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<td>(Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement) The final writing requirement for all SF State graduates.</td>
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<tr>
<td>IT</td>
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<tr>
<td>ITL</td>
<td>(CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEPET</td>
<td>(Junior English Proficiency Test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>(Learning Assistance Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>(College of Liberal and Creative Arts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>(Liberal Education &amp; America’s Promise) An AAC&amp;U initiative on liberal education in the 21st Century.</td>
</tr>
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<td>NSSE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORSP</td>
<td>(Office of Research and Sponsored Programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACE</td>
<td>(School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>(Professional Development Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>(Philosophy Department)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.I.s</td>
<td>Principal investigators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse</td>
<td>SF State survey of students administered every semester during online registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP</td>
<td>(Retention, Tenure, and Promotion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAEM</td>
<td>(Student Affairs/Enrollment Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICC</td>
<td>(Student Involvement and Career Center)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS</td>
<td>(Student Information Management System) The SF State database system that manages student data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLI  (Student Life Initiative)
SOS  (Student Outreach Services)
SOTA (School of the Arts)
SoTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning)
SSGI (Student Success and Graduation Initiative)
STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics)
TTD  (Time to Degree)
UC  (University of California)
UPAC (University Planning and Advisory Council) Strategic Planning Group initiated by President Corrigan in Fall 2009.
URM  (Underrepresented Minority)
WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) The regional accrediting association for the Western United States.
WAC/WID (Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Discipline) A writing approach that infuses writing into the genre of specific disciplines such as scientific writing.
## WASC EER List of Appendices

### EER Report Appendices

- Appendix 01: SFSU Institutional Stipulation Agreement
- Appendix 02: Mission Statement
- Appendix 03: EER Strategic Plan
- Appendix 04: EER Communication Outreach Activities
- Appendix 05: Summary of Revised WASC CPR Recommendations
- Appendix 06: EER Standards and Criteria for Review
- Appendix 07: EER Committee Structure
- Appendix 08: SFSU Academic Program Chart and Bulletin
- Appendix 09: Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- Appendix 10: Off-Campus and Distance Education Degrees and Programs
- Appendix 11: WASC Summary Data
- Appendix 13: Index of Required Data Sets
- Appendix 14: EER Databook 2011
- Appendix 15: SFSU CPR WASC Visiting Team Report 5/17/11
- Appendix 16: Highlights of Recent Initiatives to Build Fundraising Capacity
- Appendix 17: Baccalaureate Degree Outcomes

### Essay 1 Appendices

**Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement**

- Appendix A: EER Civic Engagement Report
- Appendix B: EER Social Justice and Equity Report
- Appendix C: ICCE Marketing Plan
- Appendix D: Active Social Justice and Equity Awards by Unit
- Appendix E: CHHS Vision Statement on Scholarship
- Appendix F: PACE RTP Proposal
- Appendix G: Courses with Explicit-Embedded Social Justice Content in Titles-Descriptions
- Appendix H: Social Justice and Equity Forum Invitation and Agenda

### Essay 2 Appendices

**Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile**

- Appendix I: SFSU Student Mental Health Initiative Proposal
- Appendix J: WASC Subcommittee Report on Student Demographics
Appendix K: Learning Assistance Center Year-end Report
Appendix L: Campus Academic Resource Program Year-end Report 2011-12
Appendix M-1: Undergrad Advising Center Assessment Report 2010
Appendix M-2: Undergrad Advising Center Assessment Report 2011
Appendix N: Professional Development at SFSU PDC
Appendix O: WASC Faculty Affairs Report 2012

**Essay 3 Appendices**

**Improving Student Success in Graduation and Learning**

Appendix P: Student Success Enrollment Strategies
Appendix Q: Student Success Initiative Milestones
Appendix R: AAC&U Institute on High Impact Practices and Student Success
Appendix S-1: Report of Implementation of GE
Appendix S-2: GE Course Approval Form
Appendix T-1: International Relations GWAR Assessment Report
Appendix T-2: Philosophy GWAR Assessment Report
Appendix T-3: Sociology GWAR Assessment Report
Appendix U-1: Tanya Augsburg Liberal Studies Research
Appendix U-2: Sarah Lawrence Research
Appendix U-3: Tara Lockhart Research
Appendix V: GWAR Research Writing Across the Curriculum
Appendix V-1: Summary of Writing Assessment with HED 400
Appendix V-2: HED 400 Assessment of Student Writing
Appendix V-3: Seeding and Affording Literate Practice from 2YC to the Major
Appendix W: WASC Academic Technology Report
Appendix W-1: Huron IT Assessment Consultant Report 2012
Appendix W-2: ETAC Survey Results Presentation
Appendix X: Student Pulse Survey Fall 2012
Appendix Y: SF State Results 2010-2011 HERI Faculty Survey
Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Reflective Essays

**Essay 1: Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0 Introduction to Social Justice and Civic Engagement</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Progress on Recommendations in the Capacity and Preparatory Review</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Engaged Scholarship</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Educational Effectiveness Course Offerings and Outcomes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in the Curricula</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in Undergraduate Education</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in Graduate Education</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4 Forum on Social Justice and Equity in the Academy</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Essay 2: Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0 Changing Student Demographics</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Co-curricular Program Development</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Development of Future Student Venues</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 The Changing Faculty</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Direction of CTFD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Staff Morale</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Essay 3: Improving Student Success in Graduation and Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0 Student Success</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 General Education and the Baccalaureate Requirements</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 Implementation Progress</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2 Research and Assessment</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3 Going Forward</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Academic Technology and Operations</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.1 AT Support Services</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.2 AT Implementation Strategies</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.5 Program Review
- 3.5.1 The Sixth Cycle of Program Review 29
- 3.5.2 Academic Program Review Committee 29
- 3.5.3 Components of Program Review 30
- 3.5.4 Program Review Schedule 32
- 3.5.5 Sixth Cycle Progress 33

### 3.6 Assessment and the Assurance of Learning
- 3.6.1 Institutional Assessment 34
- 3.6.2 Academic Program Assessment 36
- 3.6.3 SF State’s Efforts to Develop General Education Assessment 37
- 3.6.4 Assessment of Co-Curricular Programs 39
- 3.6.5 Integrating Assessment in Future Planning 41
Section 1: Introduction

The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) is aligned with the Capacity and Preparatory Review: “Its primary purpose is to invite sustained engagement by the institution on the extent to which it fulfills its educational objectives. Through a process of inquiry and engagement, the Educational Effectiveness Review also is designed to enable the Commission to make a judgment about the extent to which the institution fulfills its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.” More specifically, the EER investigates efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs with a special focus on program review. It examines institutional practices for evaluating student learning and shares good practices for using educational results to improve teaching and learning. It also examines the alignment of institutional resources with activities designed to achieve the institution’s educational objectives.

In keeping with the Commission’s goal of a focused accreditation process that permits adaptation and responsiveness to institutional context and priorities, San Francisco State University elected to conduct its Capacity and Preparatory Review and its Educational Effectiveness Review with a focus on three themes:

- Social Justice and Civic Engagement
- The Changing University
- Student Success

The activities surrounding this cycle of reaccreditation for San Francisco State University began in Spring 2007 with the appointment of the WASC Steering Committee by President Robert A. Corrigan. Under the leadership of the Provost, the Steering Committee developed the SF State Institutional Proposal after an extensive self-review following the WASC guidelines in the 2001 Handbook of Accreditation. Leadership in the Educational Effectiveness Review has continued under the direction of the current Provost, Sue Rosser, and our recently appointed President, Leslie Wong. [CFR 1.3]

The first theme (Social Justice and Civic Engagement) represents two of the university’s strategic priorities, which are embedded in SF State’s culture and programs in myriad ways. [CFR 1.1] Preserving and maintaining these priorities is essential to the future of the University, and for this reason, it was chosen as a theme. The two remaining themes, The Changing University and Student Success, represent issues that are crucially important to the current context of the University. Deep engagement with these issues across the campus, both in terms of capacity and educational effectiveness, will facilitate the university’s ability to respond to current trends and needs.

Preparation of the Educational Effectiveness Review

The Educational Effectiveness Review began immediately following the March 2011 WASC Capacity and Preparatory visit. Much data had been gathered during the CPR process, and the subcommittees were able to further mine that data as they turned their attention to the educational effectiveness perspective of the themes.

Each of the subcommittees met on a regular basis during the EER. Some of the subcommittee groups are ongoing with long histories of campus involvement, while others are relatively new. For example, the subcommittee that focused on writing, the Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP),

---

began many years ago and will continue its work long after the WASC review has been completed. Campus involvement in this committee is deep and wide and reflects the university’s commitment to writing as an institutional priority. Similarly, the Baccalaureate Requirements Committee (BRC) was formed in the fall of 2011 as a part of the Implementation of the new General Education (GE) program. The work of the many subcommittees of BRC will continue over the next two years as the new GE package is implemented. During the CPR review, a specific subcommittee studied graduation and retention. However, for the EER this work was subsumed under the Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI). SSGI began its work in 2009 in response to the CSU system-wide mandate to improve graduation rates. The initiative will continue, as required by the CSU system, until 2015. However, the work of this group will gradually be absorbed into ongoing Academic Senate and University committees so that the work on student success will continue as an integral element in the university’s commitment to learning and graduation. The University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee (UAAAC) and the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) are groups that have existed for many decades. They are composed of both faculty and administrators who jointly oversee and take responsibility for academic program assessment and academic program review.

Human Resources, Safety, & Risk Management (HR) and the Dean of Faculty Affairs handled the EER issues related to faculty and staff. Staff issues have been incorporated into the ongoing training and research of HR, while the Dean of Faculty Affairs, as this report will show, involved dozens of faculty in surveys and focus groups. Similarly, the Division of Student Affairs has developed a wide variety of permanent initiatives and programs in response to the changing student demographics, which were highlighted in the CPR report. The activities around Civic Engagement have drawn on the organization and expertise of the Institute of Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE), which has been moved within the School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE) in the College of Health and Social Sciences (HSS). These changes are a result of the new university organization and have served to embed the institute more directly within the academic programs of the University. We believe the change in infrastructure will result in greater educational effectiveness of all the programs and services offered by ICCE. In addition, the work on Civic Engagement and Social Justice has been incorporated as a required element of the program review self-study. In short, all of the WASC inquiry for this review has been integrated into the university’s infrastructure in ways that will sustain its impact on educational effectiveness in years to come. [CFR 3.8, 4.1]

The Steering Committee was composed of the subcommittee chairs and a few others who have been a part of the review since the WASC SF State process began five years ago. We met monthly over the past year and a half to share progress and solicit advice from one another. Our institution has been deeply affected by the budget cuts that have occurred over the past five years; however, we believe you will find much good work going on here despite the economic downturn. We are no less committed to our mission and values than we were when the budget was more aligned with campus needs. Our level of scholarship has increased. Our active commitment to understanding how students learn and making sure they graduate has significantly improved over the past five years, even as the budget has tightened. In short, the WASC review has given us the opportunity to aggregate the evidence and work that is ongoing in many areas across the campus and to reflect on how we can continue to offer both access and excellence to our students.
Essay 1: Demonstrating Commitment to Social Justice and Civic Engagement

Higher education exists in the United States as a public trust and a public good. It is linked to the improvement of individuals, groups, and society as a whole. It provides the basis for conserving and transmitting the values of society and for reflecting on and identifying needed areas of change. Through research, scholarship, and creative activity, institutions of higher education also promote the value of discovery and learning. In offering educational programs, institutions prepare their graduates for productive and meaningful lives as citizens and members of society.

WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001

1.0 Introduction to Social Justice and Civic Engagement

The preparation of students for meaningful lives as engaged citizens can only be accomplished by an institution dedicated to this purpose. As stated in the WASC Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR), San Francisco State has a proven history of and strong commitment to promoting the values of social justice and civic engagement. Within the WASC Accreditation Review process, the centrality of social justice and civic engagement to the mission of the university was viewed as so significant that it became a theme around which the self evaluation was constructed. During the CPR, subcommittees were formed to specifically address the capacity of the University to sustain its mission under the new environment imposed by changing faculty and student demographics along with a statewide budget crisis with tremendous impact on public higher education. This essay responds to issues raised in the CPR regarding the future of these strategic priorities, and it also reports on the EER issues of curricula, policy, scholarly and creative activities, student learning, and the overall student experience as these issues relate to Social Justice and Civic Engagement. (See Appendix A: EER Civic Engagement Report, Appendix B: EER Social Justice and Equity Report.)

1.1 Progress on Recommendations in the Capacity and Preparatory Review

The WASC CPR final report notes the importance of these two strategic priorities, and also their differing status in the minds of students and faculty.

Overall, SFSU can indeed claim that social justice is part of its DNA. The evidence is pervasive throughout the campus community. The campus recognizes that it is a value that cannot be taken for granted. The EER plans lay out work that the campus feels needs to be accomplished for social justice to remain a defining characteristic of the SFSU culture. Civic engagement, on the other hand, while also prevalent in the culture of SFSU, is not as clearly defined and understood by all members of the campus. SFSU understands what must be done to bring civic engagement to the level of social justice. (Appendix 15: SFSU CPR WASC Visiting Team Report 5/17/11, pages 10-11.)

The issue of defining both of these values has been the subject of much discussion on campus over the past four years. While the WASC CPR team suggested that social justice is well defined in the SF State psyche, the university’s CPR report actually recommends the need to define this value. The discussion over this issue continued into the EER review. In the end, most of the university community concluded that it wasn’t really possible to define social justice in a way that promoted this
strategic priority and cultural value. Rather than creating artificial and exclusionary definitions of social justice and equity, SF State, over the course of the EER review, created opportunities for the campus community to identify, celebrate and refine the university’s collective understanding of how social justice and equity are infused throughout the areas of scholarship, teaching, curricula, and service. These opportunities included a forum on social justice and equity in the academy, a review of externally funded projects, an assessment of current course offerings, a review of institutional assessment data, and an evaluation of the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review.

In the case of civic engagement, on the other hand, it is interesting to note that the institution seems to be recognized for this value more widely outside the campus than internally. For example, on March 11, 2012 this commitment was again recognized by the Corporation for National and Community Service by naming SF State to the 2012 President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll with Distinction for the fifth time. The Honor Roll “recognizes higher education institutions that reflect the values of exemplary community service and achieve meaningful outcomes in their communities … and (their) commitment to service and civic engagement.” ² Nonetheless, the EER team agreed that raising awareness would be a primary area of focus for the EER Review, along with an examination of scholarship and creative activities, learning outcomes, and curricula.

