

Fifth Year Interim Report: Part V

Clayton State University

QEP Impact Report

Clayton State University (CSU) was founded in 1969 on a beautiful tract of land in Morrow, Georgia just fifteen minutes south of the downtown Atlanta. Founded as Clayton Junior College, the institution is situated in a region called “the Southern Crescent”. The institution’s name has changed along with its evolution in status from a community college to a senior college and then to its current status as a comprehensive baccalaureate and graduate granting university. Although the name and institutional level have evolved, one thing has never changed: the tradition of providing a high quality, student focused education and serving the needs of the community. CSU’s vision is to be “an outstanding comprehensive metropolitan university that transforms the lives of students, advances knowledge, and drives economic growth” and the University has grown considerably in recent years in order to realize that vision.

Clayton State University is one of 35 colleges and universities in the University System of Georgia. Four Colleges/Schools within CSU provide over 30 majors and 6 graduate degrees. The University emphasizes the use of technology in teaching and learning and provides an affordable yet excellent education. CSU was among the first colleges in the country to require students to have access to a laptop. Most classrooms are equipped with data projectors and internet connectivity; students and faculty are provided with free on-campus software and hardware support through a technology support center called the HUB.

The population of students at CSU is diverse as evidenced by its ranking in U.S. News and World Report as one of the most diverse universities in the Southeastern United States. Of the close to 6,500 students enrolled in the fall of 2009, approximately 63% are Black, 23% are White, 5% are Asian and 3% are Hispanic. CSU is fortunate to count among its population many international and first-generation college students. Approximately 70% of CSU’s students are female. With an average age of 29, the university has a mix of traditional and nontraditional students, approximately 55% of whom attend full-time. The average SAT composite score (math and verbal) is slightly below 1000 and the average high school GPA is slightly below 3.0.

CSU graduates approximately 1,000 students each year. The 2008 cohort of first-time, full-time freshmen was retained at a rate of approximately 66% (the 2004 cohort was retained at a rate of approximately 56%). While it is difficult to identify specific causes for the improvement in retention rates for freshmen, it seems likely that the addition of the state-of-the-art residence hall has had a positive impact. With a large population of first-generation students and adults who struggle to balance their academic loads with work and family responsibilities, the University is challenged to improve retention for all of its students and raise the six-year graduation rate, which is approximately 29.35% for the 2003 cohort.

Title and Brief Description of CSU’s Quality Enhancement Plan

With a desire to focus on the environment supporting learning, the faculty, staff and students serving on the QEP Steering Committee in 2002 created a blueprint for enhancing the key underpinnings for student success. The QEP was entitled: “The Improvement of Student Performance through the Enhancement of Faculty /Staff Development.” This plan included three themes: Student Success and Faculty Development; Intervention and Faculty/Staff Involvement; and Advisement and Mentoring. Goals and specific objectives were established for each theme. A comprehensive list of specific tasks, timelines, quantitative outcomes, assignment of responsibilities, and funding sources was created and shared with the campus community. Additional committees and subcommittees were formed to implement the goals and to track the institution’s progress. As data was collected for each objective, it was saved and shared via links in the status report document. Information on progress towards completing each objective was

shared regularly with the Faculty Council, Administrative Council, the Dean's Council, and other campus groups. Whenever data revealed a failure to meet a goal or objective, corrective actions were taken.

Theme One – Student Success and Faculty Development: The primary focus of the first theme was to determine student educational needs and to provide an ongoing program of faculty development focused on engaging students in the classroom. During each of the first three years of the implementation of the QEP, half day workshops were provided to all faculty members on strategies for active learning, collaborative learning, and problem-based learning. (Workshops on service learning, advising and assessment were provided later.) Competitive grants were awarded to faculty members who implemented each of these practices, conducted classroom-based research to determine their effectiveness, kept an online journal, and mentored other faculty members. Over 30 faculty members were awarded grants over the course of those three years. Focus groups involved additional faculty members to discuss the use of these teaching strategies in the classroom. Online training programs were developed and peers evaluated teaching practices. A searchable online discipline-specific database of these teaching strategies was created by faculty members for others to use. The grant recipients shared the results of their research on these teaching strategies during Faculty Development Day.

