitment to following up on the recommendations

that the WASC Commission has made to date and will make in subsequent visits.

All of the documents that support this report and appear in the main section of the report (with a number in parenthesis) are identified by their respective names in an evidence matrix that we have prepared and included at the end of the report. In addition, attached to the report we include a CD with all of these documents that make up this evidence matrix, and that have been translated into English; we have identified this CD as Institutional Portfolio.

We have included our responses to the WASC Team recommendations based on the institutional capacity visit in the main part of the report, and they are identified by the letters MR (major recommendations) and the consecutive number that we have assigned them; see evidence document #86. We aligned the recommendations to the WASC standards; see evidence #67. We also assigned the responsible institutional areas to each one of the recommendations; see evidence #36. In the closing section of this report we have included specific follow-up actions to each one of the 5 major recommendations indicated in the Action Letter from the Commission.

## **STANDARD 1:**

### **DEFINING INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES AND ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES**

#### **Introduction**

This standard includes the definition of objectives and educational purposes that CETYS University expects to develop in its students. It also includes the institutional learning outcomes, effectiveness indicators, diversity achievement outcomes, and recommendations from Team WASC relating to this standard. The following report was written by a team of academics (faculty and administrators) from the three campuses of CETYS University, who, through a series of meetings, produced answers for each element in the effectiveness and educational evidence phase.

#### **INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSES (CFR's 1.1, 1.2, 1.3)**

##### **1.1 The institution has a Published Mission Statement**

The mission of CETYS University is to contribute to the integrated education and formation of persons with the moral and intellectual capacity necessary to participate in the country's economic, social and cultural improvement.

The institutional purposes are highlighted in three strategic lines:

1. Strengthening of the educational model.
2. To consolidate the student body.
3. To operate with sound finances.

The institutional purposes are broken down into twelve strategic objectives that are part of the CETYS 2010 Plan (1) and its Vision. (1) (76).

In order to strengthen the academic structure of the institution, and following up on one of the recommendations by the WASC Commission, heads of schools, curricular development, planning, and academic effectiveness, and a group of faculty members defined the Institutional Learning Outcomes (16) (MR13). These outcomes are part of an institutional model of learning measurement (3) which has been in development by the vice-president of academic affairs and academic staff, and with faculty participation.

The institution has published its educational objectives.

##### **1.2 The Institutional Learning Outcomes are:**

1. Clear and effective communication: By the end of the academic program, students will be able to clearly express their ideas in written, oral, and visual form, using appropriate disciplinary and professional language, in Spanish.
2. Lifelong learning (to learn to learn, to learn to do, continuous improvement, and entrepreneurial attitude). By the end of the academic program, students will be able to gather and analyze information, independently and in groups, which will allow them to identify opportunities, apply knowledge and solve problems.
3. Critical thinking and values (to learn to be and coexist): By the end of the academic program, students will develop and demonstrate logical and

experiential thinking within the framework of the values of CETYS, which will be reflected in the student environment and their commitment to social development and the overall environment.

4. Openness toward cultural diversity (to learn to coexist, internationalization): By the end of the academic program, students will demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and tolerance of other cultures and shall apply their abilities in establishing human relations, manifesting respect and diversity.

Without a doubt, the translation of the Institutional Educational Model into a set of learning outcomes has been presented with sufficient clarity so that faculty can include the learning outcomes in their course design and teaching. However, this approach is new to CETYS University faculty and as such presents a challenge for them. Progress so far indicates the need to develop learning assessment instruments and the definition of the evidence under which such instruments function. This implies an effort to publish and communicate these Institutional Learning Outcomes to the entire faculty of CETYS University. An identified area of opportunity, under this new perspective of assessment-based education, is that the leadership of the Schools and Colleges has assumed their role in undertaking these tasks.

Following up on another recommendation made by the WASC Commission (MR6) relating to learning English as a second language, in accordance with the institution's aspiration, an English language learning outcome that applies to all undergraduate academic programs has been formulated: "Clear and effective

communication: By the end of the academic program, students will be able to clearly express their ideas in written, oral, and visual form, using appropriate disciplinary and professional language, in English."

Clear and effective communication in the English language became the centerpiece of the institution's international dimension, which has been part of the Educational Model of CETYS University since the final years of the last century. In the academic programs that were designed in the year 2000, it was explicitly stated that our alumni would be bilingual. Toward this end, the Advanced Communication in English course was included, which is part of the general requirements section of the curriculum; therefore, all undergraduate students must complete this course by the time they finish their fifth semester. The learning outcome was that students learn to express themselves in public and be able to make presentations in English. The requirement for this course is 500 points or better (out of 677 points) on the paper-based TOEFL.

This course was accompanied by additional support efforts, such as offering ESL classes designed to improve students' understanding of the language. At first, these courses were paid for by the students but now they are free of charge.

These actions provided positive results but did not meet the expectations of University President, Enrique Blancas, and IENAC (the Board of Trustees), so the strategy was changed at the institutional level when the academic programs were redesigned in 2004. A new pre-requisite was established for the Advanced Communication in English course. Students must complete a five-module ESL program, where each module consists of 150 hours of instruction. Also, starting in the student's

fourth semester, 40% of classes must be taught in English; as necessary, foreign professors will be hired and efforts will be made so that a high percentage of the required reading will be in English.

This program has not been without its challenges, mainly because the faculty at CETYS University is not prepared to teach in English. Nevertheless, there has been significant progress as documented in the corresponding exhibits (48).

More important than the outcomes achieved to date is the fact that the institution recognizes that success in this area demands a re-evaluation of the practices and mechanisms currently in place. The main challenge is to make students aware and understand the necessity and benefits of learning English for both their academic and professional lives. There are still cases where students, for personal reasons, decide to postpone acquiring the English language, which produces setbacks in the completion of their academic programs. The academic leadership has programmed courses taught in English, but the limited number of bilingual Mexican teachers, in and out of the institution, has made it difficult for that effort to succeed as initially planned. Currently, department heads are doubling their efforts to integrate a fixed group of courses to be taught in English, to be implemented for CETYS students as well as academic exchange students.

### **1.3 The Institution's Leadership Creates and Sustains a Leadership System**

The CETYS Strategic Development Plan 2010 (1) has a ten-year life span, however, it takes into account revisions and adjustments in light of experience and changing realities. The Strategic Development Plan is important

considering that different working plans stem from it, as well as other specific actions at different management levels. These work plans and specific actions are expressed, semester by semester, in the form of reports, and effectiveness and achievement evidence, which lead to appropriate recommendations. Based on these reports, the University President addresses the Board where he explains the advancements, achievements, outcomes, and challenges of the development plan (80).

## **INTEGRITY**

### **(CFR's: 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)**

CETYS University is a solid and honest institution that acts in accordance with its principles and purposes. These are shaped into concrete educational actions for the benefit of the members of the community that the University serves.

### **1.4 Academic Freedom**

The institution serves as a forum for all of its members who wish to freely express their ideas, whether they are of a political, religious, or cultural in nature. (4).

This is reflected in an academic environment of professional development and constant modernization, through several projects and events created by students, faculty, departments, and other units that accept recommendations in order to improve their processes.

Professors take charge of their academic freedom by participating in the design and revision of academic programs, as subject matter experts (SME) and/or as curriculum development managers (CDM), and in the design of their own academic



courses (#34) and their production (course program, verification sheets of the Professor and compensation System (SERP #30). Professors also demonstrate their academic freedom by writing and publishing their work, and participating in and/or by organizing academic events (72).

The institutional and academic program learning outcomes have been designed in a way that does not affect professors' academic freedom. The expectation is that through periodic revisions of learning outcomes, adjustments can be made in order to enhance student learning and allow professors to identify and implement a variety of teaching methods.

### **1.5 Diversity**

CETYS University, acting within the framework of its mission and educational philosophy, has an open admissions and hiring policy. This means that any person can apply for admission or for a job without fear of discrimination in terms of gender, socio-economic status, ethnic background, national origin, or religious beliefs. Furthermore, CETYS University provides cultural development opportunities within the institution for its employees and students. (5)

True to its commitment to diversity, the institution is constantly developing relationships and agreements with other universities in different parts of the world, which provide the opportunity for student exchange programs that promote international cultural diversity. Also, academic programs, especially graduate programs, include visiting professors from different nations and cultures (6).

Also, students with families who cannot afford to pay for tuition fees can access

different financial aid programs that are available to them (7).

### **1.6 Autonomy**

As an academic institution, CETYS University is autonomous in its decision-making, therefore, no political party, religious group, or economic entity can influence, in a decisive manner, the institutional path, as stated in the IENAC founding articles (8). In addition, from the academic perspective and in accordance with the humanist vocation that it follows, especially in the Value System, universal thought is advocated (9).

For this purpose, collegiate organisms and an academic-administrative structure that allows joint decisions to be made pertaining to academic programs and curriculum have been established. CETYS University expresses its ideas in several printed and electronic media (72), for example, *Arquetipos* magazine and *Economic Boom* newspaper include articles from different areas, which express a variety of opinions regarding economic and social problems facing different publics of the CETYS community (4).

### **1.7 Academic Programs can be Completed in a Timely Fashion**

The graduation requirements for all academic programs are clearly stated in the documents that are necessary in order to obtain a REVOE. These requirements employ a series of academic and administrative processes that allow students to complete their studies within the established time frames – books by SEBS (10) (SEBS published a manual that describes the process to obtain a REVOE) (10).

An example of such processes is the Social Service System (11), which links social service with a general

requirement course for all academic programs and students.

Another example is the scheduling of required and elective courses in every school term, courses that are key for students to complete their academic programs. (Policies and procedures for the organization of schedules) (12).

Due in part to the actions stated above, 89% of students in the cohort scheduled for graduation in the 2007 ceremony were able to participate. It is expected that all of the remaining undergraduate students in this cohort will complete their studies by the June 2008 ceremony. (Undergraduate Curricular Model Instructor's Guide #9).

### **Communication Policies With Students**

Even though students identify their program coordinators as the medium through which they can express their concerns and complaints, the new organizational structure (2) seeks to unify these processes through the academic programs coordination, which will now operate on all three campuses, not just in Mexicali. This is the most widely used medium, but no formal evidence exists, which is why policies and procedures to follow up on complaints and grievances from students, faculty, and administrative personnel are being developed. (evidence of this project #78).

In order to identify problem areas, the institution has conducted satisfaction surveys (32) which have indirectly served as a way to collect student complaints; the section of the survey of the professor's evaluation (SERP) is designed so that students can freely express their opinions regarding areas of concern. There is also an end-of-academic program workshop where students highlight what they expected

from CETYS, but may have not received. (End-of-academic program workshop #77).

### **1.8 The Institution Exhibits Integrity in its Operations**

The integrity of CETYS University is reflected in the fact that it is a not-for-profit organization, and the management of its finances is clear and transparent, which is reflected in the Founding Articles of IENAC (8) and the General Statute (79).

In order to live up to its commitments, the institution aids its students by providing scholarships, for which resources are obtained through fundraising campaigns (67) such as raffles (67), and other support organisms, including the government. In addition, CETYS University channels its surpluses, when there are surpluses, to cover academic, infrastructural and technical needs, as well as financial aid for students (7).

The allocation and management of resources can be further understood through the University President's reports (80), which are audited before they are brought before the Board of Trustees and the Annual Assembly of IENC for its approval.

In addition, CETYS University is audited by the Secretaria de Hacienda (Internal Revenue System), INFONAVIT, the government, social security, and educational authorities. CETYS is obligated to provide evidence to donors regarding the application of their contributions (#80).

### **1.9 Our Commitment to Honest Communication with the Accrediting Commission**

CETYS University is fully committed to clear and transparent communication

with the accrediting commission, pledging to follow the accreditation guidelines and regulations and to receiving ongoing advice by the assigned WASC counselor.

The institution has been making a sincere effort to integrate all of the recommendations made as a result of all prior phases in the accreditation process, as well as to express its commitment to provide all required information as transparently and clearly as possible throughout the accreditation process and during the site visits of the WASC Commission, which was manifested in the letter of intent sent to WASC (14).

### **Conclusions:**

This report has explained how CETYS University is accomplishing, following up on, and implementing through concrete applications the ideals stated in its mission, vision, and educational model, and how these measures are translated into specific actions regarding its students and the community.

This work emphasizes the identification, construction, and communication of the institutional learning outcomes, including understanding the English language which is identified as an effort that is undertaken by the corresponding academic entities, so that the institution as a whole may reach its high educational expectations in the different academic programs that it offers. Through its systematic leadership, reinforced by academic freedom and based in principles of diversity and autonomy, the institution will contribute to its students' successful completion of their academic programs so that they may become persons who are capable of contributing in an important manner to the social, economic, and cultural development of the country.