The WASC CPR visiting team advised that a task force be created to recommend how to increase awareness of civic engagement opportunities for students. [CFR 1.2, 2.2] It grew out of a survey and focus groups of university students that established that many did not know where to find information on opportunities to engage with community. The Institute for Civic and Community Engagement (ICCE), working with faculty from multiple departments and colleges, undertook to address this issue by constructing a “marketing plan” for students that was developed in 2011 and is now well underway. (See Appendix C: ICCE Marketing Plan.) The plan has multiple goals, including:

- Increasing awareness about opportunities provided by the Institute for Civic and Community Engagement and the Community Service Learning (CSL) program among SF State students and faculty.
- Increasing the number of community engaged students by 5% over two years.
- Increasing faculty participation in CSL course designation by 5% over two years.
- Establishing communication partnerships with campus offices that can help reach our targeted audiences.
- Increasing volunteer involvement from student groups by 5% over two years.

The implementation involved multiple methods. The full list of activities is provided in Appendix C. Here we highlight several that have been initiated.

**Annual Leadership Symposium** – In Fall 2011, ICCE staff took part in the campus annual Student Leadership Symposium hosted by the Student Involvement and Career Center. More than 400 students attended sessions conducted by staff on opportunities to engage through educational and co-curricular activities.

**Enhanced Use of Social Media** – The ICCE website was redesigned to include a Facebook page (http://www.facebook.com/sfsu.icce) and a YouTube video on the value of the service learning experience (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZtIBlAIZWXg&lr=1&feature=mhee).

**On Campus Non-profit Fair** – In Spring 2012 the Institute sponsored a Non-profit Fair inviting dozens of community-based organizations and civic offices to come to campus and recruit student
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² President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, http://www.nationalservice.gov/about/initiatives honor roll.asp
volunteers. This year 66 organizations attended the two-day event held on the campus quad. The fair attracted 1,420 students and 920 signed up to volunteer in the community. [CFR 2.5]

**Move to Campus** – In Spring 2012, ICCE moved its offices from its off-campus site in Daly City to a central location within the College of Health and Social Sciences on campus. The move created additional visibility and direct contact with students in ways that were difficult to support in the prior location.

### 1.2 Engaged Scholarship

As the CPR report noted, a tremendous amount of engaged scholarship already occurs on campus on issues of both social justice and civic engagement. However, prior to the EER Review, the campus had not really taken an inventory of these efforts for a number of years. The values of social justice and equity are well represented amongst the externally funded projects developed by SF State faculty and staff. A review of active awards from the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs reveals that out of 468 grant projects, 43% (202 projects) include some aspect of social justice and equity in the scope of the project’s work. (See Appendix D: Active Social Justice and Equity Awards by Unit.)

Projects address social justice and equity issues such as health equity, economic justice, mental health, early childhood education, women and underrepresented students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), universal design for learning, human sexuality, foreign languages, ethnic studies, environmental health, disability access, international education, social welfare, and others. Grant projects that study, advance, and/or support social justice and equity are found throughout college and administrative units.

- Academic Affairs: 17 out of 18, or 94.4%
- College of Business: 2 out of 4, or 50%
- College of Ethnic Studies: 15 out of 15, or 100%
- College of Health and Social Sciences: 84 out of 105, or 80%
- College of Liberal and Creative Arts: 14 out of 25, or 56%
- College of Science and Engineering: 34 out of 248, or 13.7%
- Graduate College of Education: 30 out of 47, or 63.8%
- Student Affairs/Enrollment Management: 7 out of 7, or 100%

In addition to raising campus awareness about civic engagement, the CPR team also recommended that the University continue to support faculty who participate in community-engaged scholarship. Moreover, they suggested that the University should develop definitions and standards for recognizing such accomplishments. [CFR 2.8, 2.9]

A key strategy in support of social justice and civic engagement is in Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP). The EER plan indicates the RTP process should support faculty who participate in community engagement and scholarship and recommends that SFSU develop definitions and standards for recognizing such accomplishments, and that departments develop criteria in their RTP policies that allow recognition of work related to social justice and commitment to civic engagement within the existing RTP categories of teaching, professional accomplishments and growth, and service. (Appendix 15: SFSU CPR WASC Visiting Team Report 5/17/11, p. 9)

In some ways, progress on this recommendation arose serendipitously from the reorganization of the colleges of the University brought about by the budget crisis. One of the key recommendations of the University Planning Advisory Council (UPAC) was to consider ways in which the University might be “restructured and streamlined” to make better use of the funds available. As a consequence, the
eight colleges of the University were reduced to six, and departments that were housed in the two Colleges that were dissolved were redistributed into those remaining. In particular, four academic programs, Criminal Justice Studies, Environmental Studies, Public Administration, and Urban Studies and Planning, formerly housed in the now defunct College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, were relocated within the College of Health and Social Sciences (CHSS). In addition, in response to a further recommendation by UPAC concerning the location of institutes, ICCE was also relocated within CHSS.

In Spring 2011 a proposal arose among newly transplanted faculty to combine ICCE and these four academic programs into a single administrative unit, and in Fall 2011 this was accomplished with the creation of the School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement (PACE). Subsequently, two significant activities have taken place in parallel within the College and the School regarding the definition of scholarship and its recognition within RTP.

The Scholarship Task Force report, *A Collective Vision for Scholarship in the New College (Appendix E: CHHS Vision Statement on Scholarship)*, is still in draft form, but several of its tenets are already taking shape. Most importantly, the fundamental vision of scholarship within the college is described as follows:

> Consistent with the social justice mission of the University, the hallmark of the College is its belief in the potential of scholarship to right a wrong – an act of intellectual advocacy to serve the public good, to wrestle with critical social problems, and to transform how individuals, communities, and institutions function – by advancing and disseminating the knowledge and practice of specific disciplines.

In addition, in delineating the values behind this vision, the document “affirms scholarship that leads to positive social change and addresses critical societal problems by advancing both knowledge and practice” and “emphasizes culturally competent and socially engaged scholarship that responds to and addresses the needs of communities, particularly those that are marginalized and underserved.” [CFR 2.8, 2.9]

In addition, PACE has begun work on its own RTP guidelines (see Appendix F: PACE RTP Proposal) that will embrace engaged scholarship. The PACE leadership team has adopted a working draft that borrows heavily from the tenure policy at Syracuse University in a commitment “to longstanding traditions of scholarship as well as evolving perspectives on scholarship … where] the role of the academy is not static and that methodologies, topics of interest, and boundaries within and between disciplines and between campus and community change over time. PACE will continue to support scholars in all of these traditional as well as emerging practices.”

**1.3 Educational Effectiveness Course Offerings and Outcomes**

**1.3.1 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in the Curricula**

To determine the penetration of social justice in campus curricula, the Social Justice subcommittee examined the content of course titles and course descriptions for the purpose of discovering the extent to which social justice and equity appear explicitly in text and the extent to which course descriptions imply the inclusion of the same.
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3 Syracuse University, Faculty Manual, Tenure Policies
This content analysis was based on course titles and descriptions listed in the 2011-2012 University Bulletin. Courses met the criteria of addressing social justice and equity in three ways:

1. The title of the course explicitly used the words “social justice,” “justice,” or “equity.”
2. The course description explicitly used the words “social justice,” “justice,” or “equity.”
3. The course description embedded issues concerning social justice and equity by indicating students would examine the following topics: fairness; access to resources caring for persons or environment; values and values clarification; ethics and morality; disparities in distribution of services and resources, concern for victims and vulnerable populations (elderly, immigrant, disabled, etc.), and concern for the underrepresented and underserved.

During the 2011-2012 academic year, 5,119 courses were listed in the Bulletin. Of all courses listed, 609 courses (11.7%) contained language indicating that social justice and/or equity was embedded in the course. The number of courses containing explicit references to social justice and/or equity in their descriptions combined with the number of course descriptions in which social justice and equity were embedded totaled 645 (12.4%) of all courses listed, as illustrated in Figure 1. (See Appendix G: Courses with Explicit or Embedded Social Justice Content in Titles-Descriptions.)

Figure 1: Percentage of All Courses Listed in the SF State Bulletin that Have Explicit and Embedded Content Addressing Social Justice and Equity

Though not evenly distributed in all colleges, courses containing content dedicated to the exploration of social justice and equity were found in all colleges. The highest percentages of courses addressing social justice and equity offered by departments are in the domains of social science and the humanities. For instance, disciplines in which over 25% of courses offered contained explicit or embedded content addressing social justice and equity included: Social Science, Race and Resistance, Africana Studies, Cinema, Labor and Employment Studies, Anthropology, Asian American Studies, Criminal Justice, Economics, Health Education, Latina/o Studies, Urban Studies and Planning, Women and Gender Studies, Political Science, History, and Social Work. There are several areas in the STEM disciplines that offer courses with explicit and/or embedded social justice and equity content, but only in one discipline, Geography, is the total percentage of such courses over 10%. The percentage of courses in STEM with explicit or embedded social justice and equity content by discipline are as follows: Biology 3.3%, Chemistry 3.0%; Computer Science 1.1%; Engineering .89%; Marine Science 3.0%. Math, Oceanography, and Physics and Science have zero percent.
Lastly, it is important to note that this report might underrepresent the extent to which the curriculum at SF State addresses social justice and equity because many course descriptions are highly generalized. There exists the possibility, for instance, that instructors of history courses integrated a great deal of material and do much to advance students’ thinking about social justice and equity without asserting in the course description that such instruction took place. Surveys of history routinely examine the human experience from political, economic, and social perspectives, with the inevitability that students will encounter narratives depicting the conflict between populations that have advantages and those that do not.

The clearinghouse for coursework that includes civic engagement is situated in the Institute for Community and Civic Engagement (ICCE), which coordinates campus service learning, collects data on faculty and student involvement, promotes faculty and student participation in civic engagement, and conducts research regarding the educational impact of these activities. Two years ago ICCE conducted an internal survey and found that SF State students enrolled in 472 course sections in which community service learning was an integrated course element. These sections enrolled a total of 8,978 students, or 38% of the total student population. Those who opted to participate in a community service learning course provided almost 500,00 hours of service. Included in this number are nearly 100,000 hours that social work students provided to hospitals, clinics, homeless shelters, and other programs. Many students earn educational awards for their stellar service. For example, during Academic Year 2008-2009, SF State placed #1 out of 89 higher education institutions in California by awarding $147,000 in Students in Service educational scholarships for performing 51,000 hours of service in their communities. [CFR 2.6, 2.7]

In addition to community service and interaction with others in the classroom and beyond, SF State has made great efforts to encourage students to vote in public elections. During 2008, for example, the voter registration efforts assisted more than 5,000 SF State students to register and vote. Student participation in voting was particularly successful. Though only 30% of freshmen voted in the federal election, 90% of seniors indicated that they had voted. The campus registration drive was repeated in
Fall 2012 for the November election, and San Francisco State (along with San Diego State) led the CSU by registering 4,060 students (http://www.dailybreeze.com/news/ed_21859136/csu-campus-groups-register-31-000-new-student). [CFR 2.6, 2.7] The success of these efforts has led to the campus becoming its own voter precinct.

To introduce students at the earliest possible moment to the concepts of social justice and community engagement, a new feature has been added to Welcome Days when students first arrive on campus for the new fall semester. In Fall 2012, students were invited to participate in one of three service projects to join on the Saturday after they were welcomed to campus:

- **San Francisco Rec and Park Team** – Join the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department clean and beautify Lake Merced! Projects include habitat restoration, weeding, trash pickup, and getting to know your backyard of Lake Merced.

- **Department of Public Works (DPW) Clean Team** – Participate in a great opportunity to improve the community you live in. Join the San Francisco Department of Public Works Clean Team to clean up the neighborhood around the San Francisco State Campus. Volunteers will work in teams to pick up litter and trash from 19th Avenue and Holloway Avenue.

- **San Francisco State Facilities and Sustainability Team** – Join in an exciting day of planting native, drought tolerant plants that provide food and habitat for bees, butterflies, birds, and other pollinators and beneficial insects. Plant to save water, increase biodiversity on campus, and beautify our surrounding environment.

Clearly, the issues of social justice and civic engagement are infused in the campus academic curricula and the co-curricular programs in ways that have an impact on both the students and the San Francisco greater community.

### 1.3.2 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in Undergraduate Education

In Fall 2010 the Academic Senate and the University President approved the recommendations of the Graduation Requirements Task Force, a project that took several years to complete. Academic departments across the campus are now proposing courses to be approved for inclusion in the revised General Education program and graduation requirements to be launched in 2014. [CFR 2.4] It is greatly significant that the new programs recognize civic learning and social justice outcomes in important ways. Under the new program, students must complete at least one course in their undergraduate education that meets student learning outcomes in each of the following areas: Social Justice (SJ), Global Perspectives (GP), American Ethnic and Racial Minorities (AE), and Environmental Sustainability (ES). In addition, the upper division requirement of the GE program is designed around nine Topical Perspectives; students will select one topic and complete three courses related to it. Of specific interest is the Topical Perspective on Social Justice and Civic Knowledge/Engagement in which “students will explore their responsibility to work toward social justice and equity by contributing purposefully to the well-being of their local communities, their nations, and the people of the world. Courses might address, but are not limited to, such subjects as social power and privilege, characteristics and dynamics of systemic oppression, economic exploitation within societies and beyond their borders, the personal and social consequences of phenomena like racism or sexism, scientific and pseudoscientific accounts of racial or gender differences, art or literature that represents or resists social injustice, liberation movements and
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political strategies aimed at eradicating injustice, freedom of the press and civic knowledge/engagement, and community activism and advocacy.” [CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.3]

Though it is too early to establish gains in educational effectiveness that will accrue with the new program, it is possible to establish baseline measures of civic learning to be compared with future student achievement once the program has been in place. To this end, the Subcommittee on Civic Engagement examined two sources of data on student learning to analyze current levels. [CFR 2.4]

The first instrument was the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). San Francisco State does well in certain NSSE categories but not so well in others. In the 2011 Survey, for example, in the area of “educational and personal growth,” the students surveyed in the First and Senior years scored highly in the civic behavior of “voting in local, state, and national elections.” (See http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/student_engagement.) Similarly, SF State does well in the area of “understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds.” Moreover, SF State was comparable to the comparison groups in the area of “contributing to the welfare of your community.” However, in the area of “participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course” the results were more mixed. Among first year students, SF State responses were considerably lower than comparable institutions in California. This is an area that deserves more research and focused effort in the future.

The second set of data that was examined was an internal survey that is conducted each semester as students register, the Student Pulse survey. The set of questions each semester can differ from previous semesters, which makes comparisons across years difficult. And because this survey is limited to SF State only, there is no opportunity to make comparisons with other institutions. Nonetheless the Pulse survey does provide an opportunity to make comparisons from the freshman to the senior year. (See http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/pulse_survey and Appendix X: Student Pulse Survey Fall 2012.)

