

**Assessment of CUSP II – Goal 1  
Social Justice and Equity**

**Progress Report  
Spring 2007**

**Committee Members:**

Linda Buckley, Gene Chelberg, Caran Colvin, Charlotte Ferretti, Barbara Holzman, Mary Beth Love, Jake Perea, Amy Smith, Kasra Vazarghani, Rob Williams, Nancy Wylie

**Goal 1**

*San Francisco State University demonstrates commitment to its core values of equity and social justice through the diversity of its students and employees, the content and delivery of its academic programs and support systems, and the opportunities for both campus and external constituencies to engage in meaningful discourse and activity.*

**Objectives:**

1. SFSU facilitates teaching, learning, and work experiences among students, faculty, and staff that promote equity and social justice within a respectful and safe environment.
2. SFSU facilitates understanding and appreciation of human diversity expressed in the world's rich array of cultures, languages, religions, intellectual and political perspectives, ethnic and racial backgrounds, and disability, gender, and sexual identities and experiences.
3. SFSU develops the cultural and professional skills students and employees need to participate as informed, responsible, and active members of diverse communities at levels from local to global.
4. SFSU promotes a sense of intragroup and intergroup understanding, pride, and community.

## Recommendations

### **Recommendations Requiring Additional Resources**

1. A task force should be formed to determine how to bring together and coordinate the various campus functions and activities regarding social justice and equity.
2. An annual inventory and assessment of the campus activities with regard to social justice and equity should be initiated.
3. An academic requirement should be instituted that would prepare students to analyze and understand issues of equity and social justice.
4. A program should be developed for first generation college students containing a peer advising and mentoring component with training and oversight by faculty using the trainer of trainers model.
5. An event hosted by Academic Affairs should be staged each year (such as a mini-conference or symposium) in which faculty can showcase research and projects that are related to issues of social justice.
6. The Colleges should encourage regular discussions at the college level of current “hot button” issues. Deans should bring forward to the Academic Affairs Council an annual discussion of the emerging issues for consideration across the colleges to create an institutional awareness of best practices and on-going needs. The Academic Senate should engage in the same sort of annual discussion.

## **Recommendations Requiring Few Additional Resources**

1. During new student orientations, Undergraduate Studies should develop a workshop to inform students of the pluralistic character of the SF State campus and the expectation for developing the competencies and leadership skills necessary to function effectively in a diverse environment.
2. The Faculty Awards Committee should create an awards program for equity and social justice. This award will be coordinated with the annual showcase of research and projects on issues of social justice.
3. The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development and Faculty Affairs should be responsible for developing an intercultural/cross-cultural workshop which will be provided to chairs and deans and will be responsive to the issues that emerge from the annual discussions of hot button issues that occur at the college level.
4. The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development will be responsible for a workshop for chairs to sensitize them to the hidden challenges of a diverse faculty and student body.
5. Academic deans, department chairs, and RTP committees should be encouraged to recognize in the RTP process the value of community based efforts that have an impact on equity and social justice.

**Progress Report**  
**2006 - 2007**

**Introduction**

The strategic goal on social justice and equity represents the signature value of the San Francisco State University campus culture. This value has evolved out of a long history of social activism which has become our campus heritage. Realizing that social justice and equity are ideals that we may never fully realize, we nonetheless remain committed to the pursuit of these ideals in our classrooms and in our scholarship whenever this is possible and appropriate. Corollary to this ideal is the belief that diversity is a strength and that diversity and pluralism create opportunities.

As educators, we are committed to a non-tolerance policy on any acts of prejudice and discrimination on campus and to increasing the competencies that enable our campus community to interact effectively in a diverse environment. As scholars, we are committed to supporting research and activities that address issues of structural and social inequality in our community and globally. We are also committed as community to the hard work of continual self-reflection in order to avoid the dangers of politically correct authoritarianism. We realize that this goal invites difficult dialogs. However, by encouraging difficult discussion, we create the possibility for growth and understanding.