A very near challenge for the institution is the systematization of learning assessment, integration of the faculty responsible for this area, and incorporating these actions in the annual plan of learning assessment, which is set to begin the first semester of 2008. Only through continuous evaluation of the different academic programs, as well as of the impact of alumni in the community, will the efficacy of the institution's effort be proven.

## **STANDARD 2: ACHIEVING EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES THROUGH CORE FUNCTIONS**

### **Introduction**

CETYS University reviews and revises its academic programs periodically in response to its mission, as well as the requirements of the Secretaría de Educación Pública (SEP), SEBS, and Mexican accreditation bodies. The faculty is the main entity in the review and revision process. Their involvement and participation is made possible through specialized academic groups led by CDMs (Curricular Development Manager) and the SMEs (Subject Matter Expert) (70). Additionally, the institution is actively promotes co-curricular activities related to its core values. Such activities enrich student learning and development.

In this report, the following questions are addressed: What have we done? Why have we done it this way? How do we evaluate what we are doing? How are we looking to the future? What are our areas of opportunity? Additionally, we discuss the actions that have been implemented in response to the recommendations made following the site visit during the capacity phase.

### **TEACHING AND LEARNING (CFRs: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7)**

#### **The Academic Programs Review Process**

2.1 and 2.7 Academic programs are reviewed and revised every four years and such reviews and revisions are made in a systematic manner. The faculty, school directors, and the

curricular development leadership have undertaken this project in semester cycles based on the academic reform of 2004. There is an official document that establishes institutional policies for these activities (Institutional Policy for the evaluation of academic programs and new program design #71).

Curricular redesign at the undergraduate level has generated work groups that up until now have been working informally and have defined the elements in terms of content, activities, and learning outcomes for all academic programs, based on the Institutional Educational Model and the graduation requirements.

- The Academic Reform focused mainly on the undergraduate program by modifying its curricular structure through a design that took into account three general education axes, and as such making evident the humanistic education of the educational model of CETYS.
- A syllabus design methodology was developed which focuses on learning and establishes what every student from every academic program must learn to comply with the graduate profile of such program.
- Since its beginning, the Academic Reform project looked and is looking to incorporate the Blackboard platform to deliver the syllabuses.
- The Academic Reform has entered an evaluation phase that will be strongly impacted by the assessment culture that the WASC accreditation process is leading us to carry out. We are already witnessing that impact on the preparation of the Institutional Learning Outcomes and the Academic Programs.

- On its own, the Graduate College has undertaken curricular review that has not been directly linked to the Academic Reform. It has been carried out with different logistics, and the emphasis has been on reducing the length of time of the courses and the school periods; at the same time the academic supply was broadened to offer more concentration areas in each master's degree program. For example: the master's degree in Engineering went from 60 to 35 hours. The school periods were modified from 15 to 10 weeks, and all of the master's degree programs were standardized to 14 courses. Every master's degree program has at least 4 concentration areas, and some have up to 11 areas which are activated according to the demand and the supply capacity of the Graduate College.
- Two common aspects that both curricular efforts demonstrate are: 1) education centered in learning, and 2) the use of the Black Board platform. Nonetheless, the undergraduate programs demonstrate greater evidence of the preparation of the learning outcomes and an alignment between the faculty evaluation and student learning.
- Now that the Assessment culture has arrived at CETYS, there will be more common areas between the two curricular design and review efforts because the institutional learning outcomes apply to all the graduates of CETYS, and not only to those of the undergraduate programs. Also, the definition of learning outcome by academic

program has also been extended to the master's and doctoral degree programs, and this will be another common area between both efforts.

In short, even though both efforts coincide in time they have a different reason for being. Nonetheless, it is evident that the experiences earned in the Curricular Reform have served to facilitate the curricular redesign in the graduate programs; in particular the design of the master's degree programs. The doctoral programs have followed a preparation path totally different. Their curricular design has been enriched by the participation of professors from other universities which also have contributed their experience to the running of these programs. The most recent example is the doctoral degree in education and values.

In response to our assessment model of learning outcome requirements, certain areas of expertise are in the process of being defined and formalized so that curricular mapping and annual learning assessment plans can be defined and implemented by faculty, thus enabling systematic learning assessment by semesters or years (35). (Academic Program Documentation Format).

In order to review the current academic programs and create new areas of specialization, meetings with the business sector have taken place as well as consultation with employers. This has led us to revise the academic programs development vision in terms of resources, infrastructure, and faculty development and training. (Employee follow-up surveys #25).

Another important factor in the academic programs review and revision process is the evaluation outcomes of students in organism such as CENEVAL and from testing through the EGEL (31). Testing

outcomes for students who participate in programs that require external examinations are taken into account when programs are reviewed, as are the guidelines of assessment bodies that have accredited CETYS programs (and the guidelines of programs under review for accreditation) (55).

## **General Education**

**2.2** Given the cultural differences in how México and the United States approach higher education, the WASC Commission decided, in a meeting held with the University's President on July 2, 2007 in San Diego, CA (#37 - minute July 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting) that special considerations by WASC would need to be made relative to General Education Requirements.

## **Information Literacy**

**2.3** The institution has resources devoted to assisting students with their information literacy and with their information searches, as stated in the graduation requirements of academic programs as well as through the diversity of learning strategies of course programs that are used by the faculty in their teaching (33) . Even though there is evidence for this area, there is room for improvement in the use of information resources; improvement could be achieved by a program specifically designed toward this end (#38 – report on the use of magazines and databases). Thus, there is a need to systematically display, through the curricula, the institutional learning outcome that has been defined to develop continuous learning and the capacity to conduct research. Also, within the library's strategic plan (59, 59-A), the development of learning outcomes related to the student's ability to search for information is being contemplated. The learning assessment process will help gather the necessary

evidence to evaluate the effectiveness and competence in the use of these resources.

## **2.4 Development of Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOS)(MR13).**

The WASC accreditation process, as well as the various seminars and workshops that representatives of the institution have attended, have led CETYS to acknowledge the need to develop and implement a Learning Assessment Institutional Model (3) that fits the needs and profile of the institution.

The Learning Outcomes (*SLOs*), which constitute the fundamental elements for this Learning Assessment, are not new to CETYS, since as of the Curricular Reform of 2004, such outcomes have been constantly and systematically defined and worked on, although merely at a Course Program level. Throughout its curricula, CETYS University has developed the following concepts: curricular goals and generic profile of graduating students (Instructor Guide). Both concepts are in tune with the mission, educational model, and official stipulations of the SEBS, though we understand that according to WASC standards we had to transform them into institutional learning outcomes (*ILOs*).

In addition, we identified the need to define Learning Outcomes (*SLOs*) for the Academic Programs, which indicate the knowledge, skills, and behaviors that every student graduating from a Bachelor's or Postgraduate Program must possess upon concluding the respective Program.

The basic references regarding the definition of the Institutional Learning Outcomes (*ILOs*) are the Mission and Vision of Plan 2010, which is the Institutional Educational Model and the

Value System fostered by CETYS University.

The Academic Vice-presidency was responsible for defining the Institutional Learning Outcomes, and did so through the director's offices of Colleges, Schools, Curricular Development, Planning, and Academic Effectiveness, and through a select group of faculty from the Social Sciences and Humanities areas. The work was relatively direct, since the generic graduate profiles –the same for all programs– that were prepared by the academic bodies that undertook the review and revision of the 2004 curricula, contain much of the elements required to create an ILO.

**(MR17).** The final outcome was the definition of 4 Institutional Learning Outcomes (*ILOs*) that are applicable to the Bachelor's Academic Programs and the Graduate Academic Programs (16). Subsequently, work has been done on the Curricular Mapping of these Institutional Learning Outcomes in the Academic Programs offered by the institution.

An end result of such work has been the Institutional Educational Model, translating into a set of observable or measurable learning outcomes whose definition is deemed to be sufficiently broad, although at once present the specificity deemed necessary so that the instructors at CETYS may include them in their teaching practice and in designing the courses they teach, as they have been doing so with the nuances and learning expressions, as well as with the substantial features of the graduate profile.

At present, the challenge lies not in training the professoriate in the development of curricular design or didactic strategies for classroom purposes, which has been taking place

on a regular basis under the activities of the *Programa Integral de Formación Docente* (Comprehensive Teacher Training Program), but rather in defining the part that corresponds to the assessment of Institutional Learning Outcomes (*ILOs*), and to encourage greater professoriate discussion that delves into the manner in which this assessment takes place and on the role faculty play in facilitating student learning.

### **Development or Learning Outcomes for Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Programs (MR13) (MR19)**

CETYS University has carried out the review and revision of its Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Programs as per cycles of approximately 4 years. On the other hand, upon conclusion of each semester, the professoriate has carried out the review and update of such Programs; however, these reviews and revisions were not carried out in a systematic or standardized manner. The formal and systematic review and revision of all Bachelor Level Course Programs began as of the Curricular Reform of 2004, whereby the Learning Outcomes (*SLOs*) required for such Course Programs were established (33 and 34).

Currently, what has been developed at the level of a Course Program is being readdressed so that a set of Learning Outcomes (*SLOs*) at an Academic Level are defined based on the Institutional Learning Outcomes (*ILOs*). Groups of instructors led by Colleges have been assembled. The work of such groups has focused on defining the particular Missions, Educational Goals, and Learning Outcomes (*SLOs*) of the Academic Program in which they participate, as well as defining the Curricular Mapping thereof and the

identification of evidences that support the learning achievement (35).

It is worthy to point out that at present some Academic Programs are organized by departments, and are housed within schools or colleges. In the colleges where the formal organization into departments has not been possible, it is important to point out that the groups of instructors from the various campuses have concurred so as to work in preparing the learning outcomes for their academic programs. Although it is true that we must seek to structure into departments, we do have sufficient evidence that shows proof of the collegiate work carried out by such entities. (Collegiate work minutes 81, 82).

(MR9) A group of graduate faculty is presently assembled; their main focus has been on defining the Missions, Educational Goals, and Learning Outcomes (SLOs) of the various Graduate Academic Programs, as well as their Curricular Mapping and identification of evidences supporting the learning achievement. The work that has been done to date has been shared with the group of faculty, both internal and external, who are currently teaching in the Masters Degree Academic Programs so they may be widely known and incorporated. (34)

Identified as important challenges are professoriate involvement, greater discussion on how learning takes place, understanding the role instructors play in facilitating learning, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and lastly, the identification of better practices and strengths in their their endeavors that may be shared so as to achieve better outcomes inside and outside of the classroom. For such purposes, several talks and workshops have been held with bachelor and graduate level instructors, in which they

are encouraged to reflect on this new paradigm.

Professoriate involvement in the process of revising the academic programs is of paramount importance, and more so within the context of a learning-centered paradigm, and under a learning assessment model; thus there is a need to redefine the teaching endeavor so this may occur, and doing so regarding faculty participation in endeavors such as the following:

- a) Instruction: Definition of the timelines and supplemental resources for the pedagogical work of the instructor, both inside and out of the classroom, so he/she may focus on accomplishing the learning outcomes, and seeking for this to be the chief focus of his/her work, so as to continuously revitalize the educational process in favor of enhancing the academic program student learning.
- b) Research: Definition of the timelines and ways in which each instructor shall dedicate part of his/her time to engage in research projects, as well as the pertinent and necessary supplemental resources under the structure and scope of the institutional research model and along the lines of research the instructor so defines. Such processes favor the unfolding of the academic program and the review thereof when students are systematically integrated, whereby students increasingly come together in the undertaking and development of research projects whose transcendence may and should lead to innovations becoming integrating elements in the further development of the various disciplines.
- c) Academic Advocacy: Definition of the timelines and supplemental



resources, and ways in which the instructor shall support, or even lead all projects and processes which are not included in the previous headings, though they are part of the daily endeavors of the institution. One of such endeavor entails the process of continuously reflecting on the vision for the development of academic programs, considering resources, infrastructure, professoriate, pedagogy, etc.

Also identified as an area for improvement is the need for the new organizational structures to encourage and facilitate the definition of timelines, supplemental resources, and means, so that each member of the faculty has a clear and definition of his/her participation under each of the three headings above, always understanding that all three have a favorable impact in the review process of the academic programs.

Moreover, the need to extensively elucidate the Institutional Assessment Model (3) is acknowledged; furthermore, the definition of the learning assessment outcomes by academic program is required.

## **2.5 Student Performance Outcomes in the Undergraduate Academic Programs (MR9).**

With the Academic Reform of 2004, an effort has been made to integrate evaluations whose primary aim in furthering and measuring the knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviors, and values of our students, that is, learning that has been oriented towards the knowing-to-do, knowing to coexist, knowing to learn, and towards the development of attitudes and values that will lead the way for students to become successful professionals, aside from also becoming good, contributing citizens.