Theme Two – Intervention and Faculty/Staff Involvement: The primary focus of the second theme, student intervention and faculty/staff involvement, was aimed at identifying at-risk populations of students and providing intervention programs to serve their needs. This part of the QEP included increasing admission standards, expanding library holdings, partnering with nearby schools, creating policies relating to attendance and academic standing, implementing a midterm grade report process, using a course scheduling program (ASTRA), establishing honor societies, requiring all students to attend orientation, and adding or enhancing programs. Examples of programs created or enhanced include the Freshman Year Experience Program (taken by all first-time, full-time freshmen), Supplementation Instruction (seven sections were offered to support student performance for historically difficult classes in 2008), the StartSmart Program (academic and social skills workshops provided to more than a hundred students each year before classes begin), the First Step Program (a summer bridge program), the CARE Program (online referral for faculty to use when they observe problems in the classroom), and the Academic Success Workshop Series (for freshmen on probation). Resulting data indicate that each of these endeavors has proven to be effective. For example, students enrolled in the Freshman Year Experience Course were retained at a 6% higher rate than those who were not involved.

Theme Three – Advisement and Mentoring: The primary focus of the third theme was on improving academic advising and mentoring. Through a combination of professional (staff) and faculty advisors, advising at the University has improved significantly. An Advising Council was established in 2005; professional development opportunities have been provided to advisors; an online advising handbook has been created; each department has developed advising training plans; an online scheduling and record keeping program (AdvisorTrac) is used by all professional advisors and faculty advisors; and an Advisement assessment instrument was created and administered for the past three years. The results of the advisement survey reveal that students are learning from their advising session, not only about selecting courses, but also about majors, careers, and campus resources. Overall, students are well satisfied with their advising experience. In those areas where weaknesses have been identified, the problems have been addressed. All students are now advised each fall and spring semester. Mentoring has also been targeted for improvement and faculty and peer mentoring programs for students were established. Initially, faculty members and students were awarded stipends to attend workshops and participate in the program; more than 20 faculty members and students participated each year. Much of the mentoring effort has focused on freshmen, as retention of this student population has been challenging for the University. Today, all of the full-time freshmen have a faculty mentor. Programs have also been created to address the needs of special populations of student such as nontraditional students, veterans, and African American males.

Initial Goals and Intended Outcomes

The overall goal of the QEP was to help students to be more successful—to improve the environment for student learning and to further the mission of the university. The QEP has proven to be a highly effective tool for improving the quality of students’ educational experiences. The goals of the QEP are found below.

Quality Enhancement Plan Themes and Goals

Theme 1: Student Success and Faculty Development

- Goal 1: To establish ongoing faculty development programs related to student success.
- Goal 2: To implement instructional strategies that promote student success.

Theme 2: Student Intervention and Faculty/Staff Involvement

- Goal 1: To establish instructional policies, procedures, and priorities that maximize student success.
- Goal 2: To implement methods for early detection and remediation of at-risk students.
- Goal 3: To involve faculty, staff, and students in providing academic assistance for at-risk students.

Theme 3: Advisement and Mentoring

- Goal 1: To improve the knowledge level of advisors.
- Goal 2: To improve freshman advisement/orientation.
- Goal 3: To improve the uses of technology in the advisement of students.
- Goal 4: To enhance student success through increased faculty-student interaction outside the classroom.

Clayton State’s QEP was among the first group developed and was quite ambitious – far more complex and multifaceted than the more tightly focused QEP that is typical today. Despite the difficulties of attempting to implement and manage such a huge project, the set of interrelated themes and goals provided the foundation needed to help CSU’s students to succeed. Multiple objectives were established for each goal, targets determined for each objective and measures chosen for each target. Progress toward achieving these goals was monitored by the QEP Implementation Committee and by three subcommittees established to collect data and review progress. Faculty and staff from across campus worked to achieve objectives, monitor progress, and evaluate the results. The QEP Implementation Committee took appropriate steps to modify programs, alter practices, increase funding, and develop new measures in order to achieve the established targets. Data was obtained from many sources, including nationally normed instruments such as National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Freshman Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE); in-house surveys, such as the “Faculty Development Needs Assessment and the Student Satisfaction Survey”; and Banner data for measures of withdrawal rates, grades, retention and graduation rates. Many departments began tracking job placements; developing internship and capstone courses; and measuring the intellectual growth of their students using various assessment techniques. In terms of the original QEP, 44 targets were created and 91 quantitative outcomes were established. In five years, Clayton State University met or made substantial progress toward accomplishing those targets (see Table 1).