In Spring 2012, specific questions were added to the survey concerning student commitment to social justice and civic engagement. Here we point out a few of the results. The majority of undergraduate respondents to the questions in the section about “ethical engagement” reported that they agree or strongly agree that their coursework and other campus experiences attained the goals listed in the survey. [CFR 2.4, 2.5, 2.10, 2.11] Three quarters of the respondents (75%) indicated that coursework has helped them understand ethical dimensions of decision-making and develop their own sense of values.

- Nearly seven in 10 respondents (69%) reported that courses have helped them embrace a personal responsibility to work toward social justice and equity in their community.
- Slightly more than half of the respondents (53%) indicated that courses have motivated them to do community work.

The indirect data on social justice and civic engagement clearly show that these issues are embedded in the coursework and student experience at SF State. Our task in the years to come will be to measure the impact of these experiences on learning in the assessment of the new General Education program.

1.3.3 Social Justice and Civic Engagement in Graduate Education

The Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review began in the academic year 2006-2007. The purpose of the review was to describe the achievements, needs, and recommendations of graduate programs, and to ensure the quality of graduate degrees administered by San Francisco State University. These
reviews are part of a larger effort to monitor student learning outcomes and assess the quality of all academic and co-curricular programs. The focus on graduate programs resulted from recommendations made by the 2001 WASC Report and CUSP II recommendations. [CFR 4.4]

Sixth Cycle reviews, guided by Senate Policy F05-236, called upon the faculty to conduct studies of their graduate programs with particular attention to the appropriateness of the curriculum and sustainability of the programs. The guidelines require faculty to evidence the link between stated learning outcomes and student achievements. The criteria addressed in these reports also include the program’s achievements relative to social justice, international relations, and community service. [CFR 4.6, 4.7]

In Fall 2011, there were almost 4,200 students enrolled in 67 graduate programs at SF State. At the time of this study, 28 of the 67 programs had their Sixth Cycle listed on the Academic Planning and Development website. Fifteen of those studies were selected for a content analysis that identified: (1) categories of activity, and (2) the specific evidence offered to support claims about student learning and overall departmental achievements. In the Sixth Cycle Reports, there are five broad categories of activity in which graduate programs manifest their commitment to advancing social justice and equity; these are:

1. Community outreach and liaisons for support and development of community programs
2. Curriculum and instruction that explicitly addresses matters of social justice and equity
3. Publications, conference presentations, and aesthetic works
4. Hiring process and efforts to maintain a high level of diversity in faculty
5. Admissions process and efforts to maintain a high level of diversity in student enrollment

The evidence that supported claims that the department was dedicated to promoting social justice and equity included specific references to individuals who received grants to conduct research, titles of publications, discrete course content, specific internships and programs in which students participated, and data related to student enrollment and faculty hiring. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 4.7]

**Community Outreach and Liaisons**

All programs included in this study reported that graduate students are active in the community to some degree, though two of the 15 programs indicated that the extent to which their students are able to participate in community service, internships, and other social projects is extremely limited because the majority of students are working either full- or part-time.

The community engagement projects include internships, volunteer work for ongoing programs and special projects, collaborations with external and internal agencies (such as the Institute for Community and Civic Engagement), and research. Hundreds of these are mentioned in the sample of Sixth Cycle Reports, and many of them are specifically aimed at improving the health, education, and general well being of the public. The Department of Recreation, Parks and Tourism offers examples of this practice: the Pacific Leadership Institute offers outdoor recreation and self-sufficiency education to marginalized urban youth, the Sajai Wise Kids program educates children ages 6-11 to make healthy dietary choices, and the Insieme project provides education and life-skills training to women and children who have been victims of domestic abuse. In the Department of Kinesiology,
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graduate students deliver lectures to at-risk youth in the Outreach School Program, which strives to keep children out of gangs and in school.

It is evident in the descriptions of outreach programs and community liaisons that the University’s graduate programs are proactive in seeing that students understand the social component of learning and the social implications of their learning. The descriptions reveal that programs and outreach consistently target the poor, the under-served, and the vulnerable; these populations include children in poverty, people who are incarcerated, and victims of violence, racial discrimination, sexual discrimination, and institutional neglect. [CFR 2.5]

Curriculum

Course content plays a significant role in the promotion of social justice and equity. Of the 15 programs in the study, nine described explicit course content that addresses issues of discrimination, inequitable access to resources and services, exploitation of labor, and institutional indifference to human suffering. In the Theater Arts program, students study the impact of social injustice and inequity by analyzing and performing plays that speak to the diversity of human experiences and the stories of those who have endured discrimination, poverty, institutional abuse and neglect, and social marginalization. Several programs use community service, which immerses students in communities that have acute and special needs including health care, safety, nutrition, and education as a teaching strategy.

The curricula examine not only the physical and legal implications of injustice and inequity, but the psychological as well. The Psychology Department, for example, offers a course, The Psychology of Social Justice, that examines the adverse effects of abuse and discrimination on the perception of self. The graduate program in the Department of History requires students to examine the causes and effects of discrimination, injustice, and inequity, and the program in Human Sexuality requires students to explore how the biological sciences and psychology have revolutionized society’s knowledge about the complexities of human sexual behavior and identity and what that new knowledge implies about social justice. In the Cinema Department, all theory classes address the matter of fair representation and the value of recovering marginalized voices and perspectives.

Curricula addressing social justice and equity in graduate studies also pertain to non-human populations, as illustrated by the work of the Department of Geography and Human Environmental Studies. Coursework in the graduate program explicitly requires students to examine the variables that create inequities and injustices impacting humans, animals, plants, and the ecosystem. The curriculum also requires students to explore institutional and governmental responses to these inequities and injustices.

Finally, some descriptions of curriculum include statements that reveal the mindfulness of purpose of the graduate programs themselves. In particular, as noted in the descriptions of programs found in History, International Relations, and Human Sexuality, the purpose of the curriculum is to inform and inspire students to be better citizens and better advocates of human rights.

The study demonstrates that the SF State graduate curricula provide students with significant exposure to issues of social justice and civic engagement in many fields. Our next step as an institution should be the development of institutional outcomes for these issues and the creation of benchmarks for evaluating student learning. [CFR 1.5, 2.5]
Publications and Projects

Graduate students are involved in both research and publication. At least the programs in this study noted specific scholarly work that students produced; some were conference papers, others were articles co-authored by instructors, and some were works of art and films.

Social justice and equity are both prominent themes in graduate publications. The Art Department, for instance, emphasizes in its curriculum and expectations for student work that art is a valuable and powerful medium of social criticism. The department notes: “Because artists make cultural objects, it is nearly impossible to discuss creative research without invoking cultural context. A prevalent theme, particularly in the Bay Area, concerns the questions of equity and social justice.”

Like the Art Department, the Cinema Department explicitly encourages students to explore themes of social justice and to use their medium as a means of social criticism. Students have presented their work in animation, documentary film, and other genres locally and at the International Graduate Film Conference.

In the International Relations program, scores of students have presented papers at national and international conferences and several have published articles in academic journals. The list of topics posted in the IR program’s Sixth Cycle Report includes discrimination against women, civil rights, and labor exploitation. Graduate students in History also participate in local and national conferences where their work is presented; the most frequent outlet for student manuscripts is *Ex Post Facto*, a journal dedicated to encouraging historical research and scholarship in graduate programs. [CFR 2.8, 2.9]

1.3.4 Forum on Social Justice and Equity in the Academy

One of the highlights of the WASC activities for the year was the Forum on Social Justice and Equity in the Academy. The WASC Steering Committee and the Subcommittee on Social Justice created the forum to invite the campus community to think about the current work that was being done on social justice and to consider how this value can be preserved for future generations of faculty and students.

On Friday, April 17, 2012, faculty, staff, undergraduate and graduate students, administration, and executive leadership engaged in collegial dialogues about weaving social justice and equity throughout the efforts of academic departments and disciplines. (See *Appendix H: Social Justice and Equity Forum Invitation and Agenda*.) Academic Senate Chair Pamela Vaughn and President Robert A. Corrigan welcomed forum participants. President Corrigan reminded audience members how SF State had come to hold equity and social justice as institutional values. Three panels followed these opening remarks: scholarship, teaching and service. Panelists were asked to address the following questions:

- How do/does you/your field define social justice and equity?
- How are social justice and equity manifested in your work?
- How do you assess the impact of social justice and equity in your work?
- How do/will you maintain/sustain social justice and equity initiatives?

Each panel included three faculty members and a moderator. The presentations and the discussions that followed were spirited and engaging. Faculty, staff, administration, and students participated in
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the question-and-answer period, and there seemed to be no doubt that Social Justice is alive and well at SF State and will be carried forward as a value in years to come.

The forum ended with reflections on the day by Dean Jacob E. Perea, Graduate College of Education. Dean Perea emphasized the breadth and depth of social justice and equity work being done on campus, stating that campus efforts are broadly representative, including access to education for underrepresented students, disability access, economic justice, environmentalism, and LGBTQ concerns. Additionally, he was impressed by the diversity of disciplines represented on the panels. He cautioned the audience to not lose sight of the importance of service in public higher education. [CFR 4.6, 4.7, 4.8]

This essay demonstrates the educational effectiveness of social justice and civic engagement as a value at SF State. These issues are represented in both graduate and undergraduate curricula and are included in student learning outcomes at all levels. They are also included in the criteria for reporting in the Sixth Cycle of program review, and there is much evidence represented in both student activities and student work that these values are part of the educational programs at SF State. In addition, there is enormous evidence that faculty are deeply committed to social justice and civic engagement in their teaching and in their research. The WASC review has served as a welcome opportunity to reaffirm this commitment and to ensure that these values continue as Core Commitments of the University.

The project for the University in the coming years will be to measure these values as competences at the GE level, to develop institutional outcomes at the baccalaureate and graduate levels, and to benchmark our progress in attaining our goals.

Essay 2: Facing the Challenges of a Changing Faculty and Student Profile

2.0 Changing Student Demographics

SF State has seen a dramatic shift in the last 10 years in the student population driven largely by the number of first-time freshmen arriving each fall on our campus. The freshman population grew by 63% from Fall 2002 to Fall 2012 (Fall 2002 = 2,328; Fall 2012 = 3,804). This change in the profile of new students occurred at a time when both new transfers and new graduate students held steady or declined slightly, causing the overall student body to trend younger than in previous decades when SF State was known primarily as a commuter university.

A parallel trend during this time period was a significant increase in the number of freshmen coming to the campus from outside the local region. In 1992, 80% of all freshmen came from the six-county San Francisco Bay Area. By 2011, over 50% of freshmen came from counties outside the Bay Area. More freshmen choose SF State as a result of targeted marketing to students in Southern California where the State’s largest population of high school graduates resides. The increase in out-of-area students has created a younger, more residential student body with all of the social and developmental needs that a younger population requires. [CFR 2.10]

Although it is still true that SF State enrolls many students who commute to campus while living at home with their parents or in apartments in the vicinity, our changing demographics are affecting the nature of our student body and their housing patterns. Currently, 48% of new first-year students live in campus-based housing or residence halls, and a total of 12% of all undergraduates live in campus housing. This year approximately 42% of current residents reapplied to live on campus for the 2012-
2013 academic year, compared to 37% who reapplied for on-campus housing the previous year. This increase in students choosing to live on campus is another testament to the success of recent campus initiatives to improve retention and the growing need for services and programming that will support an increasingly residential student population.

With this new, younger population, the need for additional campus support services and co-curricular activities has significantly grown. Both enrollment data and recent NSSE results reveal that SF State, while maintaining a sizable population of non-traditional students, now also has transitioned into a campus where many students work less, commute less, and are on campus for longer periods of the day and week. Campus support units have needed to reshape their identities and programs to respond to the demographic changes and serve the shifting numbers of the new student population.

Recently, Student Affairs/Enrollment Management (SAEM) restructured to focus more intentionally on the needs of our younger and more residential student population. A new Dean of Students (http://www.sfsu.edu/~life/) was designated with responsibility for leadership and student involvement, residential life, campus recreation, career services, and student conduct. In addition, the Dean serves as liaison to the Associated Students Incorporated and the Cesar Chavez Student Center. The Office of the Dean of Students has become a vibrant, coordinated unit that focuses on the developmental needs of the younger student population, while continuing to meet the needs of SF State’s traditional older student population. [CFR 2.11, 2.13]

The reopening of the award winning J. Paul Library has also helped this situation by offering a welcoming space for both socializing and study, including individual and collaborative work. The library serves as a learning space outside the classroom and offers support for student group work in the group study rooms and spaces with movable furniture and whiteboards, technology enhanced collaborative tools like the Media:Scapes, extended hour spaces that are open 24/7 until 2:00 a.m., providing students with a safe place to study and congregate. (See Section 3.4. for more details.)

### 2.1 Co-curricular Program Development

In response to the changing demographics of the institution, SF State developed and implemented several new student initiatives and programs to enhance the student experience. These initiatives include the Student Life Initiative, the Mental Health and Wellness Initiative, and the Latino Educational Progress Initiative. [CFR 2.11, 2.13] (See Appendix I: SFSU Student Mental Health Initiative Proposal.)

**Student Life Initiative** (SLI) – This initiative focuses on events, programs, and resources that promote healthy living with a focus on personal health (physical and mental), academic and career excellence, and social/conduct success. The SLI develops resources, events, and programs to enhance student life. Specifically, SLI coordinates late night social events, student marketing, student assessment, event venue review, school spirit activities and programs, and arts and cultural events. (http://www.sfsu.edu/~life)

**Mental Health and Wellness Initiative** – This initiative was created in response to a demonstrated need created to address growing mental health concerns and create a “culture of care” on campus; heighten awareness of existing mental health and wellness programs and services available to faculty, staff and students; formalize protocols across a variety of campus units; mitigate liability; and develop a branding mechanism that emphasizes mental health and wellness as a community responsibility. (http://www.sfsu.edu/~life)
Latino Educational Progress Initiative – This initiative addresses the growing number of Latino students in California and at SF State and is working to identify specific areas of need, faculty research interests, and programs to support Latino student success. The backdrop to this effort is SF State’s imminent designation as a federally recognized Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) as SF State approaches the threshold of 25% of undergraduates identifying themselves as Hispanic/Latino. (http://www.sfsu.edu/~life)

SF State recently achieved the designation of Asian American/Native American/Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI). Both designations (HSI and AANAPISI) carry with them opportunities for federal funding that will benefit all students for support of such things as labs, counselors, and tutors. Both HSI and AANAPISI status also require that institutions earning the designation serve a significant undergraduate population receiving Pell grants in recognition of their financial need. (See http://news.sfsu.edu/news/sf-state-earns-federal-distinction-service-diverse-populations).