Our experience, evidence, and quantitative data show that this goal represents a core value of the University community. Over 100 courses offered in the curricula deal specifically with issues of equity and social justice. Thirteen full departmental curricula deal directly with these issues and many more deal indirectly with the issues. There are 15 centers/institutes<sup>1</sup> that promote equity and social justice, and 79% of the faculty surveyed indicate that they embed issues of diversity and social justice in their syllabi. It is clear from our assessment that this value is instilled in the SFSU sense of self.

---

<sup>1</sup> These include the Center for Integration and Improvement of Journalism; the Center for School Reform and Collaboration; the Cesar E. Chavez Institute; Community Health Works; the Community Involvement Center; the Institute on Disability; the Institute on Sexuality, Inequality, and Health; the Marian Wright Edelman Institute for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families; the MESA Engineering Program; the Office of Community Service Learning; the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute; the Pacific Leadership Institute; the Public Research Institute; and Whirlwind Wheelchair International.

### A Diverse Campus

It is also apparent from our assessment that the campus has made great strides over the past five years in increasing the diversity among campus employee constituencies. The percentage of tenure/ tenure-track faculty from underrepresented groups has increased by 4% over the past 5 years and is 6% higher than the CSU percentage. The percentage of administrators who are from underrepresented groups has increased by 7% over the past five years and the percentage of staff has increased by 5% on this measure over the same time period. While most campuses appear to be struggling to increase faculty and staff diversity, SFSU is doing well.

Student diversity among undergraduate students has increased as well by 4% over the five years. And while diversity in the graduate student population is strong in the Asian groups, it lags significantly behind the CSU system numbers for African-Americans and Chicano/Latinos. The distribution of numbers within these groups is probably partially due to the geographical distribution of ethnic groups in northern California. In the Bay Area the percentage of Asians is higher while the percentage of African- Americans and Latinos is relatively lower than is found in other northern California communities. In addition, the absence of strong financial support for graduate students at SFSU compared to many private institutions may also be a factor. Well-qualified students from underrepresented groups can usually count on generous support from private institutions.

### Student Competencies and Faculty Research

If we were only concerned with the numbers that reflect campus diversity, we might conclude that we have achieved our goal, or that we, at least, are on the way to achieving the goal. We should certainly celebrate these gains, and remain vigilant about maintaining a diverse community. However, the objectives of this goal focus more on developing competencies for promoting social justice and equity, as well as developing intercultural skills. Some work along these lines is in progress. For example, as we have already noted, a large number of courses that deal specifically with issues of equity and social justice are currently offered. In addition, six departments have explicit student learning outcomes for social justice, and 54% of faculty surveyed say they reinforce ideals of diversity and social justice in their classes, monthly or more.

Moreover, there are many research efforts that address issues of social justice and equity. The Health Equity Initiative is one of the most prominent, where social justice extends out of a socially engaged and politically minded sensibility. This sensibility also includes the Center for Civic and Community Engagement, where students participate in grounded, applied work that combines classroom theory with daily, hands-on application to issues of access and equity. Another example is the study on Supplemental Instruction by the Secondary Education Office (SEO) in the College of Science and Engineering, which has shown a significant positive impact in terms of retention rates and a variety of other factors as a result of supplemental instruction in courses with historically high failure rates.

All of our research indicates that a great amount of work is going on across campus independent of others or any organizing infrastructure. This fact in itself indicates the strong commitment that the campus has, in general, for this goal. The disadvantage of this decentralized approach is the difficulty it presents in forming a comprehensive picture of all that is happening, exactly where it's happening and more importantly where it could be happening but isn't and perhaps why it isn't. We will need to track the data across time to determine whether or not the efforts among faculty are increasing. We will also need to become more intentional with regard to realizing the student learning outcomes that are suggested in this goal. Currently, there is no GE or graduation requirement that would ensure the learning proposed in this goal. In the recent external review of graduation requirements, the consultants suggested in their exit presentation that if this goal represents one of our institutional core values, then we should consider incorporating it into the GE or explicitly requiring it as a graduation requirement. This is an issue that the committee on graduation requirements should consider.