In order to provide feedback to the curricular review and revision process of our academic programs, information on the learning acquired through the general knowledge exams administered by the CENEVAL (*Centro Nacional de Evaluación*) has been continuously collected, through the corresponding EGEL (*Examen General de Licenciatura*). It has become mandatory to take this exam in the last semester for the Undergraduate Programs for which the exam exists. It has been observed that in general terms, students from CETYS University score above the national average, and in some cases they excel in the EGEL Exam; however, there are some academic programs in which the students have not been able to earn such favorable results, and it is thus necessary to assess why this has taken place, and to take appropriate measures to rectify the situation. (31)

There is also evidence of the solid academic performance of students currently enrolled (25); however, the collection and integration of all this information needs to be systematized so as to become part of the *Modelo Institucional de Medición del Aprendizaje* (Learning Assessment Institutional Model) (3).

Important activities regarding student performance entail a personalized follow-up for those students who are admitted on a conditional basis due to the score they earned on their admission exam, personalized follow-up of students with low GDA or who have failed a course, and the tutor program. These initiatives were previously carried out by the areas known as the CEA, or *Centro de Enseñanza-Aprendizaje* ("Teaching-Learning Center") and the DAPA, or *Desarrollo Académico y Personalizado del Alumno* ("Student

Academic and Personalized Development”) but seeking to standardize good practices at a system level, these activities have now become integrated into the CEDEs, or *Centro de Desarrollo Estudiantil* (“Student Development Center”), one existing in Mexicali and another one at Tijuana/Ensenada (Coast Zone) (39). (MR14).

Personalized follow-up with students with academic problems, students that were accepted on a conditional basis, as well as with students with low GPA and/or students who failed courses has resulted in a decrease in the percentage of students who have been dropped from the Institution due to poor academic standing. (MR9).

While concrete actions regarding the monitoring of student academic performance are in place, it is necessary to systematize the collection and organization of information through the new structure of the CEDE, as well as the way in which such information will be communicated and utilized, for example, in such a way that it may be used in the evaluation and decision making process regarding academic programs and curricula.

## **2.6 Student Performance Results in the Graduate Academic Programs (MR9) (MR18).**

Prior to the 2004, the graduate programs were divided into two broad areas: Administration and Engineering. In each area the corresponding Director would carry out an individual assessment process of the course assignments completed by students regarding the level of depth, assignment styles, assignment types, and also held meetings summoning graduate level instructors that were under his/her charge so as to inform them on how

such assignments should be undertaken.

In Administration, most instructors were foreigners, while most Engineering instructors were full-time CETYS faculty. This led to differences in styles and forms of presentation in the assignments of Administration students resulting from the variety of professors outside the institution they had, while in the case of Engineering, since most instructors were from CETYS, assignments were more uniform in style and depth.

The outcome stemming from these two options was beneficial. On the one hand, Administration students expressed that the perspective of a foreign instructor helped them to better visualize their assignments and work, and that in most cases they were applicable to companies where they were actually working, a fact that was corroborated with interviews that the program director carried out with the employers of these students, whereby it was identified that students had a broad perspective towards analyzing and solving problems in both their work and school assignments. On the other hand, there was a greater uniformity in the work style and degree of demand in the Engineering programs stemming from the fact that instructors were local and operated with well-defined styles, whereby their class projects were targeted at needs of the students’ companies. They also were able to achieve in-depth application of their Masters topics, with the convenience of having a adviser-instructor nearby; this led to the Engineering students doing work that was focused on solving technical problems, thus the instructor would play the role of guide and advisor.

As of year 2004, work at the Graduate level began to be carried out under a new structure and way of operating; the best from the two previous versions of

student work and assignments was rescued, for example, the rate of foreign instructors to CETYS instructors became 50/50; depending upon the nature of the program, the percentage of foreign instructors may be slightly higher, such as in the case of Law (40).

Students must prove that they have acquired the knowledge and skills set out in their Masters academic program (34) by developing an application to a real situation, which has to be prepared at the final stage of their program; that is why all Masters programs have an Application Project class assigned to them for their final quarter. In this course, students are taught by a research professor that may be foreign or in-house so as to be able to solve a Masters-related problem. The instructor is responsible for leading the students along an appropriate research methodology, while students are responsible for approaching an instructor-advisor, whether from CETYS, of some other institution or industry, so that he/she may act as the student content advisor. These application projects have been in place since 2006, and uniform results have been achieved for proof of learning accomplishments; as an example of the quality of these projects, we have several instances of students whose papers have been accepted for presentation at academic conferences. The projects carried out by students have been geared towards strategic lines the institution detects as priorities in the academic and/or entrepreneurial communities (41).

Currently, for the students' projects to bear greater relevance and to better assess their outcomes, information is requested from the companies where they work. This has been done in an informal fashion by holding feedback meetings with the academic program coordinators and the student employers. Examples of companies that have been

present at such meetings include Honeywell, Gulfstream, EEMSA, Skyworks, in Mexicali; Hyson, and COPARMEX in Tijuana; and Fender in Ensenada, among others.

Each instructor carries out an individual learning evaluation for each student in each of the courses he/she teaches. Commonly, instructors present the students with the evaluation criteria and learning activities to be carried out by the students, and quite often students carry out such activities by making use of real problems/issues from their work setting. At the end of a course the instructor presents the student evaluation, which includes all learning achievements on a scale of 5-10, where 5 is a failing grade, 8 fair, 9 very good, and 10 excellent. As evidence of the quality of these projects, there is a random sample of the assignments prepared by the students (41).

The student achievement evaluation model is centered on what the student does, on practical work, based on the learning that has occurred (and based on the program's accreditation). An objective test is not the standard, rather the student's grade is based on the development of projects and the presentation these projects before the class and and a jury.

Identified as areas for improvement are the standardization and documentation of the process for obtaining the outcomes of student performance, of being able to develop a portfolio of the projects carried out by the student during his/her graduate studies that can become an integral part of the Learning Assessment Institutional Model (3). Also deemed important is being able to involve the companies where the students work so they participate as promoters, sponsors and advocates of projects carried out by the students.

CETYS' faculty has always played an important role in defining the academic standards of CETYS University. From the definition of the new Undergraduate and Graduate academic programs, to the curricular development and review of these programs, the faculty's participation has always been valued, active, and consistent.

Positions such as Curricular Development Coordinators (CDM) and Subject Matter Experts (42) were established with the Curricular Reform of 2004, which have been held by faculty members that to date have been in charge of developing the Course Programs (33) for all the subjects of the Bachelor Level Academic Programs. Definition of course programs takes into account the professional and teaching experience of the instructors from the three campuses in order to define the standardized work documents that reflect such experience, as well as the Educational Model and Institutional Nuances.

At the Graduate Level, instructors have defined the direction of the Academic Programs currently being offered, and have contributed to their evolution and consolidation.

Aiming to become a learning-centered institution and to carry out learning assessment in a systematic fashion, we face the challenge of achieving the full involvement of the faculty in the activities pertaining to a learning assessment cycle, in seeking for an evidence-based culture to permeate the academic endeavor, and in having the faculty engage in teaching whose main focus is student learning, as well as in the systematic compilation of evidence supporting such achievements.

(MR2) Among the aims of the new organizational structure (2) is that of providing the means, arenas, and

functions to be able to accomplish an organization primarily focused on the academic endeavor, and to firmly establish the role of the faculty. CETYS is undergoing a transition and accomplishing an effective operation of these new structures constitutes both a challenge and an opportunity, seeking to extensively communicate the academic goals of the institution and faculty involvement in accomplishing these goals.

As per the Vision 2010 Plan, CETYS University will try to be the best institution in Mexico to offer higher education programs in the selected areas of Management, Engineering, and Social Sciences and Humanities. In concurrence with its development vision and in an effort to satisfy the needs of local industry, we have been preparing master's degree programs with a practical orientation for part-time students since 1992 in these three areas. The students that have participated in these programs have completed their programs in an average of 5.1 years; this is a very competitive time for programs of this nature in Mexico. The data in Table 3.1 show the number of master's and doctoral degrees that the institution has granted in the last 5 years which mainly have concentrated at the master's degree level.

Due to official (government) regulations in master's programs, it seems that the number of master's degree programs offered is very large. In reality and true to the current operation of the Graduate College, we are offering only one master's degree program in Engineering Sciences (with 11 concentration areas), one master's degree in Business

Management (with 12 concentration areas), one master's degree in Education (with 4 concentration areas), and one master's degree in Psychology (with 5 concentration areas). Thus, the total number of master's degrees is 4, and the concentration areas are only offered according to student demand. In general, the master's degree in Management and in Engineering operates only 5 concentration areas. Opening of concentration areas is done by demand and only when we have the appropriate faculty to provide the required support for the students so they can complete quality academic work. It is appropriate to clarify, as well, that the degree granted makes reference to the master's degree title, and not the concentration. As far as the doctoral degree programs, there are only 2 operating; the doctoral degree in Education and Values and the doctoral degree in Management, so the total number of programs offered by the Graduate College is only six.

### **SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY** **(CFRs: 2.8, 2.9)**

#### **2.8 Faculty Development.**

From its inception, CETYS University has dedicated efforts to teacher training and development, mainly focused on the didactic facet, and independently coordinated at each Campus. As of 2004, instructors have been trained based on the institution's educational model, no longer based merely on the application of pedagogy, and such training is carried out by way of a teaching diploma and a Masters Degree in Education.

**(MR15).** A Comprehensive (Integral) Faculty Training Program has been developed (43), which entails a project aimed at systematizing work geared towards mastering pedagogy, training in the field of expertise, and also training in the personal sphere. There are important efforts that were previously made at a pedagogy training level and in the personal realm by areas such as CEA. Seeking to achieve a greater coverage and level of systematization, such functions now have become integrated into a *Coordinación de Formación Docente Integral* (Comprehensive Teacher Training Coordination), under the *Dirección de Desarrollo Curricular* (Curricular Development Direction) (44). Training in the field of expertise now falls under the responsibility of Colleges who, on the basis of the development projections of the Academic Programs, have developed *ad-hoc* programs for the training of instructors supported by the Academic Programs.

Presently, seeking to implement the pertinent initiatives and given the various levels of instructor preparation and development, a personalized diagnostic is being undertaken in order to identify the areas in which each instructor may require additional training (45). While training is not directly evaluated, the teaching performance of the instructor is evaluated by means of the *Sistema de Evaluación y Remuneración del Profesorado* (SERP), or (Professoriate Evaluation and Remuneration System) (30), which evaluates teaching performance in the context of course planning, learning facilitation, and learning evaluation. This system is currently under review and it is aimed at focusing more on the achievement of learning rather than on the instructor's performance.

Data on instructor performance have been gathered, but mainly for

administrative purposes pertaining to compensation and decision-making on rehiring of subject-instructors. In some cases, evaluation has allowed us to obtain information on the personal needs of instructor orientation and training; such evaluations are carried out on an individual basis, and have included conducting live observations of classes to identify strengths and weaknesses.

Instructor weaknesses are identified in an effort to systematize institutional instructor training efforts for all faculty, including full-time, part-time, and subject-assigned instructors. Instructor training seminars and workshops should follow a cyclical program, and the contents of these programs should be continuously reviewed so as to ensure that they guarantee the instructor's orientation towards achieving the learning outcomes. One of the significant efforts towards achieving this is the workshop on learning assessment that will be offered to all full-time instructors of the three campuses on January 8, 2008. Dr. Mary Allen will be the instructor for this workshop (84). It is importance, as well, for the instructor training programs to unfold into areas of specialization, which are the responsibility of Colleges, particularly those focusing on instructor training in areas of expertise in the Academic Programs offered by the institution.

### **2.9 Design and Unfolding of the Educational Model Through Co-Curricular Activities.**

The Institutional Educational Model defines a series of learning expressions, nuances, and a value system that must be part of the academic life of every CETYS University student. This Educational Model becomes part of the curricular activities by means of the Standardized Course Programs that

have been developed since the Curricular Reform of 2004, where their implementation becomes explicit by means of the work carried out by the instructor with his/her students.

Aside from the aforementioned, there are several other activities that supplement curricular work and through which the student experiences the Institutional Educational Model, its learning expressions, nuances, and value system. Some of these activities are mandatory for students at a certain level, and are carried out at CETYS System level (for instance, Social Service, Professional Practices, English Course, etc.), (48, 49, 50, 53) while other activities are particular to certain campuses or Schools, and provide distinctive elements that have to do with a given School's Academic Program (for example the organization of and attendance at Symposia, Congresses, Science Weeks, as well as the participation in National and International Competitions and Meets, etc).