Table 1: Quality Enhancement Plan Quantitative Summary of Results

	Met		Partially Met		In Progress		Not Met		Total
Targets	30	68%	5	11%	5	11%	4	9%	44
Quantitative Outcomes	83	91%	5	6%	2	2%	1	1%	91
Total	113	84%	10	7%	7	5%	5	4%	135

The efforts to develop faculty skills, better engage students, improve advising, and offer an increased level of student support services appear to have positively impacted an important index of student success: retention (see Table 2).

Table 2: Retention Rates of First-Time, Full Time Freshmen (by Cohort Year)

Cohorts	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Retention Rate	56.3	59.7	61.1	58.6	66.5

Results for Theme One: The QEP's Impact on Student Success and Faculty Development

The most important effort undertaken in the QEP in terms of student learning was the student success and faculty development theme. As stated above, the faculty development program was multi-year. Each year, a new type of teaching strategy for engaging students was selected and targeted: active learning strategies for year one, strategies aimed at encouraging collaborative learning for year two, and problem-based learning strategies for year three. Grants were awarded each year to classroom research proposals related to that year's selected teaching strategy with consultants providing annual workshops on that year's strategy for the entire faculty. The grant winners presented the results of their efforts at the next year's faculty development day. Focus groups were formed to discuss the teaching strategies and online training modules were posted on the website. The research grant winners, in conjunction with staff from the Center of Instructional Development, became leaders/mentors of each year's faculty development efforts. Qualitative data was collected via faculty journals recording their observations regarding student learning and their changes in teaching strategies. Additional faculty members joined focus groups to implement the teaching strategy and discuss the impacts on learning. The faculty mentors observed teachers who were using these strategies and provided them with feedback and student feedback was also solicited in many cases.

In the first year, 32 faculty members were involved in the focus groups that implemented and discussed active learning strategies in the classroom. The active learning teaching strategies varied widely and included such methods as case studies, peer teaching/review, the one minute paper, and concept mapping. An analysis of the participants' journal entries reveals that many faculty members recorded statements in their journals indicating that students were more active learners in the classroom. One faculty member, for example, stated in her journal that "working as a class allowed the students to understand how concept maps can be used in chemistry courses. There were some 'aha!' moments as students saw how concepts related and how this concept map simplified what they had learned in the chapter." Another participant stated that "the students were forced to interact, share their ideas, and think deeply about each characteristic. Because they had to defend their thinking in a large group, a great deal of energy was generated." Other journals stated that "the students engaged both the instructor and each other during the activity" and that "students were definitely actively engaged and seemed to enjoy being an active listener." A few journal entries did not show that these teaching strategies worked with every student. Teachers commented that some students were distracted or not fully involved. However, the faculty mentors who observed others using the teaching strategy affirmed the comments made by the majority of the instructors. One mentor said of a classroom that she observed: "All students were actively involved in arriving at a reverse solution. There was quite a bit of discussion." The peer review process also provided instructors the opportunity to have an observer comment on the use of various teaching strategies. One peer reviewer, in his written report of the use of polling as an active learning strategy in a math class, stated that "the students actively discussed the problem and arrived at an answer." He made several observations about why the technique was effective, but he also made suggestions as to how to make better use of time, how to provide summaries when trends are uncovered, and how to pair the strategy with other techniques. The observer and instructor then met afterwards to discuss the lesson.

Electronic journals, focus groups and peer reviews gave instructors the opportunity to rethink ways to implement and improve their teaching techniques. The courses where instructors applied specific teaching strategies were called “intervention courses.” Intervention courses typically showed an improvement in student learning with a D, F, and W rate for the active learning strategy intervention courses of 13% - a 55% decrease in these poor grades compared to the same courses the year before.

During the collaborative learning sequence, 46 instructors participated in the focus groups. The faculty members who implemented strategies such as case studies, group investigation, structured problem solving, and analytic teams found value in these approaches to engaging students and many observed improvements in student learning. One nursing faculty member commented about her students in her journal: “They were very engaged, attentive and motivated to discuss the questions that addressed critical content. They asked questions within the group to engage critical thinking to be able to answer the questions. Some students were so prepared that every time a wrong answer was voiced, they would provide correct feedback with rationale to help the others understand.” Another health science faculty member wrote the following in her journal: “The case study worked very well. It was basically a ‘who dunnit’ pathophysiological style, with the students having to explain to a fictitious family why the patient died despite treatment . . . There were many possible wrong solutions, but nearly all found a correct version.”