Additional programs that are underway due to changing student needs include Welcome Days, Residential Life Learning and Theme Communities, Student Leadership programs, Recreation programs, and additional Wellness programs in the Residential Community. While many of these programs have been established for many years, they continue to evolve due largely to feedback received from students about their experience. (See Appendix J: WASC Subcommittee Report on Student Demographics for a brief overview of continuing and new programs.)

In addition to the Division of Student Affairs’ co-curricular offerings, the Division of Undergraduate Studies offers academic support services to students, including tutoring and academic counseling and advising. Over the past few years, some of the focus on the work in these offices has evolved due to the changing demographics of our student body. One issue has been an increase in student demand for academic support services with no concomitant increase in funds. The tutoring and advising offices have had to find creative ways to meet student needs. The following are some examples of these creative approaches.

Our tutoring services, the Learning Assistance Center (LAC) and the Campus Academic Resource Program (CARP), offer tutoring in a wide variety of subjects. For example, LAC offers writing workshops designed to support multilingual and native English speakers in their first and second semester developmental English classes. CARP collaborates with a variety of SF State programs, departments, and faculty to provide services for a wide range of students. LAC is staffed primarily by faculty and graduate students, while CARP tutoring is provided entirely by graduate and undergraduate students. The tutoring services have made a real effort to meet the needs of our changing student population. An increasing amount of tutoring time over the past few years has been dedicated to helping students develop basic skills and to supporting students as they complete the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) (see Section 2.3.3 below). Tutoring services have increased the number of group sessions they offer, have offered additional supplemental support to specific courses, and have tried to focus attention on courses where students appear to have the most difficulty and high rates of repeat (see Appendix K: Learning Assistance Center Year-end Report, Appendix L: Campus Academic Resource Program Year-end Report 2011-12).

The Undergraduate Advising Center (UAC) is staffed by professional counselors, interns, and peer advisors who are committed to providing guidance and information to help undergraduate students enjoy a successful college experience. The UAC offers new student orientation programs for freshmen and transfer students, serving over 11,000 new students and their family members last summer. Over the past few years, the UAC has increased its attention on student success in the first
years, particularly on undeclared sophomore students who in the past have had little attention paid to them, focusing on those deemed most “at risk.” These students have GPAs below 2.1 and earned fewer than twelve units a semester (see Appendix M-1: Undergrad Advising Center Assessment Report 2010, Appendix M-2: Undergrad Advising Center Assessment Report 2011).

2.2 Development of Future Student Venues

In response to the need to provide healthy alternative activities for a younger student population, plans for several important new venues are underway. Finding space for campus-wide events hosted by student organizations and university departments continues to be a challenge at SF State. Oftentimes the existing venues do not meet the current programmatic needs of the campus. SAEM, in collaboration with Administration and Finance, is in the process of repurposing the former Library Annex 1 (now under the direction of SAEM) and making appropriate alterations to the venue to create an event center. This facility will provide a 900-seat capacity venue for events, including banquets, graduation celebrations, dances, performances, and expos. This facility is projected to open in Spring 2013. [CFR 3.5, 3.6]

Outdoor space is also a challenge at SF State. The limited open recreational area on campus does not allow for scheduling recreation events because Athletic Department teams have priority for the fields. With over 5,000 students living on or near campus and with the growth of Campus Recreation, a recreation field is essential to meet student needs for outdoor activities. With the recent acquisition of the former School of the Arts (SOTA) property, SAEM is working in collaboration with Administration and Finance to create a recreation area that will allow formal outdoor campus recreation as well as informal recreation for our students. The field is projected to open in early 2013 [CFR 2.11, 3.5]

SAEM is coordinating efforts among Administration and Finance, Campus Recreation, Associated Students Incorporated, and the Cesar Chavez Student Center to design and build a new Recreation and Wellness Center funded by an increase in local student fees (approved by students in 2010). In response to the needs of a younger, more residential student population, Campus Recreation offerings have expanded to the limit of the campus’s physical and fiscal boundaries. When open in 2016, the center will provide all students with access to a state-of-the-art facility where they will be able to gather, exercise, participate in wellness activities, socialize, and develop, while taking part in intramural sports, sport clubs, group fitness/wellness, and informal recreation. [CFR 2.11, 3.5]

2.3 The Changing Faculty

Research for the CPR report revealed that SF State has hired more than 50% of its current faculty since 2000. This fact led the CPR group to survey and hold focus groups with many of these junior faculty and faculty who were hired prior to 2000 to determine changing needs and perceptions among both groups. In the focus groups, the newer faculty noted a number of specific concerns. In particular, they pointed out the tension between the increased teaching and service expectations due to budget cuts and the greater emphasis on research and grants.

Similarly, the mentoring of new faculty has occurred unevenly, and previous attempts to create a university-wide program have not met with success. Because of these issues, the Office of Faculty Affairs has played an increasingly important role among faculty, mentoring them in the development of their academic portfolios [CFR 3.2, 3.4]. In addition, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs has also played a crucial role in assisting faculty in the development of research agendas and publications. This essay provides an update on progress made in addressing the concerns of
faculty first noted in the CPR review. Detailed evidence of the involvement of these offices is described below.

Assessment of Needs

Based on the survey data and focus group findings from the CPR report, the Dean of Faculty Affairs and the Professional Development Council (PDC) initiated a collaborative project to bring together faculty from across the campus to talk about experiences that are central to faculty professional development and careers at SF State. The goal was to explore further the issues that had been raised in the Capacity and Preparatory research. The specific goals of the initiative were fourfold:

1. To address low faculty morale
2. To gather information about faculty’s experience of support for their scholarship
3. To solicit suggestions and ideas for improving support for faculty scholarship
4. To engage faculty in the process

Three faculty groups participated in the initiative: the Professional Development Council, a Faculty Affairs working group, and the CTFD Advisory Council, as well as the Faculty Affairs and CTFD staff. Working together, the groups developed and facilitated eight faculty conversations during Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 with groups organized according to career level. Conversation groups addressed the following questions: [CFR 2.8, 2.9]

1. In what ways have you felt supported in your scholarship?
2. In what ways have you not felt supported in your scholarship? What barriers to successful scholarship have you faced?
3. What suggestions/ideas do you have for improving support for successful scholarship at SF State?

A detailed account of the process, methodology, findings, and recommendations for addressing the issues identified can be found in the PDC report to the Academic Senate (Appendix N: Professional Development at SFSU PDC). In general, recommendations fell into four categories:

1. articulating scholarship and expectations
2. “creating” community
3. “creating” time
4. “creating” resources

Based on these findings, the PDC and Faculty Affairs developed a short-term plan with a series of first steps. Some components were implemented in Spring 2012; other items form the basis of a plan to be implemented in 2012-2013. In the spring of 2012, Retention, Tenure, and Promotion workshops were held with an emphasis on expectations for scholarship, a central issue in the focus group conversations. In addition, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs hosted a Post Award Forum to help address some of the questions that principal investigators (P.I.s) have been raising about the coordination of all the different aspects involved in administering grants. ORSP also organized a Symposium on Research, Scholarly, and Creative Works in which faculty who had received ORSP small grant and methodology awards presented their research. Finally, in an effort to promote better community among faculty, the faculty from PDC, CTFD, and the University Research Council held an Open House in the Faculty Commons in the newly renovated Library. There are also plans for a Faculty Research and Creative Activities Retreat in late January 2013 and a Book and Creative Works celebration in April 2013.
In the 2012-2013 Academic Year, the Office of Faculty Affairs made plans for the following activities in its continuing response to the needs of faculty: [CFR 2.8, 2.9, 4.2, 4.6]

- Streamlining Working Personnel Action Files (creating time)
- Offering College level RTP meetings with the Provost, UTPC Chair, and Dean of Faculty Affairs (articulating scholarship and expectations)
- Continuing the RTP workshops with a focus on expectations for scholarship (articulating scholarship and expectations)
- Offering new faculty orientation (creating community)
- Organizing and offering a professional development retreat (creating community)
- Expanding mentoring opportunities (creating community)
- Improving communication regarding professional development opportunities (creating community)
- Offering a graduate student research fellowship program (creating resources)

For more specific explanation of each of these activities, see Appendix O: WASC Faculty Affairs Report 2012.

2.4 The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development

The faculty focus groups from the CPR report also noted some concern over the attrition that has occurred in the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development. As recently as five years ago, CTFD had 5.5 staff members, while currently the Center is down to 1.5 staff members. In addition, the Dean of Faculty Affairs has taken over the directorship of the Center. While the number of services CTFD has been able to provide has decreased over the years, the Center continues to provide valuable support to faculty in the areas of teaching and scholarship. Especially useful have been individual and small group consultations, faculty learning communities, and new faculty orientations. [CFR 4.6, 4.7]

2.5 Direction of CTFD

With the urgent need for support for research and scholarship expressed in the CPR focus groups and the professional development conversation groups of last year, the Center, with the guidance of the CTFD Advisory Board, has begun to explore ways to collaborate more closely with other units on campus and to expand its efforts to provide the kinds of support services that can reach a larger number of faculty in the areas of mentoring and scholarship [CFR 4.6, 4.7]. While the Center will continue to provide support in the area of teaching, going forward it will also direct its attention to the following efforts:

**Improve communications among faculty across campus.** Given that our campus has very limited resources to provide new training and support, one of CTFD’s goals is to participate in the development of a university wide communication system or calendar that connects faculty to existing opportunities and services across campus. Currently there is no effective way for department chairs, deans, and faculty to communicate about or connect with opportunities across campus. Events such as professional colloquia, distinguished speaker series, teaching and grant writing workshops, gallery shows, creative and performing arts events, tenure and promotion workshops, and professional celebrations are not well communicated across campus. Although these events are often listed in the CampusMemo, the goal here is to develop a system that alerts faculty only to existing opportunities and services and does not include other news and announcements that are off topic.
Facilitate and develop mentoring opportunities. We plan to implement the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning (ITL) supported mini grant on mentoring of mid-career faculty with the objective of developing a model of mentoring that can expand and continue in subsequent years.

Increase revenue stream through grant writing. We have already moved in this direction and plan to continue to expand grant-writing activities. Examples of three grant proposals CTFD worked on this past year are:

- **Magic in Mentoring**, Mid-Career Faculty Mini Grant – CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning, awarded $1000 for 2012-2013.
- **Student Mental Health Initiative** – California Mental Health Services Act (CalMHSA) via the CSU Office of the Chancellor, Award for $410,000. SF State’s plan addresses: Curriculum Development and Training, Peer-to-Peer Programs, and Suicide Prevention.
- CTFD took a leadership role in the portion on *Curriculum Development and Training*.

For 2012-2013 the Center staff is working on grant proposal submissions for:

- **Faculty Learning Community** for new faculty on high impact teaching practices to support student learning and critical thinking – for submission to the Institute for Teaching and Learning, CSU.
- **Chair Development Mini Grant** – for submission to the Institute for Teaching and Learning, CSU.
- **Improving Teaching and Learning in Undergraduate STEM Courses** (Working Title) – funding source to be determined.

2.6 Staff Morale

The 2011 WASC CPR team report suggested that the University respond to issues of morale that have arisen largely as a result of the budget crisis. In response to this recommendation, the Human Resources Department commissioned a third-party vendor to implement a campus-wide Employee Assistance Program (EAP) (see [http://www.sfsu.edu/~hrwww/Payroll_Benefits/benefits/eap.html](http://www.sfsu.edu/~hrwww/Payroll_Benefits/benefits/eap.html)). This program is comprehensive and addresses both professional and personal issues through individual counseling and group training seminars. This program will help employees feel empowered as they learn how to manage stress, financial, legal and familial matters, and work difficulties. The program is available to all employees and members of their households and is being rolled out during 2012-13.

Last year we implemented campus-wide change management programs and various leadership training opportunities on topics related to productivity. The Office of Human Resources, Safety, & Risk Management is also implementing a series of educational briefs on HR Intelligence (IQ) seminars to help employees and managers understand their roles and responsibilities within the workplace and make better work and life decisions. Educational briefs range from employee safety and ergonomics to employee relations and managing conflict.

With leadership from Student Affairs, SF State implemented a Community of Caring program to encourage all employees to be aware of signs of emotional distress of their colleagues and to inform designated campus representatives of potential issues that might require intervention. Approximately 40 employees across campus completed 40 hours of intensive training and will be certified as master trainers for the campus. This program is in the initial stages and has been well received to date.
3.0 Student Success

In the Capacity and Preparatory Review, we focused our attention on a number of areas related to student learning. At the institutional level, we examined graduation, retention, and program assessment. At the other end of the spectrum, we gathered data on specific initiatives that we felt would have an impact on student learning. These initiatives include the Student Success and Graduation Initiative, the new General Education program, Academic Technology, and Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID). Over the past 18 months, we have continued these projects and report on them here.

3.1 Student Success and Graduation Initiative (SSGI)

During the CPR review, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of time-to-degree, graduation rates, and retention, disaggregating our data by college, department, first-time freshmen, transfer students, and race/ethnicity. At that time our six-year graduation rate was 48% for the total population, 49.9% for non-underrepresented minority students (non-URM), and 43% for the underrepresented minority students (URM). We also noted that time to degree had decreased over five years across all variables and all colleges. Moreover, we were graduating more students and found that once a student began a major, different populations were just as likely to persist and graduate. [CFR 2.10]

We also found, however, that there was much work to be done in understanding the reasons for attrition, in improving our graduation rates, and for ensuring that students succeed in learning the things we consider to be most important. The Student Success and Graduation Initiative, which began shortly before the CPR visit, has served as a catalyst in our efforts to improve graduation and retention. That initiative originated in the CSU Chancellor’s Office, which has tasked us to increase the six-year graduation rates of first-time full-time freshmen and transfer students at SF State by 8% by 2015, and to decrease the gap between URM and non-URM students by 50% by 2015. Over the past two years, the SSGI Task Force has worked intentionally to implement policies and practices that would improve graduation (see http://air.sfsu.edu/graduation-initiative for the SF State Facilitating Graduation Task Force Plan).

Our initial efforts focused on administrative changes to facilitate graduation. These changes were prompted by what we learned from research and best practices at other universities with regard to helping students graduate. The policy changes included revisions to academic disqualification, administrative disqualification, mandatory advising, first-time freshman advising, graduate student enrollment restrictions, graduate student GPA minimum, incomplete course restrictions, limits on the number of units, declaration of major requirements, repeated course limits, super senior monitoring, time limit to complete requirements for undergraduate degrees, and withdrawal policy. (See Appendix P: Student Success Enrollment Strategies for further explanation for each of these policies.)