Furthermore, there is an additional group of activities that are at once recreational and educative, and constitute part of student life at each Campus (for instance, Student Day, Rallies, Queen Campaigns, Cultural Workshops, etc.), while there are activities that specifically foster nuances such as internationalization (exchanges, national and abroad stays, etc.), and being entrepreneurial (competitions, meets, *Empreser* (51), etc.). Also present are co-curricular activities to support the academic performance of students, such as student tutoring programs, and overall tutoring programs; these activities were previously under the responsibility of CEA and DAPA, they are now designed and led by the CEDEs, a new organizational structure.

Our graduate students are noted for being involved and proactive individuals, and to a great extent this is due to the contribution made by co-curricular activities in support of the education they receive during their entire stay in the institution. (52)

There are areas at a system level that are responsible for encouraging the entrepreneurial (46) and international (47) nuances, as well as their social and labor linkages, each of which has work plans duly defined and aimed at achieving these goals.

Although these activities are undertaken to encourage a comprehensive education for students, an area of opportunity that has been identified, which is being able to systematize the design of such activities, as well as the documentation and compilation of evidences within a model in which work is aligned with the Learning Outcomes that are well defined and understood by the academic and support areas involved in the design and implementation of the co-curricular activities.

## **SUPPORT FOR STUDENT LEARNING** **(CFRs: 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13)**

### **Co-Curricular Outcomes in the Undergraduate and Graduate Academic Programs.**

**2.10** (MR9) (MR14). There is a set of activities that support students' academic development. Previously such activities were designed and led in each Campus by areas such as the CEA and DAPA. We identified the need to consolidate such support activities to better serve students, thus the creation of the CEDEs; one provides assistance

to students at the Mexicali Campus, and another one to students at the Tijuana and Ensenada Campuses (Coast Zone) (39). The CEDE provide services such as: tutoring, career guidance, advising, as well as personal and academic support for the student.

**2.11** Co-curricular activities at a Bachelor level may be classified into those that are mandatory for every student and those that are supplementary (elective) and at the discretion of the student.

The mandatory co-curricular activities that foster the educational model, its learning expressions, nuances, and values, are as follows:

Courses in English: These take place during the first half of the undergraduate program, and consist in a series of activities that allow the student to achieve a competent level in the English language. Included among such activities are English courses and Diplomas. This activity also fosters the internationalization nuance (48).

Professional Practice: To encourage the social and labor linkage nuance, students must meet the requirement of a certain number of professional practice hours. Usually this practice is undertaken upon concluding the first half of the Undergraduate program (49).

Social Service: To encourage the social and labor linkage nuance, as well as the act of learning to coexist, and learning to be and to become fulfilled, the student must complete a certain amount of community social service hours. Usually this requirement is completed during the second half of the Undergraduate program (50).

Entrepreneurial Program. Student participate in activities such as business simulations that seek to foster an entrepreneurial attitude (51).

The supplementary co-curricular activities are those in which the Undergraduate student (52) and the graduate student (53) become involved differently depending upon their interests, and there are certain activities that are unique to a given campus, school, or academic program, while there are others that replicate in different versions, although with the same content outline at a system level (52). Such activities include, among others:

- Congresses, Symposia
- Cultural Workshops
- Queen Campaigns
- National and International exchanges and stays
- Science Weeks
- Sports Teams
- Participation in national and international competitions and meets

With the academic reform of 2004 a series of co-curricular activities were established for the graduate level, although they can be useful to the community in general, such as a conference format, which has come to be known as the graduate Conference Cycle (53). To date, around 20 conferences on various topics related to the graduate programs have taken place with nationally and internationally recognized speakers, among which one can cite Mr. César Gaviria, former President of Colombia, Mr. Pedro Aspe, former Mexican Secretary of *Hacienda*, and Dr. William Cohen, business strategy expert, to name only a few.

Another co-curricular activity that was established for the graduate programs is participation in Economic Development seminars, which are jointly offered by CETYS and the University of Oklahoma to the community in general, which graduate students can attend. This

course may have curricular value for the student, provided he/she carries out a research project that must be presented before a jury for assessment.

These activities have been evaluated through either a direct survey of the participants or by requesting the opinion of students. The outcomes of such evaluations have led us to conclude they these activities are both relevant and important; however, the evaluations also show that to a great extent, factors such as date, time and city have an influence on the successful outcome of these activities, since there is always the risk of students not attending due to work related commitments.

Issues such as being able to better plan, standardize, and systematize the conference cycle are identified as areas for improvement; the latter entails planning and announcing at the beginning of the year all of the conferences to be presented, with their times, dates, and sites. Also needing attention includes, involving students in selecting the topics, involving the employers so that the conferences may be more successful, as well as aligning this activity and others to be defined for the graduate studies to the learning outcomes identified for the graduate programs.

**2.12** Through a series of mechanisms already established and through both the institutional and campus Web Pages ([www.cetys.mx](http://www.cetys.mx)) ([www.cetys.mx/en](http://www.cetys.mx/en)), efforts have been made to provide students with accurate information on curricular and co-curricular requirement. Actively and continuously participating in this endeavor are the Director's Offices, the academic program coordinators, student affairs, *Empreser*, etc. However, we have detected that we must evaluate the effectiveness of such means, as we must also systematize and consolidate all good practices that take place on the



three campuses. In addition, new projects to consolidate this capability have sprung from the School Leadership (Director), such as the institutional catalogue and the institutional agenda.

**2.13 (MR10) (MR14)** Also identified as an opportunity is learning from what was done in order to create the CEDE (39) as a basis for systematizing the design of mandatory and co-curricular activities, and as an important challenge in systematically documenting and collecting evidence on such activities within a model in which work is aligned with well defined Learning Outcomes that are well known and understood by the support (supplementary) and academic areas that are involved in the design and delivery of co-curricular activities.

**2.14** Criterion 2.14 is not applicable to CETYS, since we have no transfer students as is the common practice in the United States.

## **Conclusions:**

Although working with learning outcomes it is not new to CETYS University, which is easy to document in the course programs that have resulted from the Academic Reform of 2004, such a concept had not been used at the institutional level nor at the academic program level. The reason for the latter is that upon complying with the registration requirements of our academic programs before the official Mexican Education authorities (10), it is necessary to specify the profiles students at the point of graduation for both Undergraduate and Graduate programs. This legal condition led us to formulate learning outcomes in the course syllabus that would continuously bring about the development of the graduate profile elements stipulated in their corresponding academic programs. The WASC accreditation process and

the learning assessment approach such processes bring will allow us to better check how the graduate profiles are being met, since the latter have in turn begun to translate into institutional learning and academic program outcomes. By the same token, we have begun to define educational objectives for the academic programs so that subsequent alumni follow-up studies will have better defined student performance categories that are relevant to the institution.

Having conceptualized a learning assessment model led us to reflect on how we have been engaged in delivering a learning-centered education, and now, in each academic program there is a classification of what the student must learn upon conclusion of each program. We have also identified the need to further align pedagogy with the curriculum, and to clarify for students what they should learn. In addition, looking to reinforce this learning for the faculty, in January of 2008 we have scheduled a workshop to be led by Dr. Mary Allen, who is an expert on learning outcomes, learning assessment, rubrics, etc., which represents a strategy to follow up on the recommendations identified by the WASC Team during the institutional capacity visit in 2007.

This undoubtedly places us on the pathway of developing a faculty and administrative culture that is more committed to the evidence and continuous improvement in complying with the purposes established by WASC for all institutions it accredits.

### **STANDARD 3:**

#### **DEVELOPING AND APPLYING RESOURCES AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES TO ENSURE SUSTAINABILITY**

##### **Introduction**

The progress made by CETYS University in delivering education centered on student learning and constructivism is quite significant. The institution has made several adjustments in order to align its functional areas in support of student learning. This alignment usually starts with the professoriate evaluation system and with instructor training so faculty acquire and develop a pedagogical approach that privileges learning and student feedback and that helps students to develop their creativity. The support areas and administrative offices such as student affairs, school affairs, maintenance and physical facilities, and information systems have responded favorably in contributing to create an environment that fosters student learning according to our educational model.

The strategic planning initiatives that CETYS has been implementing for more than two decades, the effort to align the resources so as to support the academic function, have been resounding at a macro level. We have made changes in the organizational structure, investments in laboratory facilities, and have placed more emphasis on the use of technology in and outside the classroom, and have furthered educational reform in Undergraduate Programs based on student learning.

### **FACULTY AND STAFF** **(CFR's 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4)**

#### **The Institution Employs Personnel Deemed Sufficient in Number and Qualifications.**

**3.1** As of January 2007, CETYS University implemented an organizational restructuring, which resulted in the appointment of the Academic Vice-president who, together with the College and School Directors, are responsible for the coordination of academic functions with the support of the various other offices. New Structure Organizational Chart (2)).

The current structure of CETYS University presently operates with 479 employees (data table 4.3) (distributed throughout the 3 campuses – Considered as administrative staff are the following: service, director level and administrative employees) and 346 faculty members. (data table 4.1)

The goal of CETYS University consists in satisfying staffing needs with the sufficient and professionally qualified number of academic and administrative staff deemed necessary for achieving the institutional and educational objectives.

The satisfaction surveys carried out each semester show the levels of satisfaction of each of the operative areas of the institution, and provide proof on personnel sufficiency and preparation. (Satisfaction survey) (32)

**The Institution has an Instructional Staffing that Includes the Sufficient Number of Full-Time Faculty with the Appropriate Background and Degree Levels.**

3.2 In accordance with institutional standards, both in number of instructors per student, class sizes, professoriate academic degrees, the institution is currently working with the standards laid out in its Plan CETYS 2010 (indicator #22 Plan 2010, evidence #1). These indicators refer to the number of full-time instructors, to the minimum degree level, and to the background the faculty needs to have in order to teach at each academic level. (40)

(MR8) Regarding the number of full-time instructors in undergraduate academic programs, Plan CETYS 2010 considers the number of students to be expected per campus and school, and based on this an ideal number of full-time instructors has been determined. The annual budget and the full-time instructor applications for the schools by the School Directors within the Annual Budget Review process are created and determined based on the aforementioned information, and are done so with final approval by the Director of the corresponding school or college ( Plan CETYS 2010) (1) (22). An area of opportunity we identified is to increase the number of full-time instructors in order to support the specialty areas according to Plan CETYS 2010.

For semester 2007-1, the academic structure was supported by 346 instructors (full-time PP, part-time MP, full-time director DP, shared full-time PC subject AU). The Mexicali Campus had 144 instructors for 1,071 students; the Tijuana Campus had 131 instructors for 946 students; the Ensenada Campus had 71 instructors for 358 students; and

the Graduate College had 102 instructors in the period for 1,555 students (includes two quarter periods – reported by semester, data table 2.2) (data table # 4.2)

In the case of subject-assigned instructors, the goal is for them to have a Masters or Doctorate degree, and/or that their professional expertise justifies the fact that they only have a Bachelor's degree. Moreover, the goal is for them to remain in the institution over time based on the evaluation they receive from students and the institution, seeking to incorporate them into the faculty.

In 2007, 320 instructors taught in undergraduate programs (100% with a Bachelor's degree, and 50% of them with graduate studies). Seeking to improve these levels, the Academic Vice-presidency has set guidelines aiming at having more instructors with graduate degrees. The goal set for the number of students per full-time instructor targeted in Plan CETYS 2010 ranges between 30 and 40; current planning has been adjusted to the lower range of 30 students per full-time instructor. (Data Table # 6.1)

MR 18 Regarding graduate studies, the differentiation strategy is based on three key elements: Applied Research, Internationalization, and Continuous Improvement. In order to stress the emphasis on these three aspects, instructors with research experience, as well as instructors from national and foreign universities are hired.

In Master's Degree programs, all instructors must hold a Master's degree at the minimum, and should stand out due to their professional experience and accomplishments, both in business and administration, as well as in specialized and consulting activities, and they must have the capacity and ability to convey

their experience and knowledge to adult students. At least 33% of the professoriate teaching in the Master's degree program has a Doctorate degree with specialization in his/her teaching area, and engage in research, publications and consulting.

In the case of Doctorate programs, 100% of the instructors have a Doctorate degree, as well as a background in research and academic publications. In addition we have the support of foreign faculty who teach in English and who contribute with their international perspective to the development of the doctoral programs. (Data Table # 4.1)

One of the four main dimensions on which the quality of graduate academic programs is sustained is the professoriate, meaning their preparation, training and experience, as well as their performance evaluation.

The average class size in graduate programs is 19. Also, we have sufficient staff members to be able to respond to the needs and requirements of each student in the program.