The journal entries also provide evidence of enhanced engagement. For example, an English faculty member using a “think/pair/share” strategy noted how important it is for students to reread and rethink to become engaged in learning. Another faculty member reported some of the students’ comments about their learning experiences: “we had lot of interactions . . . the group makes the class more interested and gets the class involved. . . it gave the students a better understanding of the concepts . . . help[ed] us to process the information . . . I think the class is more interesting when everyone gets involved . . . great way to get students involved with learning the material . . . I believe the group interaction not only allows us to learn more, and also get to know our teacher and fellow students.”

The collaborative learning courses were taught in the spring of 2006. When comparing the focus group intervention courses to the same courses taught in the spring of 2005, there was a 33% reduction in the number of Fs, Ws, or WFs.

In the problem-based learning strategy, 33 faculty members participated in the focus groups. One instructor commented that “students’ attitudes increased tremendously. While I don't know that learning was much better than the lecture and group activities that I usually use, the attitude of the students towards the usefulness of the knowledge was noticeably improved.” One peer reviewer said that “discussion did seem to increase critical thinking and analysis.” Another said she was impressed by the “depth of the answers given by some student groups.” Failure and withdrawal rates in these intervention courses declined by 30%.

Overall, the failure and withdrawal rates of students enrolled in the Focus Group Intervention Courses improved considerably. Table 3 indicates that those courses in which faculty were working together discussing the strategies had a lower percentage of students who were failing or withdrawing compared to the same courses offered the previous years. The percent of Fs, Ws, and WFs declined almost 40%. The success of the interventions in the individual grant recipient courses were more mixed (see Table 4). There was an improvement in the DFW rates in the first year’s intervention (active learning strategy). When the collaborative learning grant recipient courses were evaluated, there was a decline in the percent of Fs awarded, but a rise in the percent of withdrawals. However, in the problem based learning courses taught by grant recipients, students were failing and withdrawing at a *higher* rate than those enrolled in the same courses the previous year. This unexpected result may have occurred because the grant

recipients often applied the strategies narrowly for research purposes, whereas the focus group participants were discussing the strategies throughout the semester and were getting feedback for improvement from others.

Table 3: Failure and Withdrawal Rates in Focus Group Intervention Courses

Intervention	Term	Failure		Withdrawals		Fs, Ws, and WFs	
		Percent	Percent Change	Percent	Percent Change	Percent	Percent Change
Comparison Courses	Spring 2004	15.20%		14.30%		29.50%	
Active Learning	Spring 2005	7.00%	-53.95%	6.30%	-55.94%	13.30%	-54.92%
Comparison Courses	Spring 2005	10.00%		9.40%		20.80%	
Collaborative Learning	Spring 2006	5.80%	-42.00%	7.40%	-21.28%	13.90%	-33.17%
Comparison Courses	Spring 2007	7.60%		9.90%		18.50%	
Problem-Based Learning	Spring 2007	6.10%	-19.74	5.10%	-41.90%	12.90%	-30.27%
Average			-38.56		-41.90%		-39.45%

Table 4: Failure and Withdrawal Rates in Grant Recipient Intervention Courses

Intervention	Term	Failure		Withdrawals		Fs, Ws, and WFs	
		Percent	Percent Change	Percent	Percent Change	Percent	Percent Change
Comparison Courses	Spring 2003	9.30%		12.60%		21.90%	
Active Learning	Spring 2004	8.00%	-13.98%	9.10%	-27.78%	17.10%	-21.92%
Comparison Courses	Spring 2005	7.00%		11.40%		18.40%	
Collaborative Learning	Spring 2005	5.90%	-15.71%	12.60%	10.53%	18.50%	0.54%
Comparison Courses	Spring 2005	2.30%		3.80%		6.80%	
Problem-Based Learning	Spring 2006	5.20%	126.09%	6.40%	68.42%	13.40%	97.06%
Average			32.13%		17.06%		25.23%

Additional assessments of active learning, student engagement and critical thinking were examined by the QEP Implementation Committee. The Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) items of the (NSSE) National Survey of Student Engagement were especially well suited to this analysis. In 2007, the year after all of the three faculty development day workshops had been presented, three of the questions in the ACL were among the highest performing areas on the NSSE (see Table 5). This provided some evidence

of Clayton State University's degree of success when compared to other schools. The results suggested that CSU was making some progress in involving students in their educations.