We have also invested a great deal of effort on gathering and analyzing data. In the initial stages of the project, we focused much attention on baseline data such as graduation rates, retention rates, and time-to-degree (see http://air.sfsu.edu/sites/sites.sfsu.edu.air/files/FGII.pdf). Gathering and analyzing these data were necessary first steps, but we have learned that these data points don’t tell the story that we need to understand if we are to have an impact on student success and graduation. Each round of data gathering has led to yet more questions and further data gathering and analysis. For example,
in the summer of 2011 we developed a Milestone Study to examine the progress that freshman and sophomore students should accomplish in their path toward graduation (see Appendix Q: Student Success Initiative Milestones and http://air.sfsu.edu/graduation-initiative). Based on higher education research, we set expectations for GPA, number of units completed, completion of remediation, retention, and declaration of major and we measured these expectations for the freshman and sophomore students. We then disaggregated the data by URM, gender, first generation, and Pell grant students, and compared the disaggregated results for the at-risk populations to the results from the total population. Recently we have used these data to locate specific students within the at-risk group who are in need of support.

When faculty from the Health Education Department saw the results of the Milestone Study, they asked if we would investigate the same measures for students in their Metro Academy program, a pipeline program from community college through the Health Ed major that enrolls mostly URM students. This analysis showed that students in the Metro Academy were significantly ahead of the total population in all measures. These findings led us to look at all of the programs on campus in which students are receiving some kind of special attention, including EOP, Summer Bridge, the theme dormitories, Trio, and Guardian Scholars. Our results indicate that any program that gives students special academic attention (such as tutoring, advising, and coaching) improves student success. The results from these projects have prompted the creation of a Metro Academy model for the Child and Adolescent Development Department and a Metro Academy model for STEM majors. In addition, several members of the Biology and Chemistry/Biochemistry Departments have created an assessment collaboration that tracks student data on the milestone measures and a number of other areas in order to improve student success. In short, the data analysis has shown us which efforts are most fruitful. In general, any time we break down our large populations of students into smaller communities of learners and give them academic support, they succeed in greater numbers. The very encouraging recent news is that we have exceeded our goal with regard to the achievement gap. The Fall 2012 data show a 2.9% difference between the total graduation rate and the URM graduation rate, down from 8% in 2009. An additional unexpected consequence of our work has been the cascading buy-in from faculty generated by the data analysis. As the data showed specific types of trends, faculty began to ask for their departments and students to be included in our analyses. This domino effect has promoted the general value of assessment in the minds of faculty. [CFR 2.4]

These newly-formed learning communities embody what AAC&U refers to as “high impact practices” (HIPs), and one of the major thrusts of the SSGI now is the promotion and support of HIPs. This additional thrust of the initiative evolved during the summer of 2011 when a group of faculty and administrators attended an AAC&U conference on HIPs and returned with an ambitious action plan that was incorporated into the Student Success and Graduation Initiative. The action plan includes introducing first-year students to high impact practices, especially for the traditionally underserved populations, helping students to understand the mission and values of the University, helping departments explore ways to link students involved in capstone and first-year experiences, and finding ways to help students connect their first year experience to the rest of their college career. (See Appendix R: AAC&U Institute on High Impact Practices and Student Success.) We are very much aware of the fact that simply graduating more students is not enough. We need to make sure that the students we graduate have the knowledge and skills we expect them to learn, and our focus on high impact practices is built around this commitment. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5]

Another essential element in the SSGI initiative has been the continuous collaboration between Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The plethora of co-curricular programs that were implemented over the past five years is intended to give students the kind of support that we know they need in order to succeed. (See Essay 2, Appendix I: SFSU Student Mental Health Initiative Proposal.) Moreover, these programs are designed to reach all of the special populations of students in the SF
State community, traditional and non-traditional, male and female, URM and non-URM, and the data indicate that we are making a difference. One-year retention rates for freshmen reached a new high of 81.4% for the Fall 2010 entry class, after ranging from 75.3 to 77.4% in the previous five years. [CFR 2.13]

As we continue the initiative, we have plans for projects that will begin in the coming year. Discussions during the summer focused on our need to more effectively communicate the importance of graduating with both students and faculty. In essence, we need to create a culture of graduation at San Francisco State. To this end, we developed a communication plan to bring more faculty into the discussion and to raise awareness of students. Several informational flyers were sent out to faculty in Spring 2012 (see http://air.sfsu.edu/graduation-initiative), and banners emphasizing the benefits of graduating have been hung in some of the large classroom buildings as well as buildings with high student traffic. Our communication plan going forward calls for more involvement of both students and faculty in the next phase of the initiative. [CFR 2.2, 2.4]

We will also continue to collect and analyze data that will guide us in implementing processes that lead students to graduate. For example, in Summer 2012 we examined the files of students in their sixth year at SF State who arrived as freshmen and who have not graduated. A few students applied to graduate but were on the verge of being denied graduation. Their records were examined closely for the possibility of substituting courses already completed to satisfy missing requirements. With appropriate course substitutions, they were able to graduate after all, rather than returning for another semester to complete the missing requirements. Other students in this group who have earned at least 100 units and are still enrolled have been given first priority registration in an effort to make sure they are able to get the classes they need to graduate within six years. We have also examined the GPAs and units earned by all at-risk students in the 2009 cohort, and we are in the process of asking departments to aggressively advise the students who are in academic trouble and those who have not completed the expected number of units. [CFR 2.4, 2.5]

We now know there is not one solution to the challenge of improving graduation rates. We must continue to drill down on the data until we get to the individuals who need more support. Administration and faculty must work together on developing high impact teaching practices that will engage students and keep them motivated. We will continue to try and find ways to create small communities of learners within a huge university, and we must continually communicate the value of learning and an education.

3.2 General Education and the Baccalaureate Requirements

Based on the belief that curriculum requirements should reflect the values of the university and the needs of the communities they serve, the Academic Senate created the Graduation Requirements Task Force (GRTF) in 2005 and called for an assessment of the appropriateness and value of the university-wide baccalaureate degree requirements for SF State undergraduate students. [CFR 2.2, 2.4] The last time such a review had taken place was in 1981. As noted in the CPR report, GRTF’s recommendations to revise the requirements for the baccalaureate were approved by the Academic Senate in Spring 2010, with further revisions approved in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011. The Baccalaureate Learning Goals and the new General Education program proposed by the GRTF and passed by the Senate included best practices identified through the review process, specific degree requirements, course expectations, and student learning outcomes. [CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4] In addition, the proposal recommended several changes that will facilitate the completion of baccalaureate degrees. For example, the GRTF recommends that students be able to complete university-wide course requirements for a baccalaureate in 48 units out of the 120 units needed for the degree, as well as a capstone experience for every major. (See http://www.sfsu.edu/~senate/documents/policies/F10-255.pdf.)
Since the CPR report, the implementation process for the program has continued. In Fall 2010, elections were held for members of the Baccalaureate Requirements Committee (BRC) and seven different course certification committees. (See www.sfsu.edu/~ugs/committee_info.html for oversight and approval process.) In Spring 2011, a Faculty Director of GE was appointed. BRC has worked closely with the Office of Undergraduate Studies to create an online course review and approval process that was streamlined, transparent, and responsive to faculty needs. [CFR 2.2, 4.6]

Certification of GE courses began in Fall 2011 and is ongoing. (See http://www.sfsu.edu/~ugs/GE_Policy.html.) Oversight of the certification process is the joint responsibility of the GE Director, the BRC chair, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. [CFR 2.4] In the first semester, submissions slowly trickled in as faculty and departments took a “wait and see” approach to find out how the process would work. In Spring 2012, the number of submissions dramatically increased. By the end of the spring semester, 130 courses were submitted for certification and 77 courses were certified by the subcommittees. See http://www.sfsu.edu/~ugs/faculty/certified_courses.html for a current list of approved courses and http://www.sfsu.edu/~ugs/GE_Policy.html for a detailed summary of the BRC implementation process. Implementation of the new General Education Program is expected to begin in Fall 2014. (See Appendix S-1: Report of Implementation of GE and Appendix S-2: GE Course Approval Form.)

3.3 Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement

As noted in the 2010 CPR report, SF State students must satisfy an assessment of writing for graduation (GWAR). The Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) recommended in 2006 that the English test (JEPET) for the GWAR be replaced by a course requirement for writing in the discipline. Following this recommendation, a Writing Across the Curriculum and in the Discipline (WAC/WID) director was hired to establish and implement the program. The director began her work by educating faculty on the value of WAC/WID and training them in the skills and resources needed to develop quality GWAR courses. (See http://wac.sfsu.edu.) From 2008 until the CPR report in 2010, 60 GWAR courses were approved and implemented and data from surveys and focus groups were collected to explore faculty and student perceptions of the value and challenges of the new program. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6]

3.3.1 Implementation Progress

Since the CPR visit, progress on implementing the new GWAR has taken a variety of forms. During 2011-2012, upper division courses designated to fulfill the GWAR increased to include every department on campus but one. (See http://wac.sfsu.edu/content/approved-gwar-courses.) Innovative partnerships continue to define GWAR courses. The Tutoring Centers offered hundreds of tutorials and in-class workshops, and librarians offered dozens of workshops tailored to students’ specific research projects. The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) worked directly with 23 instructors to improve writing pedagogy, and the Campus Academic Resource Program (CARP) embedded Writing Fellows in 13 classes. In a Business class, one Writing Fellow was paired with an English teacher (both trained in the SF State Composition MA program) and two Business instructors. To more consistently support at-risk students in GWAR courses, the LAC launched a Writing Studio, one-unit mini-seminars, and, for 2013, the Composition for Multilingual Students program created a grammar course for multilingual writers to be taken concurrently with GWAR.

With help from librarians, the Coordinator of English 214 held multiple workshops for teachers as 214 (the pre-requisite for all GWAR courses) shifts from its literary emphasis towards teaching research skills. The Committee on Written English Proficiency (CWEP) sponsored a well-attended
Winter Colloquium, and departments such as Biology hosted their own workshops. To disseminate some of these conversations, CWEP worked with a BECA course in video production to create short videos featuring GWAR faculty and students. These videos have been posted on the university’s WAC website and on an e-newsletter sponsored by CSU Fresno and co-edited by CSU WAC Directors. (See http://wac.sfsu.edu/content/what-wac-wid-gwar.)

3.3.2 Research and Assessment

In addition to the implementation efforts, considerable research has already been conducted on the GWAR. In a 2011 Roundtable sponsored by the College of Health and Social Sciences, faculty discussed how a GWAR course’s success depends on its relationship to other courses in a major, a point that students consistently make (66 interviews, fall 2009-2012). (See http://air.sfsu.edu/wasc, the SF State CPR Report.) How a GWAR course is integrated into a major is also the subject of formal assessments from Liberal Studies (LS) and Sociology. (See Appendix T-1: International Relations GWAR Assessment Report, Appendix T-2: Philosophy GWAR Assessment Report, and Appendix T-3: Sociology GWAR Assessment Report. Also see Appendix U-1: Tanya Augsburg Liberal Studies Research, Appendix U-2: Sarah Lawrence Research, and Appendix U-3: Tara Lockhart Research). In their grant-funded study, summarized in a scholarly paper (Appendix U-1: Tanya Augsburg Liberal Studies Research), LS faculty found their GWAR course was burdened by objectives, and so they shifted some GWAR material to a capstone course. (See Appendix V: GWAR Research Writing Across the Curriculum.) [CFR 2.4] Additional GWAR assessment reports can be found in Appendix V-1: Summary of Writing Assessment with HED 400, Appendix V-2: HED 400 Assessment of Student Writing, and Appendix V-3: Seeding and Affording Literate Practice from 2YC to the Major.

Since 2008, five departments have assessed student writing in GWAR courses. Together, these assessments suggest that when professors develop rubrics based on their disciplinary and institutional knowledge, as opposed to using a general skills rubric, they will agree on what constitutes “good” writing in their fields. Two departments, International Relations (IR) and Philosophy (PHIL), developed disciplinary rubrics based on the scale successfully used by History in their 2008-09 program assessment of writing in the major. In comparative studies, IR and PHIL faculty found that students improved their abilities to contextualize arguments, understand theory, present relevant data, and appropriately cite sources. [CFR 4.7] (See Appendix T-1: International Relations GWAR Assessment Report, Appendix T-2: Philosophy GWAR Assessment Report, and Appendix T-3: Sociology GWAR Assessment Report.)

Students’ perceptions of their learning provide a rich context for writing assessment. In 2011-12, the incoming Coordinator of English 214 and the WAC Director interviewed 22 students who completed English 214 and a GWAR course and gathered their writing from both courses. The majority reported that they transferred specific strategies from 214 to GWAR. Consistent with interviews that we conducted in 2009-10, this group perceived that they learn the most in GWAR courses when their teachers offer quality feedback, sequence assignments logically, and explicitly comment on the rhetoric of their fields. Students also described passionate engagement when professors challenged them with innovative assignments in their disciplinary fields that fostered deep research and expertise. [CFR 2.4, 2.5]

A number of individual faculty members and students have also conducted assessment studies of their GWAR courses. For example, a Master’s student in the Composition MA program found syntactical growth in three sets of papers. The 214 Coordinator presented preliminary findings at three national conferences, and, with the WAC Director, is collaborating with professors at Western Illinois University to develop a grant proposal for the 4Cs Research Initiative and an article for 3Cs, the
field’s flagship journal. Finally, several masters’ students and one doctoral student studied WAC in GWAR courses for their culminating experience papers and dissertation. The doctoral study found that students actually make more progress in their writing in the discipline if the GWAR course comes after the students have had some coursework in the major.

### 3.3.3 Going Forward

In 2011-12, the Academic Senate voted twice to preserve the University’s Policy on Written English Proficiency, and class size in these courses has remained small despite the budget cuts. As CWEP shifts from a policy body to one focused on supporting and assessing WAC, the committee will build on the Senate’s confidence by continuing to engage faculty in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). Thus in 2012-13, CWEP plans to host roundtables to share assessment results and explore how WAC intersects with the SoTL in the disciplines. [CFR 2.9]

In conclusion, San Francisco State University is an institution that has been deeply committed to and engaged with the improvement of student writing for 20 years. The implementation of the new GWAR requirement and attention to writing is a campus-wide endeavor that involves faculty across the campus. This involvement has not only included writing curricula and pedagogy, but also research on writing from faculty across the disciplines. Our institutional NSSE assessments indicate that these efforts have had a significant impact on students. In the past two NSSE surveys, students report that they write significantly more and feel more confident about their writing than do students from comparable institutions. (See [http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/student_engagement](http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/student_engagement).) With the Committee of Written English Proficiency, the WAC Director, and the implementation of the new GWAR requirement, the infrastructure for sustaining attention to writing is now in place at SF State.