#### Institutional Support for Social Justice/Equity

At this point, our research indicates that we need to expand our efforts beyond the numbers and beyond the numerous independent projects and efforts that are found throughout the University community with regard to extending the competencies of students, faculty, and staff. Currently, there is almost no intercultural or diversity training on campus among any of the campus constituencies. No focused attention is being dedicated to mentoring students from

underrepresented groups and first generation students. No central place exists for gathering data regarding faculty and student activities and scholarship around issues of social justice and equity, and we do not have a way of showcasing the enormous work that is currently underway. The fact that these activities are so pervasive on campus is a testimony to the depth of commitment to the goal. However, we now need to organize campus efforts in a more strategic and intentional manner in order to achieve some of the more challenging aspects of this goal.

The campus made progress in this area between 2000 and 2004 in terms of infrastructure planning through the development of the Office of Human Relations (OHR). In response to WASC recommendations and according to the CUSP I strategic plan, it was determined that each department would develop affirmative action/diversity strategies for their particular needs. Each of the four divisions did develop a diversity plan. However, only a few departments developed plans, and none of them were actually implemented. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the compliance orientation of the office became a major barrier in gaining faculty acceptance and involvement. The OHR was disbanded in 2004, and the work of this office was largely abandoned. While the campus has become increasingly diverse, there is little administrative support for dealing with and understanding the challenges of our diversity. The only diversity/intercultural training recently available for staff, faculty, students, or administration occurred once among staff of the Cesar Chavez Student Center.

The entire CSU Systems seems to have fallen into the same trend in decreasing attention to diversity and equity issues. A survey of the system websites shows that only five CSU campuses are providing training through Human Resources or other offices. There were extenuating circumstances that led to the present status of these activities. With the passage of Proposition 209, the focus on affirmative action and diversity was substantially curtailed. However, as stated above, we no longer regularly offer this training through any office to the University community. Our current lack of attention in this area does not seem to be in keeping with this strategic planning goal.

In addition, the ombudsman function of OHR has been decentralized to a variety of individuals in separate units (usually the associate deans), so there is now no office that oversees this

function. As a result, students do not have a clearly defined path for registering a complaint. In addition, records are not kept centrally of the complaints, so it's difficult to know how many complaints we have or trends in the types of complaints. It may be that it looks as though we don't have a problem when in fact, there might be a problem we are unaware of simply because no one is counting. The ultimate receiver of complaints when they escalate is now University Counsel. However, this arrangement could potentially constitute a conflict of interest since the Counsel's primary responsibility lies in protecting the interests of the University, not responding to complaints against the University.

We believe that an administrative unit or an RSO might be a way of bringing together the teaching, research, and service functions and activities that are encompassed in this goal. Such a place would help reify this goal, creating greater visibility and integration of the activities, and thus greater legitimacy as a strategic focus. The umbrella organizational structure of an RSO would emphasize the academic nature of the goal and would include a group to gather data regarding the academic activities encompassed by the goal. In addition, the RSO would house the service related activities such as EOP, Safe Place, and DPRC, as well as the diversity and intercultural training efforts. We are aware that the attempts to create such a "place" have not been successful in the past. Before making such a recommendation, we believe that a task force to study the possible alternatives for aggregating all our campus efforts should be initiated. But generally speaking, it seems important to address the need for a "place" because the increased diversity of the community brings a greater need to address the challenges of difference on many levels. By priding ourselves on our diversity, we have a responsibility to understand its many consequences.