Table 5: Highest Performing Areas, NSSE 2007

Question	Bench.	Percent of students who...	Clayton State	Selected Peers	Carnegie Peers	NSSE 2007
First-Year Students						
1a.	ACL	Asked questions/contributed to class discussions	66%	56%	63%	57%
1b.	ACL	Made a class presentation	36%	28%	37%	30%
Seniors						
1g.	ACL	Worked with other students on projects during class	57%	47%	49%	47%

CSU did not make considerable gains on the Active and Collaborative Learning section of NSSE during the intervention years. However, the results for seniors have improved considerably in the last two years (see Table 6). The results for freshmen have been relatively flat until the last administration of the test. This may suggest that it takes time for the teaching culture to become more collaborative or for enough students to be exposed to these new teaching strategies to impact the NSSE results.

Table 6: NSSE 2009 Benchmark Report (Active and Collaborative Learning)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
First Year	39.6	40.7	40.2	38.3	40.5	40.6	44.5
Seniors	49.3	49.0	48.7	50.5	49.7	53.1	53.2

Results for Theme Two: Student Intervention and Faculty/Staff Involvement: Examples for objectives for this theme include: raising admission standards, developing policies to decrease the number of withdrawals, requiring faculty to submit midterm grades, increasing the number of students using tutoring services, providing supplemental instruction in historically difficulty courses, creating better class schedules, creating an online referral system for at-risk students, providing a summer bridge program, developing theme-based learning communities to be taken by all first-year students, and providing workshops for faculty and staff on campus services and retention strategies. All of these policies were adopted and the resulting initiatives were implemented. Many of these initiatives appear to have improved the environment for student success; for example, the Center for Academic Success (CAS) has substantially increased the number of students using its services.

Table 7: Number of Tutors and Tutoring Hours in CAS

Semester	Tutors	Hours
2004-05 Total	32	3214
2005-06 Total	57	5511
2006-07 Total	87	6893
2007-08 Total	80	10,669

Those students taking Supplemental Instruction (SI) showed an improvement in their grades compared to those who did not attend SI sessions. During the first year SI was introduced, SI students earned passing grades at a much higher rate than non-participants.

Table 8: Grades of SI Students vs. Non-SI students, Fall 2005

BIOL 1107					
Grade	# SI	Non SI		% SI	% Non SI
A	6	1	Successful	77.78%	54.17%
B	7	5			
C	8	7			
D	1	6	Unsuccessful	22.22%	45.83%
F	3	4			
W	2	1			
Total	27	24	Total	100.00%	100.00%
CHEM 1211					
Grade	SI	Non SI		% SI	% Non SI
A	2	1	Successful	48.57%	26.09%
B	7	2			
C	8	3			
D	5	0	Unsuccessful	51.43%	73.91%
F	7	6			
W	6	11			
	35	23	Total	100.00%	100.00%
MATH 1101					
Grade	SI	Non SI		% SI	% Non SI
A	1	2	Successful	72.73%	59.09%
B	3	6			
C	4	5			
D	1	2	Unsuccessful	27.27%	40.91%
F	0	2			
W	2	5			
	11	22	Total	100.00%	100.00%

NOTE: More sections of SI have been added each year and the results were tracked at the end of each semester. Typically, the grades for those students taking SI were better than those for the students who did not.

Results for Theme Three: Advising and Mentoring: Successfully accomplished objectives included the creation and revision of an online advisement manual; increased usage of advising tools such as AdvisorTrac; the development and implementation of an advisement survey; a training plan for new faculty; better provision of information about advisement to students; an improved and expanded learning community program; and a faculty mentoring program for at-risk students. The advisement manual is posted on the Provost's website and is updated regularly. Almost all faculty and staff are using AdvisorTrac to schedule appointments and to keep electronic records. All students are required to meet with their advisor at least twice a year and are unable to register until they have completed an advisement session. Each department has a training plan in place for new faculty members. The learning community program now provides students with three options: a themed set of courses with a Freshmen Year Experience (FYE) course as its anchor, a paired cluster of courses, or a FYE course. The mentoring

program has changed over the years, but currently all first-time, full-time freshmen are provided a faculty mentor.