### **Faculty and Staff Recruitment, Workload, Incentive and Evaluation Practices are Aligned with Institutional Purposes and Educational Objectives.**

**3.3** There is an alignment between the compensation systems and the instructor educational effectiveness. This becomes evident in the fact that subject-assigned instructors receive: payment fees, performance compensation payment, biannual severance payment, and social security payment in accordance with the corresponding Law. In addition, along with the aforementioned, the full-time faculty has performance bonus resulting

from the effectiveness of his/her teaching-learning process.

The compensation that CETYS University offers to its professoriate is competitive in terms of national and international standards. In order to grant compensation, we evaluate academic degrees, academic and professional experience, and research and publications. (Educational Committee Salaries report (54)).

The *Academic Load* of instructors is set in class hours. Full-time instructors must have between 15 and 18 class hours per week. Part-time instructors teach 12 class hours per week in all instances. Career Coordinators or Career Groups Coordinators teach 12 class hours per week. For School Directors it is estimated that they may teach from 3 to 10 class hours per week. Also, Academic Directors have from 3 to 8 class hours per week. Lastly, for College Directors, regulations establish from 3 to 8 class hours per week. The aforementioned is in response to criteria established in the national academic program accrediting bodies (CACEI, CACECA). (55).

The instructor and staff recruiting practices are aligned with the needs of academic programs and their educational objectives. For example, in the case of Graduate Studies, part of the academic coordinator's fundamental activity consists in recruiting, both domestically and internationally, instructors that meet the necessary requirements (academic degree, experience in his field of expertise, and a teaching background due to the fact that the essential element lies in the practice, as well as his/her capability to participate in research and publications).

**The Institution Maintains Appropriate and Sufficiently Supported Faculty Development Activities Designed to Improve Teaching and Learning.**

3.4 Throughout the history of CETYS University, faculty development activities have been a constant. But now, in an effort to consolidate, institutionalize, and align these activities with student learning achievements, a professoriate comprehensive training program has been developed (43), which is coordinated by the Curricular Development area and operated by the Comprehensive Instructor Development Coordinating Departments, one in Mexicali, and another one in Tijuana-Ensenada (44). These areas work on the instructor training aspect as related to pedagogy, while the professoriate professional development remains under the responsibility of the Colleges. The latter has been implemented following a recommendation set forth by the WASC Team during the Institutional Capacity visit in February of 2007. Updating instructor training: professional updating evidence (56 and 57). (Copies of WASC enrollment records).

The action guidelines of the comprehensive professoriate training program are: Didactic Training, Educational Technology, Faculty Linkage and Educational Research Projects, and with these guidelines the aim is to improve the pedagogical competency of instructors so as to facilitate learning and to incorporate the use of Blackboard in the design of learning activities. The effectiveness of these actions will have to be evaluated in relation to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

To ensure a work plan in tune with the needs of instructors and with the demands of the educational model, the

Comprehensive Instructor Training Coordinating Departments have taken into account the results of the professoriate diagnostics (45) , as well as the results of the Professoriate Evaluation and Retribution System (SERP).

In November of 2007, the institution requested the services of Dr. Mary Allen, renowned expert in learning outcome assessments and in professoriate development, and also author of books on learning assessment. Dr. Allen will visit CETYS University's Mexicali campus on January 7, where she will lead a training workshop specifically dealing for all the full-time faculty members. The institution will continue to make efforts so Dr. Allen and other faculty training experts will continue providing training and support to the professoriate in all the current educational strategies, which will lead us to continuously improve as a learning-centered institution. (84).

**FISCAL, PHYSICAL AND INFORMATION RESOURCES**  
**(CFR's: 3.5, 3.6, 3.7)**

**Fiscal and Physical Resources are Effectively Aligned with Institutional Purposes and Educational Objectives, and are Sufficiently Developed to Support and Maintain the Level and Type of Educational Programs that are Currently Offered, and that will be Offered in the Foreseeable Future.**

3.5 CETYS University has maintained stable financial health. (Auditor Ruling) (58) However, in order to achieve its institutional purposes, CETYS must improve its investments in information technologies and infrastructure. (17)

The institution has designed regulating plans (Master Plans) for each campus, which determine the requirements for sundry resources deemed necessary to support its academic programs (73). These master plans will be available on campus.

The budgeting process of the institution is clearly aligned with the achievement of its educational objectives, but at the same time the aim is to maintain sound finances (13,65,66,68,69). The budgeting process begins in the academic area, with the School and College Directors, who identify the resources required by their corresponding academic units.

The Board of Directors of the institution has the permanent challenge of gathering and optimizing all the financial resources deemed necessary in supporting the achievement of institutional purposes.

**The Institution Holds, or Provides Access to, Information Resources Deemed Sufficient in Scope, Quality, Currency, and Kind to Support Academic Offerings and the Scholarship to its Members.**

3.6 y 3.7 Upon heeding the recommendations set forth by the WASC Team (MR1 and MR12) and acknowledging that the library is an area of great importance in the teaching-learning process, CETYS University has initiated a process for the reorientation of the library function. The Library Development Strategic Plan was prepared, with an emphasis on human resources, bibliographic resources to support the academic programs (59), and on purchasing computer equipment and software to encourage the use of information technologies in libraries

as well as access to information banks and networks, also considering the universities with which CETYS holds agreements at an institutional level.

The educational services director and library personnel from the three campuses participated in drafting the development plan, also with the advice of Dr. Susan Parker, Director and UCLA library top financial authority. On September 19 and 20, 2007, Dr. Parker visited the library facilities at the three campuses, and on October 15 she prepared the first feedback report and recommendations for the development report. On October 22, 2007, a telephone conference between personnel from the CETYS library and Dr. Parker took place, and Dr. Parker reviewed the Ensenada library construction project (new library facilities in Ensenada). An analysis of the current situation has been prepared by considering the standards of the ALA (American Libraries Association) and the CONPAB (Mexico). Under the responsibility of the Academic Vice-presidency, the library personnel continued to work on the development of a strategic plan and on the construction project of the new library facilities in Ensenada with the support of Dr. Parker. This library strategic plan was concluded in November of 2007. (60) Regarding the operational aspects of the libraries at the campuses, matters are still in a transition phase in order to redefine responsibilities, both of the campus Directors, as well as of the library Directors, with a focus on meeting the objectives of the strategic library plan.

Related to the aforementioned, another activity that is carried out is personnel training, which is one of the main components of the library development plan. During the present year, the following events have been attended:

- CETYS University System Second Interlibrary Meeting, which took place on Friday July 20, 2007 in the city of Ensenada.
- Attendance at the course “Alfabetización Informacional” (Informational Literacy): A basic course for librarians”, taught by Gabriela Sonntag from the California State University-San Marcos library, on October 3, 4 and 5 of 2007, with a 20 hour duration.
- Attendance at the “Segunda Jornada Bibliotecológica de Baja California”, organized by the Baja California Librarian Association, which took place on October 29.
- A visit to the San Diego State University library was carried out on November 9 of 2007, as part of the Sister Libraries Agreement program.
- It is expected that one of the library directors will begin a Master’s Program specializing in library issues in February of 2008.

The main components of the library development plan are:

1. Collections and Access
2. Information Literacy
3. Staff
4. Space and Facilities
5. Technology
6. Services
7. Leadership
8. Collaboration and Outreach
9. Outcome Assessment

Even though the financial resources for the changes required in the library have not been quantified, the budget was

increased during the second semester of 2007. It is recognized that the challenge faced in developing the library is great and important and that is why the institution is aligning its efforts for the fulfillment of this goal.

The Library investment carried out by CETYS System for year 2007 is presented in evidence #59-B. Specified in this evidence are the investments per campus and where the funding sources to cover such needs will be obtained. The increase of this budget complies with the MR1 of Team WASC: “the university needs to substantially invest in its information resources”. We will continue to work on the library strategic development plan, with a special emphasis on graduate programs.

The use of Information technologies has played a very important role in achieving learning outcomes. One of the most important technological tools that currently being used is the Blackboard platform, which has been systematically used for the last three years. During the January-June 2007 semester, it was used in 47% of the total courses that were offered in undergraduate programs in the Mexicali and Tijuana campuses. In these courses the instructors used Blackboard tools as follows: Announcements 41%; Course Information 43%; Teacher Information 26%; Course Documents 49%; Assignments 30%; Discussion Board 28%; External links 15%; and Online Tests 11%.

During the August–December semester of 2007, 5 online courses were offered; Blackboard was the online delivery tool for these courses. (Statistics of the 5 courses BB) (61).

Nevertheless, there are opportunities for improvement in the use of Blackboard. Training courses exist, but there is no mechanism to ensure instructor

attendance at such courses. Required attendance would result in an increase in the number of courses using this platform, and also an increase in the use of its various elements.

Another tool used by instructors are the databases and the academic supplementary resources available on the Internet, since this not only allows them to have access to current information, but also develops the ability to search and select information by students. (database use) (38).

The need for information systems that provide support to the academic administration that will provide better support to school directors, program coordinators, and instructors overall has been identified. For this reason, the following projects are in a development phase:

Electronic Portfolio, which will allow follow-up on student assignments and learning outcomes.

The academic information Web Site, which is divided in to:

- \* Academic indicators, which is an Executive Information System that will allow the academic directors to have timely access to the various academic aspects, such as terminal efficiency, full-time instructor coverage and instructor performance.
- \* Reports for Academic Directors on student academic progress.
- \* Information on regulations, policies and general statistics.

CETYS University has sought the advice of external experts, such as in the case of the electronic portfolio, in which we have received support from Dr. Paul Kim (Stanford University) (18) who visited us twice during 2007. Dr. Kim provided us with advice on the initial implementation of our e-portfolio and made some recommendations on improvements we

have to perform on our information technologies at an institutional level. Dr. Kim is the Director of Information Technologies in the School of Education at Stanford University. We are confident that with his support we will be able to satisfactorily comply with the recommendations set forth by the WASC Team on information technologies and evidence of student learning outcomes.

### **ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES** (CFR's: 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11)

**The Institution has an Organization Chart that Clearly Depicts Positions, Associated Responsibilities, and Lines of Authority.**

**3.8** CETYS University has been experiencing a series of additional changes in its academic organizational scheme with the purpose of responding to the new national and international trends in education and its improvement. Until December of 2006, the academic area in the CETYS University System was the sole responsibility of the Education Direction and the Campus Directions, the same group that established all of the academic policies of the institution. This group established the foundations for the creation of new programs, evaluation systems, and professoriate compensation, the modification or updating of curricula, the hiring of instructors, setting their salaries, the definition of academic loads of faculty members, alumni degree requirements, among others. Academic decision making was highly centralized. The Presidency and its staff Directors established all policies.

As of January of 2007, with the



appointment of the Academic Vice-presidency (2), the CETYS University System has been experiencing a series of additional changes in its organizational structure so it may respond better to its educational objectives and to stay on top of the newest national and international trends in higher education.

**The Institution has an Independent Governing Board that Exercises Appropriate Oversight over Institutional Integrity, Policies, and Ongoing Operations.**

**3.9** The CETYS University system has a civic non-profit association that supervises its permanence and integrity, known as IENAC (Instituto Educativo del Noroeste, Asociación Civil). It is a non-profit organization that is the complete owner of the assets, goods, and property of the institution (IENAC Diagram) (62).

Through the Executive Commission and the different committees of the Association, as well as the chapters operating on each of the campuses, the IENAC oversees that the institution provides timely reports regarding student learning, the competitiveness and relevance of the academic programs, the involvement and curriculum appropriation by the faculty, student satisfaction related to the educational services received, and how CETYS University resorts to external resources to assess its educational effectiveness. (Tijuana Chapter Agenda: WASC, assembly reports, committees) (63).

The IENAC committees are advisory to both the President and the Executive Commission, which are defined as the following committees: Educational, Planning, Nomination, Financial, Capital Campaign, Pensions, and Image. The

state committees report directly to the Executive Commission. These committees in some cases are also structured locally and seek to support the tasks of the Campus and Chapter Director, while at the same time they are part of the State Committee.

The IENAC, consistent with the continuous learning of how higher education institutions operate, conducts reflection and study retreats on the operation and administration of universities (Workshops for Board Members #75). Along the lines of the aforementioned, IENAC members will participate at the beginning of 2008 in a tour to different universities in the state of California in order to learn more about the trends in higher education. WASC has suggested a series of universities whose missions are very similar to that of CETYS University so that the visitors will have adequate reference points.

**The Institution has a Chief Executive Officer Whose Full-time Responsibility is to the Institution.**

**3.10** Even though the institution has had a Presidency since its foundation, the current dimensions of the institution, along with its educational purposes have led to making a decision to modify its organizational structure, with the definition of two vice-presidencies: one academic and one administrative. By the same token it has defined the College and School Directors and a Supporting Staff for the Academic Vice-presidency in order to strengthen its decision making and to allow the Presidency to make better decisions with regards to the overall future of the institution.