### Conclusion

The examination of the campus activities around this goal is certainly important for ourselves, but it is also important for external accreditation purposes. WASC expects the University to engage in reflection and planning processes which assess its strategic priorities. The institution is expected to monitor the effectiveness of the implementation of its plan and to revise it appropriately. Moreover, the University is expected to inform planning processes with appropriately defined and analyzed quantitative and qualitative data, and to include consideration

of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning. In sum, WASC will be asking to what extent planning efforts lead to priorities and clear institutional implementation of activities. Based on our assessment of the implementation of Goal 1 and on the WASC imperative to conduct sustained, evidence-based activities to accomplish its educational objectives, we offer the recommendations listed at the beginning of the Year-End Report.

# **APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A

Assessment Data on Goal 1 Outcomes

**Outcome 1: There will be increased diversity in both the hiring pools and the employment and advancement of administrators, faculty, and staff capable of promoting an understanding of equity and social justice.**

- With regard to tenure/tenure track faculty, since 2002 the percentage of white T/TT faculty has decreased from 70% to 66%, while the percentage of non-whites has increased from 30% in 2002 to 34% in 2005.

In addition, we are more diverse than the CSU system in general:

	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-white</u>
CSU	72%	28%
SFSU	66%	34%

- With regard to MPPs, SFSU has made considerable progress over the past four years. In 2002 there were 69% white and 31% non-white administrators. In 2005, there were 61% white and 38% non-white.
- With regard to staff, in 2002 49% was white and 51% non-white, while in 2005 there were 41% white and 56% non-white.

Assessment

SF State has made significant progress in increasing the diversity of administrators, faculty, and staff over the past four years.

**Outcome 2: Faculty, staff, and administrators will participate increasingly in training activities to support teaching, research, and service related to equity, diversity, and social justice.**

- The OHR was developed in 2000 and between 2000 and 2004 all divisions developed diversity plans. A few departments developed diversity plans, but none of these were ever implemented
- The OHR was disbanded in 2004
- The only diversity/intercultural training currently available for staff, faculty, students, or administration occurs among staff of the Cesar Chavez Student center.
- The responsibility for student complaints has been decentralized. The ultimate person responsible for this function is University Counsel

### Assessment

The campus activities related to this outcome have decreased precipitously since 2004. Our current lack of attention in this area does not seem to be in keeping with this strategic planning goal.

### **Outcome 3: The ideals of equity, diversity, and social justice will be increasingly incorporated into academic curricula, student and faculty research, and co-curricular activities.**

- According to a survey of faculty, 54% reinforce ideals of diversity and social justice in their classes, monthly or more.
- 79% of faculty embeds ideals of diversity and social justice into their syllabi.
- The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development offers materials and workshops for faculty on diversity and on culturally responsive pedagogy. CTFD and DPRC are also involved in the EnACT project to ensure curricular access to all students.
- Six departments have explicit student learning outcomes for social justice.
- A conservative counting process indicates that there are 108 courses that deal specifically with issues of equity and social justice.
- There are many research efforts that address issues of social justice and equity. The Health Equity Initiative is one of the most prominent. Another example is the study on Supplemental Instruction by the Secondary Education Office (SEO) in the College of Science and Engineering.

- Focus groups with constituents from across campus indicate a great interest and commitment to this goal.

### Assessment

All of our research indicates that a great amount of work is going on across campus independent of others or any organizing infrastructure. This fact in itself indicates the strong commitment that the campus in general has for this goal. The disadvantage of this decentralized approach is that it's hard to get a comprehensive picture of all that is happening, exactly where it's happening and more importantly where it could be happening but isn't and perhaps why it isn't.

**Outcome 4: Members of the University community will exhibit increased cultural and global competency through greater participation in cultural, ethnic, and international collaborations.**

- CUSP II Goal 1 and CUSP II Goal 4 overlap in this outcome. The strategic planning committee decided to retire this outcome from Goal 1 and allow the Goal 4 committee to research the data.