### 3.4 Academic Technology and Operations

The 2010 CPR self-study included an investigation of changes in the learning style preferences of students and faculty. The results pointed to newly developed technologies as one of the changes in preferred learning modes. A recurring theme in the responses was the ubiquitous nature of technology in students’ lives and the increasing desire for the incorporation of appropriate technology into the learning experience. Faculty often identified the need to use technology to communicate effectively with the current generation of students, and students identified iLearn (SF State’s learning management system), podcasts, video conferencing, online exams, and email as the technologies they used in their learning experiences.

Academic Technology (AT), which resides within the Office of Academic Affairs Operations, supports and advances effective learning, teaching, scholarship, and community service with technology, and has focused much research and effort towards this emerging area. (See Appendix W: *WASC Academic Technology Report*.) The WASC CPR team expressed confidence in AT’s leadership and staff competencies to help advance the university’s faculty development programs and teaching and learning environments. Furthermore, they stated that “SFSU is cautioned as it pursues its sense that increased integration of central IT and unit-based IT operations will lead to cost avoidance, increased capacity, and increased security that there is a positive distinction between the focus of IT and Academic Technology that is worthy to maintain.”

The question of whether or not to centralize Information Technology (IT) has been an ongoing discussion at SF State. In late 2011, the University hired the Huron Education consulting group to conduct a comprehensive review of all areas of IT at the University and to provide recommendations with regard to effective organizational structure. The Huron Report Executive Summary (see
Appendix W-1: Huron IT Assessment Consultant Report 2012) outlines the recommendations from their study.

Although many of the recommendations from Huron are still in the early stages of implementation, Academic Affairs Operations (AAO) is currently leading the campus initiatives on online course evaluations, virtual labs, computer labs, common workstation standards, and streamlining of online services for learning and teaching. AAO is also partnering with the Division of Information Technology (DoIT) and the IT units on campus cost-saving initiatives related to common helpdesk ticketing, campus-wide software licensing agreements and server elimination, and consolidation.

A positive development for student and faculty use of academic technology is the recently completed, award-winning J. Paul Leonard Library, which houses the Library, Academic Technology, and the Sutro Library. The new building includes 50% more seating, 300% more group study rooms, and twice as many computers as the original building. This translates to more than 3,000 seats for study and more than 250 public computers. In addition, there are faculty and student digital media studios with 12 editing rooms and a variety of collaborative work environments. Using their own personal computers or one from the 150 available for checkout, students, faculty, and staff can also access the robust wireless network from any location within the library, including the 100-seat café.

The University still has not filled the open CIO position and the implementation of the Huron recommendations are still in the earliest stages. However, Academic Affairs has a strong interest in ensuring that the interface between Academic Affairs and other technology units is carefully and thoughtfully managed. The newly appointed Associate Vice President for Operations has been charged with representing the needs of Academic Affairs as we transition to the PeopleSoft student system, as well as promoting and maintaining the quality of our efforts in Academic Technology.

3.4.1 AT Support Services

The 2010 CPR report stressed the need to maintain a critical set of support structures for faculty to help them manage new approaches to engage students in learning. The paragraphs below provide a summary of the many support services provided by AT to faculty, staff, and students at SF State. See Appendix W: WASC Academic Technology Report for further details and assessment results of these services. [CFR 3.6, 3.7]

**Systems, Applications and Support:** AT develops, maintains, and optimizes performance on SF State’s technologies in support of learning and teaching, including iLearn (SF State’s Moodle learning management system), DIVA (digital virtual media archive), CourseStream (lecture capture), POWER (workshop registration and scheduling), LabSpace (virtual desktops and software applications for faculty researchers and students), Online Syllabus Tool, ePortfolios, Clickers (standardized personal response systems), and other web-based technologies.

**Learning Spaces, Media and Events:** AT installs and maintains all audiovisual technologies in campus classrooms, meeting rooms, and lecture theaters. AT also supports the cablecast system that broadcasts 18,000+ films on demand to classrooms and viewing stations. Other services include satellite hookups, video production and streaming for events such as Commencement and Welcome Days, and audiovisual equipment checkout to students, faculty, and staff.

**Online Learning and Teaching:** AT helps faculty develop curricula in an expanding continuum of instructional modes that use technology, thereby helping ensure universally accessible, flexible and meaningful learning experiences for SF State’s students and faculty. Faculty development activities include AT’s summer and winter institutes, modularized face-to-face and online workshops, a new faculty multimedia drop-in lab for support with instructional design and
development of technology enhanced courses, an expanding collection of online tutorials, resources and video training clips, and individual, department, and college-level consultations on instructional strategies in support of effective course and program delivery modes and assessment.

3.4.2 AT Implementation Strategies

Before implementing academic technology initiatives, AT ensures that the following three intersecting elements are in place to maintain educational quality and integrity: educational best practices, faculty and student support systems, and a reliable technology infrastructure that integrates with and extends the current campus technology environment.

Over the past three years, AT has established itself as a CSU Center for Excellence and National Leader in Moodle Code Development, Lecture Capture, and ePortfolio assessment to support Technology Enhanced, Hybrid, HyFlex, and Online course delivery. Specifically, this year AT received funding for and delivered the Common Code Base for Moodle campuses in the CSU system, which we can also use on our campus. Based on our best practices enabling HyFlex learning approaches, Echo360 designated SF State a “Lighthouse Campus” for lecture capture and awarded the campus $10,000 to conduct research into its educational effectiveness. AT also serves as a principle investigator on a FIPSE mini-grant to study the role of ePortfolios in student transfer from community colleges to four-year institutions.

AT has built a comprehensive suite of tools that are integrated into the SF State common learning management system, locally branded “iLearn,” which uses Moodle technology. To maintain and improve reliability, usability, and performance, AT has engaged in a series of continuous improvement activities to consistently examine our work and seek incremental changes in our processes to improve efficiency and quality. [CFR 3.6, 3.7] AT has participated fully and actively in external and internal reviews of our services with students, faculty, and staff, including those conducted by the 2012 SF State Educational Technology Advisory Committee, the 2011 WASC Visiting Team, and the 2012 Huron Consultants who explored IT Cost Savings opportunities on our campus. [CFR 4.4]

As a result of the increased functionality, reliability, and performance of iLearn, along with further integrations of useful academic technologies and AT’s faculty development outreach, SF State can demonstrate a significant increase not only in the number of academic technology users, but also in the frequency with which they engage with academic technology. (See Appendix W-2: ETAC Survey Results Presentation for detailed assessment reports.)

3.5 Program Review

The purpose of the academic program review process at San Francisco State is to assure University degree programs of the highest quality, providing an opportunity for faculty and administrators to clarify the intellectual vision, range, coherence, and currency of each program, examine the effectiveness of its organizational structure, articulate the learning outcomes it inculcates, and assess the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved. [CFR 2.6, 2.7]

The review process highlights efforts by instructional units to ensure and improve program quality, demonstrates how the degree program has been revised in response to evolving circumstances and changes in the field, and indicates the resources needed to accomplish program goals. The review
affords a clear and comprehensive perspective on the program’s standing within its discipline, its role in its own College and in the University as a whole, and its consonance with SF State’s mission, CSU plans, and State mandates. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7]

Academic program review is governed by several senate policies:

- #F05-236 Guidelines for the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review (http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth)
- #S06-238 Indicators and Standards of Graduate Program Quality and Sustainability (http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth)
- #S06-133 All-University Academic Program Review Committee (http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth)

3.5.1 The Sixth Cycle of Program Review

Over the past 30 years, the University has engaged in five cycles of academic program review, and each review has distinctive characteristics. The focus of the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review is on the quality and currency of the University’s graduate programs. This particular focus is in large measure a response to the 2001 WASC report and 2005 CUSP II recommendations that call for a thoughtful exploration of issues specific to graduate education. [CFR 4.4]

The review process is informed by explicit indicators and criteria intended to determine the sustainability and quality of programs. These indicators and criteria are best construed as normative expectations rather than rigidly prescriptive rules. In the sixth cycle, all graduate programs, whether nationally accredited or not, need to demonstrate the extent to which University- and program-established standards are being met. [CFR 2.7, 4.7]

Though the Sixth Cycle of Program Review focuses on evaluating the quality and currency of the University’s graduate programs and the resources needed to maintain and improve them, academic units offering both graduate and undergraduate programs are also expected to examine the relationships between their undergraduate and graduate endeavors, including the past, current, projected, and optimal distribution of resources devoted to graduate and undergraduate education. Undergraduate degree programs are not expected to participate in a formal process of self-study and external review during this cycle, except in special circumstances. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7]

3.5.2 Academic Program Review Committee

The role of the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) is to review and evaluate the efforts of faculty and administrators to clarify the intellectual vision, range, coherence, and currency of each program. In addition, APRC examines the program’s organizational structure, reviews the program’s learning outcomes, evaluates their indicators of program success, and evaluates program goals and effectiveness. APRC makes recommendations for action and proposes the resources needed to accomplish program goals. [CFR 2.5, 2.6, 2.7]

The APRC performs four major functions: (1) review of the Handbook, (2) consultation with College faculty, (3) review and evaluation of all relevant documentation, and (4) recommendations in the form of a concluding action memorandum (explained further below).
Membership in APRC consists of the following:

- Six elected representatives; one from each college. (3-year term)
- The AVP for APD is an ex officio voting member.
- During the Sixth Cycle, the Dean of Graduate Studies is an ex officio voting member.
- The Program Review Coordinator is an ex officio non-voting member. (currently not filled due to budget reductions)
- The Assessment Coordinator is an ex officio non-voting member. (currently not filled due to budget reductions)

Oversight of the APRC is primarily the responsibility of the Academic Senate. The APRC sends a summary report of the committee's recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the program faculty, the college dean, and the Academic Senate. APRC also sends any policy recommendations and an annual report to the Academic Senate and makes periodic status reports to the Academic Senate. [CFR 4.6]

The chair of APRC is elected annually from among the members of the committee. Policy states that the chair shall receive one course release for two semesters, and the remaining members shall receive one course release for one semester, though this support was removed in 2009-2010 as a consequence of budget cutbacks and has not been restored. [CFR 2.4]

### 3.5.3 Components of Program Review

Within the context described above, academic program review in the Sixth Cycle includes the following four components:

1. Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendations
2. External Review and Recommendations
3. Program and Dean Response to External Review and Recommendations
4. University Review and Decision Processes

**Instructional Unit Self-Study and Recommendations**

At the start of the process for a given College, representatives from the instructional units (departments and/or programs offering masters or doctoral degrees), the College, the Office of Academic Planning and Development, and the APRC meet to discuss substantive and procedural matters. In this meeting, specific areas or issues needing to be addressed are discussed so that these can receive special attention in the review process. The administration provides the academic unit with the most current available data pertinent to the self-study.

The faculty of every instructional unit offering a graduate program (other than any subject to periodic accreditation review) prepares a self-study that serves as a basis for all subsequent levels of review and recommendations. In this self-study, the unit describes and assesses each graduate degree program offered, following the guidelines in the *Handbook for the Sixth Cycle of Academic Program Review* (see [http://air.sfsu.edu/air/files/handbook_6th_cycle.pdf](http://air.sfsu.edu/air/files/handbook_6th_cycle.pdf)). The self-study describes the recent history of the program or programs under review and identifies current aspirations for development and improvement. Department and/or unit heads are encouraged to assure widespread faculty participation in the development of the self-studies and that faculty members are made aware of all findings and recommendations generated by the review process. The unit forwards its completed self-study to the Office of Academic Planning and Development and to the College Dean for review and signature indicating that the document is ready for external review. At this same time, the Dean is encouraged to submit his/her own independent comments regarding the program. [CFR 2.4, 4.8]
A handbook to guide the Sixth Cycle is provided to programs; it incorporates the general guidelines required by Academic Senate policy. Additionally, the Handbook describes specific self-study and external review expectations in regard to those indicators and criteria of program sustainability and quality set forth in policy. (See http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth.)

Units undergoing program review are encouraged to review copies of previously completed reports (self-studies, external reviewer reports, APRC reports) provided to the campus community at http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth_reports.

One of the major changes in the Program Review Policy for the Sixth Cycle was the development of Indicators and Standards of Graduate Program Quality and Sustainability. An explicit goal of the University’s 2005-2010 strategic plan was that the institution “offers high quality post-baccalaureate education widely recognized for its intellectual value and contribution to society.” It further calls for the establishment of “university-level criteria to assess graduate program quality and sustainability” and for the integration of those standards into a “revised process of academic program review.” [CFR 2.6]

To accomplish this goal, all units with graduate programs are expected to demonstrate whether University-wide and program-specific indicators and standards of program sustainability and quality are being met. “Indicators” are areas of evaluation used to determine the quality and sustainability of a university, department, or program. “Standards” are those levels of performance towards which the university, department, or program seeks to strive. Units with graduate programs that do not meet a specific University-wide standard must explain how they are working towards the standard or why these normative expectations are not applicable to their particular degree program. These explanations and justifications are included in the department or program’s self-study to the APRC. (See Handbook for the Sixth Cycle, Academic Program Review at http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth.) [CFR 2.5, 2.6]

**External Review and Recommendations**

The purpose of the external review is to provide each instructional unit with a well-informed, independent analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of its curriculum, complement of faculty, and organizational structure, as well as an evaluation of the relationship of all of these to the quality of its degree programs. The external review evaluates program goals and the program’s success in achieving them, and suggests strategies for implementing recommendations for program improvements. Typically, a team of two experts, one from within and one from outside the CSU system, conducts the external review. Reviewers receive a copy of the unit's self-study and supporting documents. They are expected to spend two days on campus interviewing students, faculty, staff, and administrators and to prepare a report of findings and recommendations.