The Presidency leadership becomes strengthened with the designation of an Academic Vice-president, since this way the educational purposes pursued by

CETYS University will have a swifter and more effective execution.

Aside from strengthening the Presidency through the College Directors, this new structure provides the academics with greater leadership and participation in the process of decision-making. In the previous organizational structure the Campus Directors were responsible for all academic and administrative issues.

**The Institution's Faculty Exercises Effective Academic Leadership and Acts Consistently to Ensure Both Academic Quality and the Appropriate Maintenance of the Institution's Educational Purposes and Character.**

3.11 The CETYS University professoriate has systematically participated in curricular decisions and has been responsible for the academic character of the institution (42). Now under the new organizational structure, which includes the designation of an Academic Vice-presidency (64) and College Directors, the faculty's participation in academic decisions will become stronger. An institutional entity that will be responsible for curricular design, are the academies that will follow the guidelines established by the Direction of Curricular Design. Through them, instructors will give a more trustworthy definition of what students should learn, what they need to improve their pedagogical competence and to better carry out their work.

However, still pending is a series of challenges that we must address in order for them to have a positive impact on our students' learning:

- A challenge that is a priority is to use the information that is obtained from course evaluations and from

in-class faculty performance reviews in a continuous improvement process. Currently they are being used to make decisions on compensation and as an additional element in decisions pertaining to the permanence of a subject-assigned instructor. Likewise, we are working on integrating the resulting from these evaluations into the training program.

- We have come a long way with regards to student participation in expressing their opinions in open forums at the three campuses, specifically in a forum known as "Dialogues with the President". During the second semester of 2007 there were 3 dialogues that took place on each of the campuses; and we are planning on systematizing these communicative experiences with the students so as to follow-up on their concerns, clarify their doubts and learn more about their perspectives and opinions (85).

However, an important challenge that we must continue to work on is to incorporate students in the decision making process. Despite the fact that we have Student Councils in our various schools, we still have not engaged in forums in a systematic and continuous manner, in which topics that are relevant to students may be discussed, such as intern services, mandatory participation in non-academic activities, the student environment, regulations they must observe, classroom services, laboratories, facilities in general, administrative services, among others.

- The university conducts a "Satisfaction Study" on each campus through a survey given to

all students in our system, particularly to new students and to students that are about to graduate. Information on almost every service area is generated from these surveys. An important challenge that stems from the Satisfaction Study is to publish the results, that is, to routinely engage in an evidence-oriented culture, as well as the actions taken based on the results of these surveys (32).

Throughout the years, the academic administration of the institution has strived to constitute an Academic Senate that will allow the faculty to participate more formally and systematically in the university's decision-making. An important challenge for the Academic Vice-presidency is to create the necessary and sufficient conditions so that such an academic body may be established. In October 2008, CETYS University is scheduled to present to the Board the proposal for the creation of the Academic Senate, including all required policies and regulations to be included in the Institution's General Statutes. The start of the operations of the Academic Senate will be January 2009.

### **Conclusions:**

One of the greatest concerns at CETYS University, starting from the IENAC to the President and the entire institution, is have the adequate resources to be able to offer high-quality education with competitive instructors, information resources, infrastructure, academic programs, and appropriate facilities, including libraries and laboratories. This concern and the need to maintain healthy finances are main forces that influence institutional decision making.

And although the student and the instructor are identified in the university's culture as the starting point for all actions, the fact of the matter is that the acquisition of resources is a critical part of the equation. Greater alignment between administrative and academic needs, as well as the challenge to be more innovative and creative in the use of resources are two areas that need to be improved. And that is why we have decided to carry out the following actions:

- a. To reinforce the current academic programs with an additional number of full-time instructors to improve the educational services provided to students, in accordance with our Strategic Development Plan.
- b. To substantially increase information resources, both in the academic and the administrative realms, especially with regards to the library. In order to enhance our library, we have hired the expert professional services of of UCLA's Dr. Susan Parker, and we will be assisted by Dr. Paul Kim, of Stanford University, in matters pertaining to educational technologies.
- c. To be creative in our schedule programming practices in such a way that the planning of each school term will be more effective.
- d. To continue strengthening the classroom and laboratory infrastructure by capitalizing on the relationships with the business, service, and government sectors that the institution has created and maintained throughout its 45 years of existence.

## **STANDARD 4**

### **CREATING AN ORGANIZATION COMMITTED TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT**

#### **Introduction**

CETYS University is an organization that is fully committed to maintaining its academic prestige and to effectively responding to the needs of the larger community. Thus, the institution bases its daily actions on continuous improvement processes and long term learning. The interest in obtaining accreditation by WASC reflects this institutional position.

In this section of the report, we describe the ways in which the team in charge of Standard 4 worked to address the WASC Team recommendations regarding the following topics:

- MR 1: The University needs to invest in information resources.
- MR2: To drive academic planning and to focus on learning outcomes.
- MR7: To find a balance between current work demand and new programs.
- MR9: The institution needs to utilize information more efficiently.
- MR10: CETYS needs to focus more on academic planning.
- MR16: The use of information on student performance for planning purposes.

## **STRATEGIC THINKING AND PLANNING**

**(CFR's; 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)**

The current and future development of CETYS University is based on and oriented towards the "Plan CETYS 2010", which includes among other elements, measurement and a set of strategic plans: Strategic Programs 2007-2 (15); which were revised yearly by the Presidency, the Vice-Presidents and their professional staff members. This revision is a result of the changes taking place in at least three interrelated areas: (a) changes originated by the evolution of the organization, as an organism that learns and develops throughout time; (b) the changes that occur in the immediate environment of the institution; and (c) those changes originated by the natural continuous interaction between the institution and its surroundings. Following, we will present the central strategic ideas of the institution that has been fed with information of from its environment, interaction with the business and service sectors, among others.

### **4.1 Academic Planning**

This institution has a strategic plan in which the annual priorities and actions are specified. This plan is reviewed every six months with the participation of all of its functional areas. Until December of 2006, educational planning was in charge of the Academic Director's Office. Once the organizational structure was modified with the designation of the new Academic Vice-president, all education planning will be the responsibility of this office. A central feature of this new organizational structure is to provide a greater voice for the academic area by fostering the participation and commitment from all who are part of the

academic enterprise (VPA Work Plan) (23).

An obvious example of the exercise of academic planning under this new structure is the formulation of a learning assessment model that includes the definition of missions and visions, both from the academic units, as well as from the academic programs. Similarly, we have designed and formulated learning outcomes (SLOs) to be applied both at an institutional level (16) and at the level of the academic programs, thus at the same time complying with one of the WASC Team recommendations (MR2).

The Office of Education Services and the Office of Information Technology have launched the design of an academic information system (17) which will include the portfolios that document the evidence related both to the achievement of learning outcomes by the students and the teaching practices that are considered to be of the highest quality (MR1). In developing these projects, we have been greatly assisted by Dr. Paul Kim from Stanford University, who visited our institution twice: on June 13<sup>th</sup> and on November 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007 (18). We expect that these institutional projects will result in better decision making in the academic planning area. This effort was also another recommendation from the WASC Team.

#### **4.2 Alignment of Institutional Needs, Strategic Objectives and Priorities.**

One of the results of the institutional reorganization has been that the University Strategic Plans are generated by entities such as the Presidency, the Academic or Administrative Vice-presidency, and with input provided by the college directors, e.g., administration, engineering, and

psychology, whose participation is now more frequent, systematic and efficient. The main objective of this new way of conducting business is to achieve a closer alignment of the existing needs in the various university entities with the strategic objectives and available resources.

The use of the Balance Scorecard (BSC) tool will allow us to achieve greater effectiveness in the supervision, monitoring, and support of academic projects, which in turn will lead to the strengthening of the institution's educational model. The work of all the university entities under this new structure will allow us, first and foremost, to improve the university's educational mission and secondly to be in a position to better access and obtain national and international accreditation processes (CETYS 2010 Plan) (1).

#### **4.3 The Use of Data in the Planning Process.**

In its strategic planning process the university uses information provided by three primary sources:

1. BSC indicators and the "Plan CETYS 2010" (22).
2. Data related to the academic performance of its students.
3. Qualitative and quantitative observations obtained by the tutors at the three campuses.
4. Information systems.

Following we will describe the way in which each one of the aforementioned sources contributes to the data-based strategic planning.

##### **1. BSC Indicators and Plan 2010**

The data provided by these control instruments are used mainly to assess the success

(pertinence, accuracy) of the actions associated with the objectives of Plan 2010. This evaluation is conducted every six months and involves all of the functional areas of the institution. This set of indicators includes a measurement with which educational effectiveness and student learning are assessed (BSC Semester Control Boards) (21).

2. Academic Performance of Students

The Curricular Development Direction (DDC), (a unit within the Academic Vice-presidency), monitors/supervises/updates the various instruments with which student academic performance is assessed every semester. Teaching-Learning Centers (CEA) operate on each of the campuses, which under the new organizational structure are called "Student Development Centers" (CEDE). Such centers are in continuous contact with the student academic performance vicissitudes, and are supported by a team of tutors from the full-time instructors of each of the schools (Tutor Report) (20).

3. The Role of Academic Advisors

Due to their close contact with students, tutors are able to obtain quite valuable qualitative information that is used to directly provide feedback to the students in a respectful manner regarding their academic performance, and also by using the data generated by the assessment instruments given to each student. In sum, this results in an emotional-educational monitoring of students which has

yielded quite positive results at the Tijuana Campus, and thus the emphatic recommendation to replicate it, respecting the regional idiosyncrasy as well as the institutional uses at the other campuses. In this way we will be fulfilling a recommendation on this matter made by the WASC Team (MR14) Tutor Report (20 and 29).

4. Information Systems

The lack of information systems that facilitate the timely access to quantitative and qualitative data that are produced in the different university entities hinders their incorporation into the academic planning process so it may be continuously improved. We are systematically working to develop and implement the academic information systems that will facilitate all of the activities related to learning assessment. It is important to relate the results obtained by the CEDE with the information obtained from the learning outcomes in order to have a clearer understanding of what takes place at the University in this area (MR10).

**COMMITMENT TO LEARNING AND IMPROVEMENT**

**(CFR's: 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)**

**4.4 The Institution Employs a Deliberate Set of Quality Assurance Processes.**

CETYS University has a basic set of systems and academic and administrative processes to ensure the quality of its educational services. For instance, to ensure the quality of

students' learning, CETYS University makes use of different quality assurance processes, among which are the following:

- A. A process of creating new academic programs
- B. Student Selection
- C. Instructor Selection
- D. Orientation and Support for Students
- E. Orientation for Instructors
- F. Degree Awarding Process
- G. Enrollments
- H. CENEVAL EGEL Tests
- I. Admission Exams

As outcomes of these processes, we note that all of the academic programs that were opened in 2007, such as the Service Administration Program and the Master's Degree Program in Aerospace Engineering, complied with all established institutional practices. The same can be said of all the students that were admitted and of all the instructors that were hired (Approval Process of the Bachelor's Degree Program in Service Administration, LAS) (24).

Despite the existence of documentation of processes such as the aforementioned, since formulating its "Plan CETYS 2010", the institution detected that there is an area of opportunity in the description, simplification, and automation of its quality assurance processes. Additionally, it is necessary to develop a learning assessment process that will allow us to be more effective in assessing educational effectiveness.

#### **4.5 Institutional Research.**

The institution has created a Research Guiding Plan (83), consisting among other elements, of the regulations that control research activities, the guidelines

that identify the research relevance for CETYS, and the programs and projects that can be undertaken. At CETYS University, research in two main fields of investigation is being conducted: one that promotes projects aimed at institutional and educational research (PIIE), and another that entertains academic research projects (PIA). Each of these two programs is divided into two subprograms as follows:

#### **Institutional and Educational Research (PIIE)**

- 1. Institutional Research Subprogram
- 2. Educational Research Subprogram

#### **Academic Research Program (PIA)**

- 1. Scientific Research Subprogram
- 2. Research Skills Development Subprogram

The progress made and outcomes that have been obtained from the research carried out in 2006 and 2007 are the following:

The Institutional Research Subprogram consists of the projects proposed and developed by different departments of the University, for example, the Office of Institutional Promotion and Development (DDPI), the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (DEI), and the Administrative Vice-presidency, among others. Financial resources have been allocated to each of these departments in order to support such studies.