**Outcome 5: An increased number of graduates will be prepared to advocate for equity and social justice in their careers.**

- Currently, approximately 108 courses deal specifically with issues of equity and social justice.
- There are 13 full departmental curricula that deal with equity and social justice.
- There are 15 centers/institutes that promote issues of equity and social justice. These include the Center for Integration and Improvement of Journalism; the Center for School Reform and Collaboration; the Cesar E. Chavez Institute; Community Health Works; the Community Involvement Center; the Institute on Disability; the Institute on Sexuality, Inequality, and Health; the Marian Wright Edelman Institute for the Study of Children, Youth, and Families;

the MESA Engineering Program ;the Office of Community Service Learning; the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute; the Pacific Leadership Institute; the Public Research Institute; the Urban Institute; and Whirlwind Wheelchair International.

- 93 faculty responded to a request to provide a profile of their work on social justice and equity.

### Assessment

We will need to track the data across time to determine whether or not the efforts are increasing. In the recent external review of graduation requirements, the consultants strongly recommended that if this goal represents one of our institutional core values, then it needs to become incorporated into the GE or explicitly required as a graduation requirement.

### **Outcome 6: Students will exhibit an increased capacity to interact, learn, develop, and thrive within the complexities of SFSU's diverse community.**

- Indicators for this outcome:
  - PRI Study – We have data from the PRI Human Relations Survey from 1996 to 2006. The data is gathered on a year basis. However, it has not been analyzed over time. This is the best data we have on this issue.

### Assessment

We need to begin to collect and analyze the PRI data and to develop a portfolio of indirect evidence on this outcome. At present, we do not have enough data to determine the status of this outcome.

## APPENDIX B

### Assessment of Strategies for Goal 1

**Strategy 1: Provide resources to the University community for training programs and professional development regarding diversity, equity, and social justice.**

#### Assessment

The Office of Human Relations had plans to implement such programs. However, when that office closed in 2004, those plans were never realized.

**Strategy 2: Provide leadership to implement diversity plans for the recruitment, hiring, and retention of faculty and staff.**

#### Assessment

Diversity plans were developed by each division and by a few departments. When that office closed in 2004, an impressive body of work had been accomplished with regard to strategic planning for equity and diversity. However, those plans were never implemented.

**Strategy 3: Provide opportunities for faculty to incorporate equity and social justice issues in teaching and learning.**

#### Assessment

It is not completely clear how faculty could be provided with “opportunities” for incorporating these issues in their teaching. The language of this strategy should probably be reconsidered. The CTFD does currently provide workshops on culturally sensitive pedagogy.

**Strategy 4: Increase efforts to recruit, retain, and graduate students from underrepresented groups.**

- The Study on Supplemental Instruction through the Secondary Education Program in the College of Science and Engineering has been successful in retaining and graduating students from underrepresented groups.
- SFSU awards the most undergraduate business degrees to Asian –Americans of colleges and universities nationwide. (US Dept. of Education)

- There are many, many efforts by individual faculty members, some of which are captured in the University data from Ellen Griffin in the Office of Public Affairs.

#### Assessment

Much work is being carried on by individual faculty members. Very little work is coordinated, and we are not sure we actually have a clear picture of all that is happening.

#### **Strategy 5: Develop and provide opportunities for ethnic, cultural, and international collaboration.**

#### Assessment

This strategy will be incorporated into the work of Goal 4 on Internationalizing the University.

#### **Strategy 6: Develop activities that promote civil discourse, understanding, and pride within and among groups.**

- This issue was one of the topics discussed at the 2006 spring Provost's retreat
- As a follow-on to that retreat, the Academic Senate and the President held a town hall meeting on this issue at the end of Spring 2006.
- This issue was a topic at the University Retreat in January 2007
- This issue was a topic at the University-wide meeting on Access to Excellence
- This issue was a topic of discussion at the Academic Senate in the context of recent collective bargaining negotiations

#### Assessment

In the past year, much discussion has occurred to satisfy this strategy. All of these activities, however, have occurred at the university-level. It is impossible to know whether or not activities are occurring and the program and department level.