**Program and Dean Response to External Review and Recommendations**

Within one to two months of receipt of the external reviewers’ report, the unit head, in consultation with the faculty of the unit being reviewed, may respond to the external report with corrections of factual errors. Additionally, the Dean may submit an independent written response to the review team’s recommendations. The unit’s complete program review file self-study, the external reviewers’ report, and the responses to the external reviewers’ report by both the unit head and the Dean is forwarded to the APRC for evaluation. [CFR 2.4]
**University Review and Decision-Making**

To provide a University-wide faculty perspective and assist in University planning, the APRC scrutinizes each unit's complete program review file. APRC meets with the College Dean and program head to ensure that APRC fully understands all recommendations made and all responses to those recommendations. The Committee then evaluates all recommendations, and in consultation with the program, College, and Academic Affairs representatives and with the assistance of the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development, develops a Concluding Action Memorandum (CAM). This memorandum specifies any actions the unit and/or College is advised to consider or is required to carry out, together with timelines for implementation and consequences resulting from failure to appropriately act. The program review culminates with the signing of the CAM during a debriefing meeting that is attended by the Provost, Dean, and Chair, the Associate Vice President of Academic Planning and Development, and the chair of the APRC. [CFR 4.4]

**Review of Accredited Programs**

For programs that are nationally accredited and undergo periodic accreditation review involving a self-study and a campus visit by an accrediting team, the accreditation review normally substitutes for academic program review. All accredited graduate programs, at the time of completing their accreditation self-studies, submit brief documentation to APRC demonstrating performance in regard to the “Indicators and Criteria of Graduate Program Sustainability and Quality.”

Following receipt of notification from the accrediting body that a program has been accredited or re-accredited, APRC, in consultation with the program, College, and Academic Affairs representatives, evaluate both the accrediting body’s recommendations and the program’s performance vis-à-vis quality and sustainability criteria. APRC’s conclusions are incorporated into a Concluding Action Memorandum that specifies any actions the program will be advised or required to undertake. This memorandum, kept on file in the Office of Academic Planning and Development and the Academic Senate, is in effect until the program’s next accreditation.

**3.5.4 Program Review Schedule**

As nearly as feasible, programs are scheduled for review on a six-year cycle in a sequence corresponding to the alphabetical order of the Colleges. Deans are entrusted to make sure that the programs in their respective Colleges are reviewed in a timely fashion, that there is appropriate involvement of program faculty and dissemination of findings and recommendations arising from the review process, and that APRC requirements are implemented.

To facilitate the academic program review process, programs are provided with support that includes clear guidelines for the preparation of documents, timely access to pertinent data, and self-studies singled out as exemplary by APRC. Under special circumstances (normally those involving accreditation, quality, and/or budgetary issues), the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Dean, or the program itself may call for a special program review – either undergraduate or graduate – outside of the normal academic program review cycle. For example, during the sixth cycle, the College of Business received a special review of its undergraduate programs as part of its preparations for AACSB Accreditation Review. [CFR4.5]
3.5.5 Sixth Cycle Progress

Since Fall 2006 when the Sixth Cycle was initiated, program review has been completed for the Colleges of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSS), Business (COB), Creative Arts (CCA), Health and Social Sciences (HSS), and the Graduate College of Education (GCOE). During 2012-2013, the College of Ethnic Studies (CES) and the College of Science and Engineering (COSE) are undergoing program review. The College Liberal and Creative Arts (LCA) and the College of Extended Learning (CEL) are scheduled for program review in 2013-2014. Due to campus-wide re-organization in 2010-2011, the graduate programs from two disestablished colleges (BSS and CCA) have been incorporated into other colleges. Therefore the remaining program review schedule overlaps colleges to some degree.

In 2007, APRC began using the iLearn learning management system to share documents and support online collaborative work (report reviews, commenting, and drafting) between scheduled meeting sessions. The use of iLearn to support committee process and to act as a “knowledge management” system has made a significant contribution to the work of the committee. When committee members are unable to attend a scheduled session, they can stay connected to the work of the committee and contribute their efforts at another time more convenient to them. The ability to connect members in a live web conference session as an alternative participation mode is also provided. One challenge noted is that not all committee members are equally familiar with the online collaborative tools, nor are all members equally comfortable participating remotely (in time or location). As the use of online communication and collaboration technologies continues to expand into the normal workflows (for both university administrators and faculty), these “technology-related inequalities” should lessen.

College Summary Reports

In 2010, APRC began creating an additional college-wide report that summarizes the program review findings across a particular college, comparing relevant metrics and program quality indicators among graduate programs. This report provides comparative data analysis of these graduate programs, summarizes their achievement of the University’s Standards for Graduate Programs, and provides overall comments on themes and patterns that emerged from the review of the College’s graduate programs. To date, summary reports have been generated for the Colleges of BSS, Creative Arts, Health and Social Sciences, Business, and Education. [CFR2.7] The College summaries demonstrate that with few exceptions departments are meeting the new standards. These threshold measures include a minimum 3.0 GPA admissions requirement, evaluation of writing at two points in graduate programs, a baseline level of faculty involvement in grad programs, and timely offering of graduate courses. Summary reports are available to view with other APRC reports at http://air.sfsu.edu/program-review/sixth_reports. Graduate program comparison reports for Business, Creative Arts, and HSS can also be found at this link.

3.6 Assessment and the Assurance of Learning

As noted in the 2010 CPR Report, San Francisco State University has three levels of assessment: Institutional Assessment, Academic Program Assessment, and Student Affairs Assessment. The processes and results from recent assessments are detailed below.
3.6.1 Institutional Assessment

The Office of Academic Institutional Research (AIR) largely carries out data gathering and analysis for institutional assessment. [CFR 4.4, 4.5] Eight types of measures are ongoing and were used for both the WASC CPR and EER reports:

- NSSE survey
- FSSE survey
- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
- The Pulse Survey
- Senior [Undergraduate] Exit Survey
- Graduate Exit Survey
- HERI Faculty Survey
- SF State CUSP II Strategic Plan

Links and analyses of these measures can be found at [http://air.sfsu.edu/acad-inst-research](http://air.sfsu.edu/acad-inst-research) and below.

**NSSE and FSSE**

The NSSE survey is conducted every two years, while the FSSE survey was conducted in 2008 and will be repeated again in 2013. (See [http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/student_engagement](http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/student_engagement).) Results from these surveys have pointed to very interesting institutional issues that are both being addressed and need to be addressed. For example, as noted earlier in this report, SF State does extremely well for all questions related to diversity and writing on any survey. These are two areas that the university has adopted as strategic priorities for a number of years. At the other end of the spectrum are conflicting results. A comparison of the NSSE and FSSE results indicate that there is a conflict in the student demographics and the faculty perceptions of the student population. Faculty believe that our students are largely non-traditional, commuting, working outside school, and have dependents. The student results, however, indicate that we have two quite different populations, one matching the faculty perceptions and another equally large population of traditional students who mostly come from outside the Bay Area. This fact has prompted a great deal of development on the part of Student Affairs, particularly in offering additional activities to students who live in the dormitories. However, the University, and in particular Faculty Affairs, probably need to invest more effort in responding to the classroom challenges presented by these two very different populations.

Another clear response from students in the NSSE survey over the last two administrations is that students don’t feel challenged by their classes. This finding turns up among both freshmen and seniors and is particularly apparent in the written comments included by students in the NSSE surveys. Some speculate that this response from students is associated with the faculty misperception that school is among many other student priorities and insistence on hard work and rigor is unrealistic. In the coming years, this is a finding that needs to be explored further in order to ensure the quality of education that students receive.

In a great number of NSSE questions, students at both the freshman and senior levels express a desire for many more opportunities to meet with and connect with faculty outside the classroom. This yearning for connection can be found across a wide variety of questions in the survey, and again might result from our faculty demographics. While our students no longer represent a “commuter” campus, our faculty are the ones who commute. With the extraordinarily high cost of living in San Francisco and the absence of faculty salary increases for five years, a large percentage of the faculty commute from long distances. This situation creates a desire on the part of many faculty not to come to campus every day, thus limiting their time on campus. As we have seen from the Student Success...
and Graduation Initiative, students succeed best when we can break them into small communities of learners and give them support. The work within Student Affairs over the past several years has helped resolve some of the need for support, but students still seek more one-on-one contact with faculty. This is an issue that we must address more intentionally in the future.

Over the summer of 2012, we took a first step in this effort by including “faculty ambassadors” at the new student orientations. Faculty representatives from the colleges attended each orientation to provide advising for majors in their areas and to share faculty expectations with incoming students. The initial reports from the experience have been extremely positive from the perspective of all involved: students, staff, and faculty. This fall the ambassadors continued with their assignment by holding a meeting of faculty advisors within their colleges to discuss the advising needs of students and to convey what they learned about best practices in advising over the summer.

**Collegiate Learning Assessment**

Each year, SF State administers the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) as required by the Chancellor’s Office, and the results are posted on the College Portrait. (See [http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/SF-State](http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/SF-State) and [http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/SF-State/learning_outcomes](http://www.collegeportraits.org/CA/SF-State/learning_outcomes).) While the SF State CLA scores show strong, positive value-added for our institution over the past two years, we continue to have concerns about the validity of this assessment tool since different students are tested in the freshman and senior years. Despite the widespread public attention that the CLA has received based on the analysis of *Academically Adrift* (Arum and Roksa, 2011), we are concerned that this assessment tool was not intended for use on large comprehensive campuses that have a significant transfer population and do not have internal incentives that motivate students to perform well on the test. We remain impressed with the test itself and are hopeful that the Chancellor’s Office can follow up with plans to create a more appropriate value-added tool for our educational context.

**Pulse Survey and Exit Surveys**

The Pulse survey is administered each semester as students register for their classes. Each student who uses the University’s online registration system is presented with five questions with multiple-choice response options. The questions for the Pulse survey focus on issues of interest to campus administration at that particular time. The Senior and Graduate Exit Surveys, on the other hand, maintain the same set of questions over long periods of time in order to gather longitudinal data on enduring issues. See [http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/data_sets](http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/data_sets) for a complete analysis of the Senior Exit and Pulse surveys. A Graduate Exit Survey has just been implemented (see [https://sfsu.us.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cPg7NOF8OxHVOwR](https://sfsu.us.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_cPg7NOF8OxHVOwR)). (Also see *Appendix X: Student Survey Fall 2012*.)

**HERI Faculty Survey**

SF State participated in the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey for the first time in 2010-2011. The analysis of this survey can be found at [http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/heri_survey](http://air.sfsu.edu/air/acad-inst-research/heri_survey) and in *Appendix Y: SF State Results 2010-2011 HERI Faculty Survey*. One of the most interesting findings from this survey is the differing perceptions of male and female responders in terms of their job satisfaction and how they teach. The results of this survey have been passed along to Faculty Affairs to consider as they implement their faculty development plan. We will continue to administer this survey every two years.
CUSP II Strategic Plan

The SF State Strategic Plan expired in 2010. Between 2008 and 2010, four of the goals were assessed (Social Justice, Post Baccalaureate Education, Internationalization, and Full Participation) and three of the goals were incorporated into the WASC review: Writing, Community Engagement, and Institutional Purpose. The findings from these assessments are embedded within this report and can also be found at http://air.sfsu.edu/planning/plan05-10. With the completion of the CUSP II Strategic Plan, the retirement of President Robert Corrigan, and the transition to President Leslie Wong, we expect to begin a new planning process in the coming year.

3.6.2 Academic Program Assessment

As noted in the CPR report, scheduled assessment reports are reviewed by the Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Development, who determines report timelines. Some departments submit reports on an annual basis. [CFR 2.7] Departments that have fully assessed all of their learning outcomes are encouraged to conduct mini-studies on a currently relevant learning issue and are given an appropriate timeline for completion. In the past five years, a number of faculty members have attended the annual WASC Academic Resources Conference to learn about assessment, and several faculty have attended the WASC assessment academies. The Office of Academic Planning and Development regularly offers training sessions on how to write outcomes and construct rubrics.

Whether or not we are obtaining the appropriate information on student learning from program-level assessment depends on the department and its attitude toward the assessment process. Most departments that have specialized accreditation are well informed with regard to their students’ learning and are making changes based on that knowledge. In addition, just as many departments without specialized accreditation have embraced the value of assessment and are also making changes. The results across the campus are interesting.

Most students are learning the content of their majors, and departments are generally satisfied with student learning in the major. The places where issues arise are in the use of basic skills in the discipline and the level of learning in the prerequisite courses needed to move into the major. Writing continues to be an issue across the curricula, and we expect that over time the WAC/WID initiative, together with changes in our lower division composition program, will yield discernible improvement in the quality of student writing. In a variety of fields, the ability of students to analyze a problem or a situation often comes up in departmental assessment reports. A number of programs, notably Computer Science and the College of Business, have turned their attention to soft skills such as teamwork, self-directed responsibility for timeliness, and communication skills as major areas of focus. The focus on soft skills has come as a result of feedback from employers and alumni. While each department might not be fully satisfied with the evidence of their students’ assessments, more importantly, a systematic process is in place to evaluate student progress, one that engages faculty in conversations that lead to curricular and pedagogical changes intended to improve student learning. [CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7]

A few departments still remain resistant to assessment, even when they are allowed to develop qualitative, constructivist approaches and methods. Departments that have demonstrated strong pushback on assessment typically have one of two characteristics. In some cases, departments are composed of sub-disciplines that differ to a large degree in their perspectives and values. In these cases, assessment is difficult because the faculty cannot agree on the skills and knowledge that they value, and so determining what to measure becomes the sticking point. Another impasse occurs in
departments that have an individualistic culture. In these cases, it is difficult for the faculty to view the student experience from the programmatic level, which is obviously necessary for program assessment. We are still working with these departments and have made much progress in the past few years due to the exigencies of the imminent WASC visit. We should also note that the level of resistance to assessment has diminished significantly over the past five years. Most faculty nowadays assume that assessment will be a part of any campus initiative, and they are generally curious and enthusiastic about measuring the effectiveness of their own work. The Educational Effectiveness summary grid and the most recent departmental assessment reports for all departments can be accessed at http://air.sfsu.edu/assessment. We very much look forward to the day when some resources can be returned to the campus assessment efforts. Resources for summer assessment institutes, faculty attendance at assessment conferences, and faculty assigned time for assessment projects would greatly increase the university’s effectiveness in this area.