In this subprogram, the following research projects were formulated and carried out during 2007-08:

- 1. Alumni Monitoring Survey (DEI)

2. Survey of Alumni Reviewed by Employers (DEI)
3. CETYS Alumni Employment (DEI)
4. Potential Market (DDPI)
5. Satisfaction Survey (alumni, parents, etc.)
6. Image and Positioning Survey (DDPI)
7. Study of the Competition (DDPI)

### **Usefulness of the Aforementioned Projects**

The alumni survey allows the institution to gather information on the professional and work development of its alumni, the fields in which they are working, as well as their social, economic and political participation in our region. Another important aspect of the survey is to obtain the ethical profiles (their values) of alumni and their professional development. Results from this survey, which is carried out every six years, are disseminated among academic directors and faculty in order to provide feedback for the curriculum and the university administration.

**Satisfaction Surveys** provide information regarding the quality of educational services provided by the institution, thus, they allow for the identification of issues as well as areas of opportunity in different departments. Results are disseminated at the campuses, with the request to take actions towards the improvement of critical situations.

**Potential Market Research Surveys** document information regarding to the number and types of students expected to enroll. This information is extremely useful since the Administrative Office is able to establish student estimates for the following periods. Results from this

survey are disseminated among academic directors and instructors.

### **Survey of Employers Perception with regards to the Performance of CETY's Alumni.**

This study provides valuable information related to the characteristics of professionals needed by employers. It also allows for a performance evaluation of professionals that graduated from CETYS, as well as the identification of the companies' most important values. The last study of this kind showed a comparison between the needs of the business sector and the profile of CETYS' alumni. Results from this survey are disseminated among College Directors and those in charge of designing academic programs.

**Image and Positioning Surveys** provide valuable information regarding how different publics perceive our institution, including relative to other higher education institutions in our region. Based on this survey, improvement actions are established in the communication processes, linkage with the media, designs for printed media campaigns and other means of marketing and promotion.

**Alumni Employment Survey.** This survey is carried out in two stages: first, at the time the student graduates, and second, six months after graduating. The survey provides data regarding the type of employment obtained by alumni. It is important for the university to know if the job of any given student is within his/her professional field. Results from this survey are shared with the academy in order to carry out improvement actions related to the academic programs that are being offered. It should be mentioned that it was decided that this survey would be to conducted annually, instead of twice a year.



All surveys have generated valuable information that inform and guide decision making and a series of actions have resulted from them; unfortunately, not all actions are in written form and with sufficient evidence. It is necessary for the institution to establish the documentation of improvement actions that result from such surveys (MR9).

The following actions have had an impact on the four research subprograms from the Research Guiding Plan: events to promote the Research Institutional Program (PII) have been initiated for all instructors on the three campuses, three courses are offered to instructors, one on each campus in Research and Funding, and a course on researcher training is offered to faculty on the Tijuana campus. The creation of the Multidisciplinary Institute, the CEDES Center and the Humanism and Values Center, all are intended to support internal and external research. The process (agreement and request) to incorporate instructors into the *Sistema Nacional de Investigadores (SIN) (National System of Researchers)* before the *Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT)* was initiated. An institutional budget for research has been established with internal funds. Research projects financed with external funds are supported and promoted. See report from Research Director. (Employee follow-up survey) (25).

#### **4.6 Leadership at All Levels.**

From the Board of IENAC and the Presidency and across all administrative levels of the institution, there much support for aligning their operations with students' learning and to improve the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process. The new organizational structure has created the following entities to strengthen the academia: Academic Vice -presidency; Office of

Educational Services, which includes a series of services related to the student development and his/her academic life; the Director of Academic Planning and Effectiveness, whose responsibility includes an evaluation of the institution's educational effectiveness; the Academic Vice-president's professional staff, which collaborates with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness in order to take actions required for assuring and improving the quality of learning.

The following examples involve a series of practices to generate information that allows the participation of directors, instructors and administrative staff in the improvement of learning, learning environment and instructor pedagogic competence, program and institutional accreditations, syllabus redesigning, the Instructor Comprehensive Development Program [PDIP], Student Tutoring Program [PTA], Professoriate Evaluation and Compensation System [SERP], Student Satisfaction Study [ESA] and the Bachelor Graduate Exam [EGEL].

#### **4.7 The Institution with Significant Faculty Involvement Engages in Ongoing Inquiry Into the Process of Teaching and Learning, as Well as Into the Conditions and Practices that Promote the Kind and Levels of Learning Intended by the Institution.**

##### **Accreditations**

An example of the search for improvement in student learning and for assessing the effectiveness of the institution's educational mission is the accreditation of bachelor academic programs. This occurs with the different accrediting agencies through the initiative of the corresponding school directors, who are supported by the

college directors and various campus offices, as well as with the commitment from the faculty. In programs that have already been accredited, improvement actions are being taken and/or improvement implementations are being initiated. Not all programs are accredited; evidence is being gathered for those that have open processes. Some programs are in the accreditation process and others are beginning with the contacts deemed necessary so as to initiate the accreditation process. These processes need to demonstrate greater progress on the Ensenada Campus. On the other hand, the force and impact of the accreditation effect at CETYS require verification with regards to the outcomes that are being obtained. (Report on the follow up of the recommendations of an academic program) (26).

### **Syllabus Redesign**

Through the initiative of the Office of Curricular Design and the participation of instructors, most of the 2004 & 2005 bachelor programs have been revised with the participation of the faculty of all campuses. Programs such as content outlines, learning outcomes for curricular design, assignment and learning assessment are being used by class instructors as reference. The use of logs and notes by the instructor for course improvement purposes has not been clarified. However, this is a process that was set in motion in a very short time, while more attention has been given to the design of subjects design before the beginning of a new semester, and a limited time and effort has been assigned to the feedback of programs that had already been redesigned. (Report of redesigned programs and faculty list) (27).

### **Instructor Comprehensive Development Program [PDIP]**

One of the recent actions of the Academic Vice-presidency has been the creation of the Instructor Training and Technology Center. Starting this semester (2007-2), the function for the creation of the instructor development program has been redesigned, since only a few isolated courses had been offered. The course on Learning Centered Education was reinstated. A workshop for the design of assessment tools is offered in Mexicali, through Blackboard. However, the impact of these actions require verification regarding the outcomes being obtained. (Evidence of instructor participation in the education certificate program) (28).

### **Student Development Center (CEDE)**

The Student Development Center (CEDE) has been recently created with the leadership of the Presidency and the support of the Academic Vice-presidency, as part of the Educational Services that are dependent on the Academic Operation (OPA), so that the institution is able to standardize the efforts to support student academic development, through vocational, educational and personal orientation. On the three campuses, at the undergraduate level, there is the organization and personnel that work with at-risk students, with the purpose of improving their learning and reducing the drop-out rate, guiding them to the appropriate entity. These processes that had been operating differently on each campus, although with the same objective, are now standardized with the same structure and name: CEDE. (39) This center also operates, promotes and supervises the efficiency of the student tutoring program (29).

## **Instructor Evaluation and Compensation System [SERP]**

The faculty at a Bachelor's Degree level is evaluated by means of a practice that involves students, and that has been in place since 1969. The SERP has been monitored by the Office of Academic Operation and the school directors are essential for its most valuable use. This instrument is used to evaluate the effectiveness of the in-class teaching-learning process every semester; with regards to administration, it evaluates the instructor's punctuality, attendance, submission of outcomes, fulfillment and collaboration with the institution. Currently, the system is being restructured to administer it on-line and thus to have the results in a more timely manner. Thus, the system will permit reports that can be managed electronically, including outcomes; and it will be applied to all the classes of every instructor and not only to just two of the instructor's courses, as it is currently done. One of the problems of the current system is that outcomes are briefly analyzed, focusing mainly on the financial compensation for instructors who earn high evaluations. Another application of these outcomes is to avoid rehiring instructors who constantly receive poor evaluations. (SERP) (30)

## **Bachelor Graduation Exam [EGEL]**

The application of this exam is under supervision of the academic division. It is a standardized test that is given nationwide to many bachelor graduate students. The EGEL is not administered for all bachelor programs, since the CENEVAL has not been able to prepare this exam for all academic programs.

Even though the EGEL exam evaluates the quality of graduating students with regards to a defined standard, its outcomes are rarely used for the review

of academic programs. Clearly, we need to work on the analysis of our programs with the competencies assessed in this exam and then make decisions about the differences. Currently, not all schools emphasize equally the importance of this exam and thus the preparation of their students for taking it. In most cases, they only inform and recruit students for this test. (EGEL-results) (31).

## **Students Satisfaction Survey [ESA]**

The campus directors and the Presidency are the main promoters for the execution of this qualitative survey that is conducted through the Office of Development and Promotion. This survey includes all educational levels in the institution. Outcomes are provided and discussed with all directors from the administration and the academic division so that the corresponding departments implement corrective actions. In the last applications of this survey, the need to improve the student milieu emerged as a major result. The improvement actions require the identification on the students' own account of what would be a good student environment (ESA) (32).

## **Faculty Engagement**

Traditionally, CETYS University has carried out periodical reviews of its bachelor academic programs (every 4 years). Such review usually entails shorter cycles for graduate programs. In both cases, the involvement of the faculty is unquestionable. Holistically speaking, the primary goal of these processes is program improvement, including curriculum and teaching. The short response times demanded by the accelerated changes in the world, particularly in science, have resulted in the program evaluation and revision processes to be carried more efficiently

than they used to be. As a result of these periodic reviews, the syllabus has been identified as the starting point for curricular development. The syllabus contains topic units, course description, learning outcomes, course entrance profile, pedagogic principles and educational model nuances that are to be encouraged, as well as the evaluation of the supplemental resources and learning activities. The professoriate has been responsible for designing these elements. At CETYS University this is known as “micro curricular design”, while the syllabus design is known as “macro curricular design”. The micro curricular design is completely developed by the CDM and SME bodies.

The macro curricular design involves the participation of the Office of Curricular Design, College Directors and School Directors. Its main task is to define the design parameters of bachelor and graduate academic programs. These parameters are related to providing responses to the needs described by employers, to the recommendations of the accrediting agencies and to the requirements of the *Secretaría de Educación y Bienestar Social* (SEBS). Aside from the aforementioned, the institutional purposes of CETYS University should be added. Based on such parameters, the following aspects are defined: program length, educational axis, the credits required to earn the degree, the hours of academic work that students have to complete both in a curricular and co-curricular fashion and the cost structure in order to determine the corresponding tuitions. (A bachelor/postgraduate program) (33 and 34) (Academic Program documentation format) (35).

We have made several periodic reviews and we expect to improve on the use of all the information gathered that is related to the administration of academic

programs, as well as the best practices on macro curricular design that have been developed in the past. For this reason, in 2008 we will initiate a learning assessment system, with the support of information systems, in order to gather and analyze information regarding the performance of our academic programs and the students’ academic performance. The latter is in response to some recommendations made by the WASC Team (MR1, MR2, MR9, MR10, MR16).

#### **4.8 The Role of Stakeholders in the Assessment of Effectiveness of Educational Programs.**

CETYS In addition to internal evaluations, the University looks to its alumni and to employers in order to assess the effectiveness of its academic programs. For such purpose, it uses several tools and studies from the field of institutional research, as well as those recommended by the accrediting agency (25 y 26).

Even though the mechanisms implemented to gather opinions from different groups, which decide and guide the conduction of periodic reviews of academic programs, can be improved, our greatest area of opportunity is to make the most of its outcomes, and those generated by our own information systems regarding the performance of the academic programs.

On the other hand, it is necessary to include a group of faculty in the revision processes of academic programs in order to enrich its design and for instructors to better engage in making the most of these programs. The learning assessment process that should be established to evaluate our students’ learning requires the participation of such scholars, which provides another justified reason for its

establishment. This action will reinforce quality assurance in micro and macro curricular design.

Although it is necessary to use the data collected from studies more efficiently, we are currently working on the creation of mechanisms that generate knowledge and intelligence about the variables that are used in various studies, in such a way that the information systems can be an advantage of great value for the decision making process in our institution.

Besides the studies of vocative demand and employment demand, the periodic reviews also consider the State Government Strategic Planning and its Entrepreneurial Development Policy, as well as the Educational Development Plan of the Federal Government. The creation of alliances, agreements and establishing relationships with interest groups are essential elements for fulfilling the CETYS mission.

The IENAC seeks for the institution, through the exercise of its mission, to respond to the needs of the region.

## **Conclusions:**

CETYS University applies and obtains outcomes from its strategic planning processes, but it needs to improve its effectiveness in the achievement of its strategic goals. For such purposes, the administrative levels of the institution have to improve their ability to analyze and discuss information generated by the operation of their strategic planning, as well as to respond more effectively to the opportunities provided by the environment. The professoriate, directors and staff are firmly committed to the mission of the institution; however, this commitment must become evident in the generation of innovative ideas that result in an organization that

is more focused on learning and continuous improvement.