The advisement survey shows that students are generally satisfied with their advisors (see Table 9). Most students would recommend their advisor to others and feel that they are being informed about careers, policies, and campus resources.

Table 9: Sample Results from the CSU Advisement Survey (in Percents; N = approx. 850)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A
2.22 helped me to select courses that met my academic needs						
2007	51	27	9	3	2	5
2008	52	24	8	3	4	7
2009	55	27	7	3	2	5
2.23 knowledgeable about campus resources; i.e. Career Services, Center for Academic Success, Financial Aid, Registrar						
2007	33	21	18	9	6	12
2008	37	19	16	7	5	13
2009	40	20	18	8	2	11
2.27 helped make my advising experience worthwhile						
2007	53	21	10	5	4	5
2008	55	20	10	3	4	5
2009	59	23	11	2	2	3
2.28 is a person I would recommend to other students						
2007	54	20	11	6	4	4
2008	56	18	11	3	5	4
2009	60	20	11	3	3	2

A survey has also been administered to students enrolled in the learning community program (see Table 10). The results from the 2007 survey indicate that most students taking the FYE course believe that the learning communities help to keep student in school and connect them to campus life and campus resources. Students who were enrolled in the learning communities that year were retained at a 6 percent higher rate than those who were not.

Table 10: 2007 Learning Community Survey Results

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree
This semester, I received helpful information about academic services	42%	41%
Faculty mentors are helpful	29%	33%
Peer mentors are helpful	29%	26%
It was easy to find study partners	36%	22%
Learning communities are beneficial	42%	23%
Having an instructor from my discipline during the first semester is important	36%	22%

CSU 1022 helps students stay in school	27%	21%
--	-----	-----

This survey compared students enrolled in the learning community program to students enrolled in a control group. On most questions, the results from the learning community students were more positive than those obtained from the control group. Learning community students were more knowledgeable about campus services; reported meeting with faculty, advisors and staff; and said they missed fewer classes. However, learning community students stated that they were more likely to change majors or transfer than the control group. The reasons for these results are unclear, but may be due to the increased exposure to available options experienced by learning community students.

Significant Changes Made to the QEP

The Implementation Committee has attempted to stay true to the intent of the original plan while coping with the realities of implementing such a complex project. The one major change to the QEP is that the original focus on enhancing the environment supporting learning was supplemented with a stronger focus on enhancing student learning outcomes. Thus, the Implementation Committee spent a considerable amount of time evaluating the QEP and the state of assessment practices at CSU. There was concern about the consequences of failing to follow-through on all of the original themes and so the result of the Committee's evaluation was a decision to continue to try to accomplish all of the original goals of the QEP while adding an enhanced focus on student learning outcomes.

Changes to the QEP since its inception have provided the impetus for a number of significant efforts:

- A new Director for the Center for Instructional Development was hired who had expertise in the assessment of learning.
- Progress has been made to ensure that all departments are assessing measurable student learning outcomes in their majors and using the results for targeted improvements.
- Enhancements have been made in the assessment of student learning in general education. The Educational Testing Service's Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) was given to a group of graduating seniors to assess their progress in the University-wide general education outcomes after completion of their upper division major programs. MAPP subscale score results in Spring 2010 were 113.47 for Critical Thinking (above the test average of 112.71) and 115.11 for Writing (very close to the test average of 115.35). These results were two to three points higher than for the Spring 2008 & Spring 2009 MAPP results for rising juniors.

Conclusion

Clayton State University's QEP was an ambitious attempt to help students to be more successful by implementing an array of policies and programs aimed at enhancing the learning environment. Forty-one targets were established and ninety-one quantitative outcomes were measured over time. Most of the original targets were reached and progress has been made toward reaching all of the original goals. QEP implementation was a campus-wide effort with many units involved in collecting data, the culture of assessment was strengthened. The academic departments have developed more refined means of assessing student learning and are using those results for improvement. Admittedly, CSU's overly ambitious QEP lacks the focus characterizing more recent efforts, but it is also true that the effort has yielded many positive benefits for student learning as detailed in this report. The QEP brought together faculty and staff from across the campus to discuss student learning and enabled them to create an environment that more effectively supports learning. As CSU continues to refine its assessment practices, it is clear that the QEP provided the impetus for faculty to use more active, student centered teaching strategies and for all departments to evaluate their programs and assessment practices to ensure an appropriate focus on student learning and improvement.