3.6.3 SF State’s Efforts to Develop General Education Assessment

As mentioned in the description of the implementation of our new GE program, one of our challenges has been developing an assessment plan. Developing institutional Baccalaureate Learning Goals was one of the first steps in the GE revision process. That document was endorsed by the Academic Senate and served as the template for the GE program. However, it has become clear that the plethora of outcomes that were drawn from the goals were not written in assessable language. Thus, in some ways we have had to go back to the drawing board in terms of our approach to learning outcomes. However, since the existing GE program is now over 30 years old, rather than halting the GE course proposal process that began in Fall 2011, we chose to continue that process while simultaneously reworking our Educational Goals into assessable institutional outcomes for the baccalaureate degree as a whole, as well as those that should be addressed in the GE curriculum. [CFR 2.3, 2.4]

Teams of faculty and administrators have participated in a number of professional development programs and retreats over the last two years in order to develop a meaningful approach to assessing the educational and extra-curricular activities that students will complete as part of their baccalaureate degree. The CSU has been instrumental in supporting assessment efforts on our campus by providing both programming and some level of financial support, allowing us to participate in activities that would have been otherwise impossible in these fiscal times. Teams attended the WASC “Retreat on Student Success” in February 2011, an AAC&U HIPs institute in June 2011, a WASC “Retreat on Assessment in Practice” in October 2011 that was paired with a CSU workshop on GE assessment, a CSU-sponsored “Engaged Learning Workshop” in December 2011, and the CSU Institute for Teaching and Learning Summer Institute on GE Assessment in June 2012. The faculty team’s goal for the latter was to develop a preliminary assessment strategy and to draft a plan for converting the Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate Degree into assessable institutional outcomes. Campus committees will review the team’s assessment proposal in 2012-2013 with a goal of having a campus-approved assessment plan for both the Baccalaureate and GE programs by the end of Spring 2013. [CFR 2.4, 4.4, 4.7, 4.8]

Although the original plan for the rollout of the revised GE program was Fall 2013, that date has been moved forward one year for two reasons. First, in these challenging budget times, it has taken longer for departments to prepare and submit course proposals. Second, the university will be making a switch in its course management system, which will not be in effect until Fall 2014. It did not make sense to program the new requirements into a system that would be obsolete within a year. This extra year should give us the time needed to have a truly thoughtful assessment plan in place.

During this time, because the new GE requirements were designed to address the Educational Goals for the Baccalaureate (http://dus.sfsu.edu/grtf/Main/vision.html), we decided to obtain some baseline
data about how much students felt that their coursework and campus experiences related to these goals, even before they were explicitly built into the curriculum. To this end, students registering for Spring 2012 courses were asked questions that related to the goals (see Appendix X: Student Pulse Survey Fall 2012). Although a majority of respondents answered questions positively, room for improvement definitely exists. As we develop courses and an assessment plan, we will pay careful attention to the areas where students seem less engaged than we would like. For example, fewer students reported that their campus experiences helped them understand concepts in science and mathematics than in other areas. Fewer students than we would like participate in community work, which we have also seen in NSSE results. [CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7]

From the report:

More than two thirds of the respondents to the questions addressing lifelong learning and critical inquiry indicated that their coursework and other campus experiences:

- Are relevant to the issues that they read or hear about in the media.
- Have helped them understand how other people form their opinions.
- Have broadened their perspective, curiosity, or creativity.
- Have helped them become better problem-solvers and more independent thinkers.

More than two thirds of the respondents to the questions on intellectual attainments and domains of knowledge reported that their coursework and campus experiences have helped them:

- Understand concepts in and the differences between the physical and biological sciences, mathematics, the social sciences, humanities, and arts.
- Employ different intellectual strategies based on the various problems they confront.

More than half of the respondents to the questions about ethical engagement reported that their coursework and campus experiences have:

- Helped them understand ethical dimensions of decision-making and develop their own sense of values.
- Helped them embrace a personal responsibility to work toward social justice and equity in their community.
- Motivated them to do community work, with 68% reporting that they plan to dedicate some of their time to improving their community after they graduate.

The majority of the respondents to the questions addressing the integration and application of knowledge reported that their coursework and campus experiences achieved the goals specified in the survey.

- More than half indicated that they have helped them understand the economic crisis, environmental problems, political issues, and global conflict(s).
- More than two thirds indicated that their coursework and campus experiences have been useful to them in non-university settings.

The final group of questions examined the amount of time spent or frequency of participation by undergraduate students in various activities.

- More than three quarters of the respondents reported that they spend 10 hours per week or less on social networking websites such as Facebook and Twitter, while more than half reported spending 10 hours per week or more on academic work outside of the classroom.
- Nearly two thirds of the respondents indicated that they do not belong to any student organizations.
Nearly half indicated that they do not spend any time doing community service. Of those who indicated that they do, most reported spending one to five hours per semester on it.

Nearly four in 10 respondents indicated that they never participate in campus events and activities. Of those who indicated that they do participate, most reported that they participate occasionally, i.e., once or twice per semester.

The University Academic Assessment Advisory Committee is currently working on developing an assessment methodology for the General Education program. Once that methodology has been adopted and the program has been in place for two years, we expect to have program-level, quantitative direct measures of student learning that can be compared to this baseline data.

### 3.6.4 Assessment of Co-Curricular Programs

Student Affairs/Enrollment Management (SAEM) is preparing to enter its fourth cycle of outcomes-based assessment. Launched in April 2009, the division-wide assessment program has fundamentally changed the ways in which SAEM professionals conceive, develop, deliver, and assess programs and services.

In Spring 2010, an associate vice president of SAEM was charged with overseeing strategic planning and assessment efforts for the division. This AVP now chairs the SAEM Assessment Team. The team, made up of three directors and one professional staff member, meets monthly to coordinate SAEM assessment activities. Team members developed a rubric to assess the 2010-2011 departmental assessment plans and reports and the 2011-2012 plans. Upon completion of this review, team members met with each department to provide feedback and guidance for the development of future assessment efforts.

The team also created a new format for departments to report more consistently on their plans and results. The team will convene an assessment refresher workshop for SAEM assessment leaders in the fall of 2012. These structures, tools, and workshops will provide the division with the capacity to continue to evaluate its work in terms of student learning.

Directors were asked to develop instruments and collect data to measure the student learning that occurred. As might be expected in an inaugural effort at identifying measurable outcomes, some instruments and assessment approaches proved to be more valuable than others. The second and third cycles of developing and measuring outcomes were greatly improved based on the experience gained in 2009-10.

In an effort to illustrate the effectiveness of our division’s assessment program, four examples are listed below:

1. In the 2009-10 assessment period, Student Outreach Services (SOS) had four goals, three of which dealt with helping prospective students gain a better understanding of requirements for admission and of the application process while actively involving faculty and staff in outreach efforts. To get an idea of how prepared future students are to apply for admission, SOS collaborated with our most impacted program, the School of Nursing (SON), on their preadmission advising presentations. At the end of each session, attendees were asked to complete a short survey developed by SOS and SON focusing on basic criteria of the major and transfer admissions. Of the 140 completed surveys, SOS learned that potential upper division SON students (more than 90%) were overwhelmingly informed about the criteria to not only apply to SF State, but also to the Nursing major.
2. Another example from the 2009-10 assessment period is the Athletics department’s goal to “provide equitable athletic opportunities for both men and women.” This goal aligns with one of the key campus tenets to provide equitable access and opportunity to all students. The Athletic Director is responsible for providing funding that ensures a just distribution of resources between the men’s and women’s teams. To meet this goal, the department’s budget maintains a 5% to 10% difference between scholarships and operations funding for both men’s and women’s teams. To measure the consistency of this goal, the department’s budget manager prepares the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) report annually. The EADA report has proven to be an excellent measure of equitable distribution, and the department has continued to meet this goal.

3. During the 2010-11 assessment period, one of the goals of the Residential Life department was to “increase residents’ awareness and knowledge regarding the negative impact of alcohol consumption and/or drug abuse.” In order to measure their goal, a quantitative resident survey was administered in Fall 2010 that included questions linking the enhancement of knowledge surrounding alcohol use and abuse to living on campus. Out of the 2,463 on-campus residents, 1,132 responded, yielding a 43% return rate. The results of the survey proved that residents’ knowledge about alcohol use and abuse had increased either greatly or moderately, with 82% of the responses indicating an increase in their understanding since becoming residents. However, Residential Life also noted the importance of continuing outreach and education surrounding this topic, and would like to partner with Prevention Education Programs in the future.

4. The final example, taken from our 2010-11 assessment period, is a goal by the Counseling and Psychological Services Center (CPSC) to “enhance the psychological well-being and support academic success and retention of students by increasing the number of students who attend their follow-up sessions” at CPSC. Judging from the results presented in a report on the previous year’s appointments, CPSC observed that 28% of students with follow-up appointments failed to keep them. Although CPSC services and appointments reduce student distress, students under a lot of stress may easily forget about their follow-up appointments. As a result, CPSC established a $20 no-show fee and input a system to contact students 24-48 hours prior to their scheduled appointment. At the end of the assessment period, CPSC noted a significant increase (20%) in students showing up for their follow-up appointments. With this decrease in missed appointments, CPSC continues to meet their goal by supporting students’ psychological well-being and academic success.

All SAEM assessment plans and reports can be found at www.sfsu.edu/~vpsa/assessment.html. Assessment plans/reports for the following departments are included:

- Athletics (Note: Effective January 1, 2012, the Athletics reporting line was moved to the Vice President for University Advancement.)
- Campus Recreation
- Student Involvement and Career Center (SICC)
- Disability Programs and Resource Center (DPRC)
- Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)
- Enrollment Management
- Financial Aid
- Registrar’s Office
- Residential Life
- Student Health Services
The academic co-curricular programs are also assessed on a regular basis. (See Appendix M: Campus Academic Resource Program Year-end Report 2011-12.) The Campus Academic Resource Program (CARP) evaluates its tutorial sessions, academic support sessions, test preparation programs, and outreach projects on an ongoing basis. The reports are discussed by the CARP staff and submitted to the Office of Academic Planning and Development. The Learning Assistance Center (LAC) also conducts ongoing program evaluations. During the 2011-2012 Academic Year, LAC conducted a study of retention of First-Time-Freshman students. The purpose of the study was to examine outcomes for students who successfully completed the LAC Writing Workshop Program compared to the outcomes for students who were registered for the workshop but did not receive credit because of lack of attendance. The results of the study demonstrate dramatic success in the retention, matriculation, and graduation of students who completed the course. (See Appendix L: Learning Assistance Center Year-end Report.)

### 3.6.5 Integrating Assessment in Future Planning

As this essay indicates, a great deal of assessment activity is occurring across divisions throughout the University. Particularly in the area of academic programs, assessment has become an integral aspect of curriculum planning and development. Faculty now often come to administration and institutional research with their own designs for studying student learning. Our area of greatest challenge lies in developing an adequate assessment and program review process for the new General Education program. The task force groups for this effort are in place, but much work remains ahead.
WASC asserts that the primary goal of the Educational Effectiveness Review is to “invite sustained engagement by the institution on the extent to which it fulfills its educational objectives.” This work as it applies to our three themes has been the focus of this report. We close this report by summarizing our accomplishments and our challenges as identified herein.

The WASC review has given us the opportunity to deeply study the commitment to our shared core values of social justice and civic engagement. Both of these institutional priorities are profoundly embedded in our curricula, research, co-curricular programs, and service to the community. The data that we have gathered for the review pointed us to particular strengths in the curriculum, but also to a discrepancy between social justice and civic engagement, especially for first year students. We are secure in knowing that social justice is a value that is embedded in every aspect of the university’s activities. We also now understand that we must undertake a number of measures in order to ensure that civic engagement has the same presence in the university community, and those activities are now underway. In addition, in the coming years we must measure and evaluate the General Education learning outcomes related to these institutional values.

The changing student population has created the need for more student service support programs, and the WASC review has given us an opportunity to develop and study these needed programs. This effort has overlapped into the Student Success and Graduation Initiative as we have come to understand through analysis and reflection the necessity for Student Affairs and Academic Affairs to work hand in hand in our effort to improve student learning and graduation rates. This effort has to occur both inside and outside of the classroom.

Our study of the changing faculty has prompted the recognition that new faculty need clear guidelines and greater support for developing their scholarship. The School of Public Affairs and Civic Engagement is in the process of creating a template that might be used by other departments in clarifying their RTP guidelines. The subcommittee work of the WASC review in this area has given voice through focus groups to many of the concerns of both junior and senior faculty. It has also provided the impetus for ORSP to work more closely with faculty on their development of research capabilities.

Deep analytic work is occurring in the area of student success. This work has occurred largely independently of the WASC review, but the review has given us the opportunity to aggregate many efforts and evaluate their effectiveness. The extensive Milestone Study allowed us to set benchmarks for freshman and sophomore students and provided a comparison for all at-risk populations and support efforts. This effort has allowed us to finally identify the students we need to provide with additional support. However, there is no silver bullet for quickly improving graduation rates or ensuring student learning. Although we have not yet reached our goal of a 50.6% graduation rate, that increase now seems attainable, and we are encouraged and excited about closing the gap between URM and non-URM students. A groundswell of faculty is beginning to take interest in this issue with regard to their own students, and they are independently researching and making changes. These efforts will continue long after the review has been completed.

After years of debate, the General Education program is in the process of implementation. Though it had been scheduled to begin in Fall 2013, to ensure a high quality program that is shared by all faculty, and to continue to develop the culture of assessment that has begun to grow at SF State, we
now know that we will need another year to complete the implementation. Although planning the assessment of this program has been a challenge, faculty are deeply involved in researching best practices, and their work will translate into a comprehensive and effective assessment of General Education.

The current WASC reaccreditation review has occurred over an eventful period of time for San Francisco State University. Since the review began, we have transitioned to a new Provost and a new President. We have reduced from eight to six colleges, hired two new deans, and added almost 100 new faculty. Student enrollment, particularly out-of-area students, has increased; we have a new CSU Chancellor, and the CSU budget has been cut by 39%. There is no doubt that in the next few years, the University will face the need to change in fundamental ways if we are to maintain the level of education that we have traditionally provided to students. We believe that we must be forward thinking if we are to continue our commitment to higher education rather than simply lamenting the budget crisis.

We face these challenges buoyed by the knowledge that our core campus values remain strong and that they have served us well in navigating the challenges presented by recent reductions in state funding. With the expiration of our strategic plan in 2010 and with a new administration in place, we must renew and revise our institutional plan. We look forward to that planning process and to the outcomes that will direct the path of the institution in the years ahead. Our previous institutional planning efforts were essential to predicting the needs of our students and initiating institutional activities that have allowed us to overcome significant challenges. Initiating a new planning process that will help us move ahead fiscally and academically is critical to our continued success.

In one of his first addresses to the campus, President Leslie Wong stated, “The challenges ahead of us are daunting only if we want them to be. San Francisco State University has never been shy in the face of ideas or quiet with our passions. For me that represents the vitality of a great university.”

On balance, we believe the future of San Francisco State University is bright. The deep analysis and self-reflection necessitated by the reaccreditation effort have prepared us for the planning efforts that lie ahead. We hope that our research and reflection come through clearly in this report. We are well aware of the challenges and opportunities before us, and we now need to reflect on how to address them. Our leadership is committed to delivering on the promise of our mission, and we look forward to a productive relationship with WASC as we strive to fulfill this promise.