The IENAC's Executive Commission has authorized the Planning Committee to begin with the formulation of Plan CETYS 2020, with the participation of internal and external publics. This development plan will create a new vision along with new programs and goals, which are able to redirect the commitments that are currently present in the "Plan CETYS 2010".

## **IN RESPONSE TO MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS.**

### **The Reference Frame that CETYS University Adopted Within the Educational Effectiveness Self-Study**

The educational effectiveness self-study had two important starting points: the recommendations offered by the WASC Team that visited us in March of 2007; and the need to create a generic model in learning assessment, a model relevant to CETYS. The construction of this model to suit our institution began in August 2007, within the Academic Vice-presidency.

The feedback provided by the WASC Team has been very important and highly relevant for the institution; and the administrative and academic departments have organized themselves to provide an appropriate follow-up to all of the recommendations. The transcendence of the work done by this team is acknowledged due to the fact that CETYS University is the first higher education institution in all of Latin America that has submitted itself to an accreditation process by WASC. The great responsibility that this step means for CETYS University was assumed by all of its members with a great sense of solidarity and respect: The administration, instructors, students, board members and employees in general enabled the development of the WASC Team visit to be highly efficient and with no complications.

We could see the depth of the analysis in the work of the Visiting Team and made us proud when they acknowledged the quality of our work, and that they could observe the seriousness and professionalism throughout the CETYS community.

The commitment of the institution regarding the follow-up on the recommendations made by the Visiting Team has been integrated into this report on educational effectiveness. Each one of the recommendations has received a code as MR#, and they have been aligned with the 4 WASC accreditation standards. This is reflected in a document that was used in guiding the work of the 4 teams in charge of the 4 standards. The document is annexed (36 and 67).

This document was created after multiple analysis sessions between the WASC- CETYS Team. It summarizes the recommendations of the WASC Team in a table, together with their relation to the standards and the CETYS area responsible for the follow-up.

In order to provide a brief answer we decided to focus on the 5 major recommendations sent by WASC in its letter after the visit from the Evaluating Team. We will describe these 5 recommendations and their follow-up:

#### **1. Writing of the Educational Effectiveness Report With a High Degree of Analysis and With All its Evidence Documents Written in English.**

Actions taken to meet this recommendation:

We analyzed and reflected on each of the recommendations made by the Visiting Team, we placed them within the pertinent standard and we assigned a person responsible for the appropriate follow-up.

Multiple working sessions were held with the WASC-CETYS teams since 2006, with the intention of analyzing the focus of this report and to define working strategies deriving from the recommendations received during the

institutional capacity visit, and from the need for a better understanding of the learning assessment paradigm.

In April 2007 a Team integrated by CETYS academicians and directors attended the annual WASC convention in San José, California. During this event the group learned more about learning assessment, including about the importance of curricular.

Afterwards, almost the identical team attended a workshop on learning assessment organized by the San Diego State University in San Diego, California, in July of 2007. Finally this team attended a workshop in learning assessment organized by WASC in October 2007 in Irvine, California. These activities rounded our vision on learning assessment, and CETYS University could already count on a team of people capable of enhancing learning assessment within their institutional realms. We also learned from experts how to define working strategies to approach areas of opportunity identified by the Visiting Team.

We hired a group of translators and CETYS University met the commitment to present the evidence in English, giving a special answer to a request by WASC and the Visiting Team to have a minimum of two courses of each academic program translated into English. This requirement was set in the minutes of the July 2nd meeting in San Diego with the WASC Chairman as well as the Chair and Co-Chair of the Visiting Team.

## **2. Substantially Improve The Information Technology Resources in CETYS University, Specifically Those Related to The Library.**

Actions taken to meet this recommendation:

In response to the suggestion made by the President of WASC in San Diego on July 2nd, consisting in visiting some American universities and getting support from a library expert to identify the best way to improve the service level in our library, in September 2007 we paid a visit to the National University. The Director of the Library, Dr. Anne Marie Secord and her staff provided us with a session where they explained their operative processes, their strategic plan, their resources and their infrastructure. The three directors of the CETYS libraries of our three campuses and the coordinator of information technology of our Mexicali campus attended this session.

After that and to address the second part of the suggestion made by the President of WASC, the institution hired Dr. Susan Parker, Director and CFO of the library in UCLA. Dr. Parker visited the libraries at our three campuses on September 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007. On October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007, Dr. Parker presented her preliminary report about the visit; we have remained in continuous contact and the Strategic Plan of the Library includes the recommendations coming from Dr. Parker.

Also, we have hired Dr. Paul Kim to assist us in matters of educational information technology. He is the Director of Information Technology at Stanford University. Dr. Kim visited the Mexicali campus in June and October of 2007.

## **3.Revision of the Doctoral Programs (MR3).**

Actions taken to meet this recommendation:

We first requested that WASC send us the criteria to implement a doctorate program according to the WASC

standards as well as information about which universities in the United States had programs similar to ours. When we received the criteria, the coordinators of our existing doctoral programs documented these according to the criteria established by WASC. In October 2007, Dr. Celestino Fernández from the University of Arizona held a working session with the coordinators of the doctoral programs in order to review the aforementioned documentation. Follow-up on the feedback received in this meeting was provided in another meeting in Dr. Fernández' office during the first week of December. Dr. Fernández acknowledged the quality of the structure and content of all Masters programs, and particularly the Masters in Education and the Doctorate in Education, during a working session held with the coordinators of latter programs. **These documents are identified as evidence #87 included in a special chapter of this report 'Supplemental in Doctoral Programs'.**

We are focusing part of the library strategic plan effort to create a doctorate culture. To be able to set this in motion, in January of 2008 training sessions for instructors in the use of databases were scheduled. For such purposes the Educational Services Direction and its Staff of Library Directors met to assemble a Training Manual on this topic, which is attached as evidence (59-C). Immediate follow-up has been given to this recommendation made by the WASC Team, and for such purposes the budget allocated to the library for year 2008 onwards had to be significantly increased.

With the expert assistance of UCLA's Dr. Susan Parker, we know that institutional support for the doctoral programs will improve for the benefit of the students and the instructors.

We continue hiring external instructors who are highly qualified in the subjects offered for out two active doctoral programs: education and management. The instructor list is in the office of the Graduate Operation Director. The line of the new Academic Vice-president is professional and academic excellence within the faculty staff for the Postgraduate programs.

#### **4.Review of Masters Programs (MR5).**

Actions taken to meet this recommendation:

We explained to WASC and to the Chair and Co-Chair of the Visiting Team the legality of the registration procedures for programs with the *Secretaría de Educación y Bienestar Social* of Baja California (Secretary for Education and Social Welfare in the State of Baja California) and the Federal Government's *Secretaría de Educación Pública* (Secretary for Public Education). This explanation served to clarify how academic levels are obtained in Mexico, and how the academic programs have to be documented in order to obtain their official valid registries.

We note again that in Mexico each specialty in a Master's program has to have separate registration. This is why so many Master's programs are listed. However, in reality the actual number of Master's programs offered by CETYS is less. Additional information pertaining to this issue will be provided by the Director of Graduate Programs.

With the assistance of Dr. Susan Parker, the Direction of Educational Services is working on a strategic plan for the library, a plan which not only includes an increase in information technology resources but also involves the formulation of the respective learning outcomes that lead to the improvement in the use of information resources and



that contribute to the strengthening the culture of information use, particularly in the master's and doctoral programs.

### **5..More Efficient Use of Our information for Academic Planning:**

Actions taken to meet this recommendation:

Following an initiative from the Academic Vice-presidency, the Directors of Planning and Academic Effectiveness and of Institutional Effectiveness with the support from the Colleges and Schools directors have reviewed elements from the basic statistics of the institution to identify which pieces of information are needed most for planning each school period. Similarly, academic indicators have also been revised in order to align them with the concepts of Capacity and Educational Effectiveness. The next step will be scheduling the review cycles of these indicators in order to close the continuous improvement cycle.

We are working on the improvement of our information system with a special emphasis on academic technology. As we have noted elsewhere in this report, we will getting technical support and advice from Dr. Paul Kim from Stanford University.

In evidence #17 of this report, we present information on improvements and advances made through November of 2007 regarding the development of the institutional information system.

It is important to mention and comment on IENAC's support of, and interest in receiving CETYS University information on the progress and work undertaken regarding each of the WASC recommendations. The Chairman of IENAC and other Board Members are fully supportive and actively involved in

the follow-up of the process leading to this accreditation.

Along with the follow-up of the recommendations of the WASC Evaluating Team, the review of Educational Effectiveness at CETYS has led us to the following conclusions:

Our learning-centered educational model and the Academic Reform we initiated in 2004 have been strengthened through the new paradigm on learning assessment and our emerging model on learning assessment. We still have a long way to go towards putting this model into action, but in 2008 we will be selecting and evaluating a wider quantity of learning evidence our students will have achieved. Additionally, faculty training has become a priority, and that is why the institution has planned a series of workshops on learning assessment, beginning on January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2008 with the presence of Dr. Mary Allen, an expert in this area.

We already had institutional graduation profiles for each Bachelor's program, something that was motivated by the registry requirements set by the Mexican Education authorities. Now, however, the establishment of Institutional Learning Outcomes applicable to every graduate from CETYS, as well as the formulation of learning outcomes in academic programs, has contributed to making the characterization of those graduate profiles more objective. Work still pending includes assessing to what extent learning is taking place, and modifying, as necessary based on experience, the learning assessment tools. We expect that by the visit in March 2008, the Visiting Team will be able to see progress in the implementation and operation of the e-portfolio.

Although we have been reviewing academic programs every 4 years, it is important that we review in a more comprehensive fashion the old practice of evaluating the performance of the curriculum, and we should not allow ourselves to release a new curriculum into the market without reflecting on and assessing the favorable aspects of the previous curriculum. In this way we will avoid reinventing the wheel. Again, in the periodic review the curriculum, it is critical to continue to rely on the participative leadership of the faculty. They currently participate in the curricular review scheme as Experts in Content and Curricular Design Administrators; nevertheless, in future reviews they will do so through instructor academies responsible for the curricular assessment and review. The College and School Directors as well as the Director of Curricular Development will supervise their participation and formulate the process for curricular review and revision.

Under the new organization of faculties for the review of academic programs, learning assessment will be the means to validate the best pedagogical practice and the starting point to strengthen the pedagogic skills of instructors. If learning is not taking place, faculty must be the first to propose and take actions to enhance student learning. Systematization of learning assessment is something that is a most relevant and welcomed challenge for 2008.

(MR4) Delivering quality education and having sound finances in the institution will continue to be the most influential forces in decision making. To reach both goals, CETYS must achieve a better alignment between the academic enterprise and supporting areas. Thus, we identified the following actions as necessary, together with others which will be identified later and as necessary,

in order to meet the aforementioned recommendations:

Reinforce the present academic programs with an additional number of full-time professors in order to improve service to student. The professional training of faculty will be strengthened as well, together with their pedagogic skills and the opportunities that they may have to become more involved in research, publications, and participation in international exchanges, to take advantage of the formal agreements the institution has with more than 40 universities (6).

This planning has been included in Plan CETYS 2010 and will be reinforced in the Projection towards Plan CETYS 2020.

To substantially increase information resources, in academic as well as administrative areas and particularly for the library. Regarding the library, we have taken significant actions with the assistance of Dr. Susan Parker and by developing our Strategic Plan for the Library, which includes increases in budgets from 2008 forward and including future investments of the institution.

To strengthen the infrastructure, classrooms and laboratories, capitalizing on relationships with the business, service, and government sectors. We have already made significant progress the relations established over the years with numerous firms and state government agencies.

To review and be creative in our schedule planning practices so that the planning of each school period is more effective and requires fewer contingent actions.

With IENAC's approval, the institution will initiate its next strategic planning

cycle towards the Plan CETYS 2020. This planning process will give us provide an opportunity to include the various perspectives and recommendations that the WASC Accreditation process has generated. Without a doubt, this planning process will be strengthened by the feedback WASC has been providing to us, and CETYS's commitment to educational quality and effectiveness will continue to deepen and grow stronger.

The President has indicated that he expects that this accreditation process will bring about an attitude and behaviour change in every individual participating in these efforts. The objective of CETYS University is to be able to create a culture of evidence and continuous improvement and to become an organization truly centered on learning. In this report we have documented the various efforts the institution has made to demonstrate the progress made in following up on the recommendations made by the Visiting Team, and most of all, in improving our educational effectiveness.

We fully recognize that it will take several years for CETYS to be fully transformed and become an evidenced-based, learning outcomes-focused university., However CETYS University is commitment to this path and in doing so has the support of its entire community.